

hundreds of them. And why? Because they preached and taught heresies that misled others? No, sir. But because they loved the land that gave them birth, and were willing to die for it.

Now there is no doubt about the true ring of that word "loyal." We have rather changed sides on this question. There was a time when the cavalier was willing to die for his king upon the bare idea of loyalty. "Loyalty" was his watch-word. But now we have changed sides; and if you only breathe in the ears of the chivalry the word "loyalty," they are like Richard—"Its shadows to-night have struck more terror to the soul of Richard, than could ten thousand soldiers armed in proof, and led by shallow Richmond." The very word is a bomb-shell to them. Now I think it is a good word, and I trust in God it will never lose its significance. I trust in God it will go upon every page of our laws, constitutional and statutory, where it is appropriate. It is a good thing. And if it had been honestly lived up to and practiced, instead now of the booming of cannon and the clashing of swords, the song of peace would have been sounding all over the land. It is because men were not loyal, but were disloyal, that these things are upon us now.

I wish now to say just a word or two in reply to some remarks that fell from the gentleman from Somerset (Mr. Jones.) His general principles are always good; his premises are sound. But I sometimes cannot understand the logical processes by which my excellent friend reaches his conclusions. He uttered what we all know to be a correct maxim, that all men are presumed to be innocent until proven guilty. That is all right. And he says that no man shall be compelled to give testimony against himself. That is all right. And then comes the conclusion that we are pre-suming all men to be guilty. Now we are not, we are hoping and praying that they are not. And instead of compelling them to come into court and testify against themselves, we simply say to them—"go into the court of conscience; conscience shall be your judge; no one shall be heard against you; you shall go into the privacy of your own house and your own closet, away from the ears of any one; and if conscience acquits you, we acquit you also." Now where is the hardship of all that? Where is the difficulty in the way of an innocent man? I cannot see it. There is no difficulty there to me.

I make the same distinction between the constitution of my country, the laws of my country, the government of my country and those who administer it for the time, as the gentlemen do in one sense. I know they are distinct. But I know that the one cannot exist a moment without the other. I know that those constitutionally chosen to administer the government are the motive power of the

government. I know that my country can no more exist without its constitutional administrators, than a locomotive can run from here to the junction without steam. The constitution is worthless; it is dead; it is as if it were not, without the motive power. And no man has the right, and no man ever did have the right to rebel against the administrators of this government until they had infringed his constitutional rights. Now let gentlemen deny if they can, let them claim if they can that the mere administrators of the government are to be rebelled against and driven from power, simply because they are distasteful to a portion of the people, before they have exercised unconstitutionally one of their attributes and powers. Not so. And men who lived under the constitution of the United States, whether they resided in Maryland, or in Maine, or in Texas, or in South Carolina, know this fact. And if they had been sincere in their love for the one, they would have stood by the other, until that other had done something that was wrong and oppressive.

Now, is that the history of this rebellion? On the pretence of the election of our present President, they have made war upon their country; not upon him, for he was not in power when they commenced this rebellion. He was then a private citizen; just as much a private citizen as the gentleman from Somerset, or myself. But in bare hostility to the man, they have made war upon your country or mine. And they did it, some with bayonets, and some, the subtler few, by word and other deed. Now, my friend from Somerset (Mr. Jones) said that his objection to the oath in this article, was, that it went to the word, and act, and deed of a party. Why, my dear sir, did you not, before you were qualified for a seat upon this floor, take and subscribe to an oath in which those very words stand printed?

Mr. JONES, of Somerset. I was speaking of the amendment of the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Stirling,) and not to what had been reported from the committee, which I had not had an opportunity of reading. I do not know what language is used in the report of the committee.

Mr. EBLEEN. The amendment of the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Stirling,) is very different from the report of the committee.

Mr. SANDS. My remarks were intended to meet the general debate in which gentlemen have indulged. I have no doubt the gentleman from Baltimore city will take care of his amendment. I say that the very oath that qualified us to take our seats here, is in that exact language. If gentlemen, then, without any violation of conscience, whose dictates of course they obeyed, took that oath, there was no compulsion upon them to come here; it was a voluntary act. The taking of the oath