

referred to Mr. Clay and Mr. Clay's sentiments. He could not quote a more patriotic, a more honest, or a more able statesman. I listen always to the counsels of Clay with as much reverence and respect as to those of any other statesman at any time in the history of our country. On one or two occasions I have been intending to call the attention of my friend to the counsels of Mr. Clay upon a subject that he seems studiously to avoid.—When he can find a remark of Mr. Clay on the ambition of southern statesmen, as he says, he is ready to adopt it, but when Mr. Clay has uttered warnings against danger from another source, they seem never to have reached the gentleman's attention. I beg to call the gentleman's attention to a few extracts from a speech delivered by Mr. Clay as long ago as 1839, in which he warned his countrymen, in a strain of impassioned eloquence, of the dire consequences of abolitionism and northern attacks upon southern institutions, and in reading his remarks, every one will be strikingly impressed with the fact that what he then predicted has actually come to pass:

"Abolition should no longer be regarded as an imaginary danger. The abolitionists, let me suppose, succeed in their present aim of uniting the inhabitants of the free States as one man against the inhabitants of the slave States. Union on the one side will beget union on the other. And this process of reciprocal consolidation will be attended with all the violent prejudices, embittered passions, and implacable animosities, which ever degraded or deformed human nature. A virtual dissolution of the Union will have taken place, while the forms of its existence remain. The most valuable element of union, mutual kindness, the feelings of sympathy, the fraternal bonds which now happily unite us, will have been extinguished forever. One section will stand in menacing and hostile array against the other. The collision of opinion will be quickly followed by the clash of arms."

Now listen to his picture of the consequences:

"I will not attempt to describe scenes which now happily lie concealed from our view. Abolitionists themselves would shrink back in dismay and horror at the contemplation of desolated fields, conflagrated cities, murdered inhabitants, and the overthrow of the fairest fabric of human government that ever rose to animate the hopes of civilized man. Nor should the abolitionists flatter themselves that, if they can succeed in their object of uniting the people of the free States, they will enter the contest with numerical superiority that must insure victory. All history and experience proves the hazard and uncertainty of war. And we are admonished by Holy Writ that the race is not to the swift nor the battle to the strong.

"But if they were to conquer, whom would

they conquer? A foreign foe—one who had insulted our flag, invaded our shores, and laid our country waste? No sir; no. It would be a conquest without laurels, without glory—a self-suicidal conquest—a conquest of brothers over brothers, achieved by one over another portion of the descendants of common ancestors, who nobly pledging their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor, had fought and bled side by side, in many a hard battle on land and ocean, severed our country from the British crown, and established our national independence."

There are two sides to this question; and I give the gentleman the warnings of Mr. Clay against the consequences of abolitionism in the north, while the gentleman gives us the consequences of the ambition of statesmen in the south.

With reference to the definition of the word "loyalty" upon which he insists, the objection to it is that we know not what it means. If, as the gentleman from Prince George's (Mr. Murbury) says, it means a steadfast and faithful obligation of obedience to the constitution and laws of the country, we understand that, and there is not a man in Maryland who is not ready to take the oath to support it. I presume that any man who withholds his assent to that would have manliness enough to go elsewhere. Those who stay here are presumed to stay under the laws and the constitution, and to be ready to perform their duties.

But the objection is, that what is loyalty to-day is disloyalty to-morrow; and a man does not know when he gets up in the morning, supposing him to be perfectly loyal in heart—the gentleman himself cannot tell whether he is loyal to-day or not. A new policy may have been adopted by the President, and a new proclamation issued, which the gentleman has not yet read, taking the back track and upsetting all his calculations. If it is loyalty to sustain the President in all his acts, then that idea of loyalty would be to sustain a government in tyranny, in all its measures.

Mr. SANDS. I hope the gentleman will excuse me for interrupting him, but my language could not bear that construction. I said expressly that it was to support the President and those in authority with him, and to obey them so long as they continue in the lawful discharge of their duty.

Mr. JONES, of Somerset. That is right; and upon that definition of the oath of loyalty I will take it every morning and every night.

Mr. SANDS. That is my definition.

Mr. JONES, of Somerset. Then it ought to be in the oath. I will show you what was loyal in 1861. I will show you what was the deliberate statement made by the President, through the secretary of state, in his instructions (No. 3) to Mr. Dayton, our minister to Paris. He says:

"The condition of slavery in the several