

States will remain just the same whether the revolution succeed or fail. There is not even a pretext for the complaint that the disaffected States are to be conquered by the United States if the revolution fail; for the rights of the States, and the condition of every human being in them, will remain subject to exactly the same laws and forms of administration, whether the revolution shall succeed or whether it shall fail. In the one case, the States would be federally connected with the new confederacy; in the other, they would as now, be members of the United States; but their constitutions and laws, customs, habits, and institutions in either case will remain the same."

Mr. SANDS. One question right there. If that was loyalty in 1861, why did not the whole southern country embrace it?

Mr. JONES, of Somerset. I am not responsible for the southern country. I am a Marylander, a citizen of Maryland, a loyal citizen, standing by the constitution and the laws of the United States. I am not apologizing for any one. I am speaking for no one but ourselves. I think the experience of the last three or four years has shown that it is enough to try to take care of ourselves. I am speaking of loyalty in the State of Maryland; of those who have stood by our law, and abode by the constitution our fathers made, and have not gone off to make a new constitution or to enter into new associations. But let me go on with this policy:

"It is hardly necessary," continued Mr. Seward, "to add to this incontestable statement the further fact that the new President, as well as the citizens through whose suffrages he came into the administration, has always repudiated all designs whatever, wherever imputed to him and them, of disturbing the system of slavery as it is existing under the constitution and laws. *The case, however, would not be fully presented if I were to omit to say that any such effort on his part would be UNCONSTITUTIONAL, and all his actions in this direction would be prevented by the judicial authority, even though they were assented to by Congress and the people.*"

Does loyalty stand upon that doctrine today? Does the gentleman place himself upon that platform for the coming canvass, as an elector for this State? Will he take this as constitutional law and the policy of the State, and plant himself upon it, and call upon all loyal men to come up and stand by him on it?

The President said the other day that no man might come to him from the South, bringing a proposition of peace, without first being authorized to declare that they abandoned their system of slavery in the States. In one of the amendments I propose to offer, I shall take this very language in the despatch of Mr. Seward and substitute it for the following words in the amendment:

"And I do further swear or affirm that I will to the best of my abilities protect and defend the Union of the United States, and not allow the same to be broken up and dissolved."

Wendell Phillips announced to Congress in Washington, in the presence of the President, that he had labored for nineteen years to break up the Union; but it was broken, and he thanked God it was broken. Is it not the policy of the government now, and for some years past has it not been coming into the idea that the Southern States are not in the Union, that they are out of the Union? Is it not the subject of a quarrel now among those who sustain the President, or his party? Is not Henry Winter Davis, and are not others who agree with him, blaming the President because he wants to allow ten righteous men to save a State under the constitution, because he says that if they form a republican government and that government is sustained by nine-tenths of the population, it shall be sufficient? Are not Wade and Henry Winter Davis insisting, on the other hand, that according to the principles of the constitution it ought to require a majority? And really, I think they have the best of the argument.

But this oath is: "I will to the best of my abilities protect and defend the Union of the United States, and not allow the same to be broken up and dissolved." By implication you swear that it is not broken up and dissolved. Has not the Union of the United States been broken up and dissolved? Is there any Union without a constitution? The oath says: "I will bear true allegiance to the United States, and support, protect and defend the constitution, laws and government thereof, as the supreme law of the land." That is provided for. But that is not sufficient. You must not only support, protect and defend the constitution of the United States, and obey the laws, but you must go outside of the constitution, and support, protect and defend the government of the United States; you must protect and defend the Union of the United States, and not allow the same to be broken up. You must go outside of the constitution and laws of the country—for that is not enough to preserve your loyalty—and protect and defend the government of the United States. Are we to be sworn to do this, when Hon. Henry Winter Davis, one of the republican high priests, has denounced the acts of the President in relation to Arkansas and some other States as usurpation and violations of the constitution of the United States, in so many words, and in express terms?

Are we to be called upon, without regard to the constitution, to follow the President, and to say to the States of the South: "We will have no Union with you unless you abandon your customs, your institutions,