

selves and each other would be sufficient. Of all the speeches delivered here, no two of them have been alike; no one even completely consistent with itself. I do not mean in point of talent or authority; but they have not been in the same direction, they have not taught the same doctrine. One gentleman tells us that there is a sort of mixed allegiance; that a part of the allegiance of the citizen is due to the State Government, and a part to the United States Government; but neither is paramount. Another gentleman seems to ignore almost entirely the existence of the United States Government; he says that the State governments are supreme; though there was a sort of obedience due for the time being to the United States Government, it might be withdrawn at any time.

But my honored friend from Somerset (Mr. Jones) presented about the rawest specimen of secession—with all due deference and respect I make the remark. [Laughter.] He said the States could assume the rights and powers granted to the General Government at any time; that it was a perfect matter of convenience to them. They could remain in the Union as long as it suited their purposes, and at any time without a moment's notice, without a word of apology, they could withdraw their powers from the General Government and establish themselves into an independent nation. Indeed the whole debate reminds me very much of what I see on the restaurant signs—"Oysters in every style." [Great laughter.] The Somerset dish I designate as the raw; [renewed laughter,] the Prince George's dish is cooked and somewhat seasoned to suit a more delicate palate. [Continued laughter.] These remarks apply about the same to all of them; there were no two of the speeches alike.

But notwithstanding the great variety of these speeches, the wide range they took, and their dissimilarity in many respects; it mattered not what their terms were, nor how they pursued their theory, they all arrived at the same result. I do not know exactly what to call it. I know they most all denounced anything like secession, and of course, we have to take them at their word, and I will not call them secessionists. But if I was up in Cecil county, I should call them all secession speeches, for we have a homely way up there of calling things by their right names; and that is what I would call all these speeches if made up there.

I forgot one gentleman from Somerset, (Mr. Dennis.) His fury against the administration and the government was so intense that he forgot to say whether he was secessor or not; whether there was any allegiance due to anybody or not. He was so rampant and raging at the assumption of military power or martial law by the General Government, that he forgot everything else, and did not exactly state his platform, except that mar-

tial law was no law, but the absence of all law; and that we in Maryland were suffering under the greatest tyranny and oppression felt anywhere on earth. Now, the very fact that the gentleman was permitted to utter such language in this House or anywhere else under the flag of the United States, proves the utter falsity of his own assertions.

The doctrine of State rights as taught by the Prince George's school, or the Somerset school, is no new doctrine. As early as 1831 and 1832 it was taught in South Carolina, and attempted to be reduced to practice there. But it so happened that we had a stubborn old customer in the Presidential chair—one Andrew Jackson. [Applause.] He had not got his education in that school, and if I had thought of it, before I came over here this afternoon, I would have brought his proclamation along, for it is first-rate reading, and I think as much to the point as anything that can be read here. He had something to say about that matter, and inflicted upon it such a total and overwhelming defeat that since that time it has not dared to show its face openly, but has pursued its purposes in a secret and disguised way.

Consequently, we heard of Southern commercial conventions, in which all the Southern States were represented. What they did behind the curtain the world never knew, except as it could judge from the developments made since. Publicly they made great professions about steamships from New Orleans and Mobile, perhaps some other ports, to Europe; a great anxiety for ocean steam communication. That was what the world heard of. But their real purpose was to educate the Southern mind into the belief that the State governments were superior to the General Government; so that whenever the interests of slavery taught them it was time to break down the General Government, the people would be prepared to do it. That was the simple purpose for which those Southern commercial conventions were called. And although the Constitution of the United States expressly prohibits the States from sending or receiving ambassadors, yet they baptized certain individuals "State Commissioners," who went travelling hither and thither all over the country laying their plans to break up this government.

And here permit me to say that, notwithstanding the general expression of loyalty made by gentlemen here, their opposition to secession, and their devotion to the country, which I do not choose to question, there is one very remarkable coincidence to be noticed. That is, that Burnett, and Breckinridge, and Davis, and Yancey, and Rhett, and Wigfall, and many others now in arms against the Government of the United States, all made just such speeches and professions up to the very hour when they left their seats in Congress to take their places in the ranks of the