

says to his dissatisfied country, "Suppose you make a war; you cannot fight always, and when you have fought for years with no great advantage on either side"—that has precisely been fulfilled—"the same questions will come back upon you to be settled by negotiation as to the terms of future intercourse." Is not that true to-day? Why will you attempt here to put a reminder into your constitution on the suspicion, for it is nothing more, that there are disloyal men in your midst? For Heaven's sake, is it possible that there can be men committing the crimes enumerated here—committing these political offences in the State of Maryland, surrounded as they are on every side by spies and detectives of the government, whom the President has unlimited power to employ—around us even in our hotels—is it possible that these offences can be committed and yet that the government can obtain no evidence by which they can come upon the man who is guilty indeed and try and punish the offender according to law? Must we get up these *ex post facto* declarations of offences to disqualify men?

There is an injustice in what the gentleman says about not requiring a man to testify against himself, because he is only required to swear in case he accepts the office. If a man is to be perfectly pure and free from all stain of political offences he ought also to be perfectly pure and free from all violation of the moral law. It is just as much an offence to violate the moral law as the political law. His allegiance to his God is quite as strong as his allegiance to his country. If he must swear that he has never failed in rendering true allegiance to his country, he should also swear that he has never violated the moral law; and I have therefore embraced in one of my amendments the oath—that he has never violated the moral law known as the Ten Commandments, as contained in the 20th chapter of the book of Exodus. There would not many of us hold office or vote either hereafter, under such rules. I confess that I would retire for I could not take it. But if you are to take the other test, I think you should adopt that, no matter whom it may exclude. I thought yesterday that the gentleman was most magnanimous in proposing that nobody but a native-born Marylander should be eligible to the office of governor, thereby excluding himself, but it turned out that he only meant to exclude those not born in the United States, and that citizens of Massachusetts were not excluded by his amendment.

I am sorry to say that the foundation of all this trouble and of all our troubles is that cursed love of self which is apostrophised by the poet:

"Oh, cursed idol, self!

The wretch that worships there would dare to tread

With impious feet on his own father's head—
To 'scape the rising wave when seas the land
invade—

To gain the safety of some higher ground,
He'd trample down the dikes that fence his
country 'round,
Amidst a general flood, and leave a nation
drowned!"

I thank the convention for the magnanimous forbearance with which they have listened to my remarks, and I appeal to them not to incorporate the bitter feelings arising out of this civil war into the organic law of the State.

Mr. THOMAS called for the previous question, but the call was not sustained.

Mr. SANDS. I wish to ask my friend this question, whether if his amendment prevailed it would not destroy all government all over the earth? If men were required to swear that they had never violated the Ten Commandments, would it not destroy civil government utterly?

Mr. JONES, of Somerset. I think it would. No—I rather think there would be found men under the intense feeling of selfishness who would take the oath every day if required, as is done about the blockade now.

Mr. SANDS. I hope the gentleman will not throw objections in the way by an amendment proposing an oath no one can take.

Mr. JONES, of Somerset. That is the very objection I raised to the other oath. But although I proposed this amendment I cannot vote for it myself.

Mr. SANDS. The gentleman from Somerset (Mr. Jones) read the policy of the government in 1861. I would like to ask my friend whether he was found among the supporters of that policy then. I would like to know whether he did not hear that policy denounced high and low, far and wide, in the State of Maryland under the rebellion. When I put the question to him why the whole Southern country did not embrace it, his reply was that he was not responsible for the whole Southern country. Now, on what principle does he allude to a single man from Massachusetts, Wendell Phillips, and attempt to hold us, and the government, and everybody responsible for him? The President, through his mouth-piece, went further in 1861, in order to quiet the country and to relieve apprehension, when he said this in Washington: "The government of the United States has no more to do with slavery in the States than with serfdom in Russia." In the name of God, ought not that to have satisfied the gentlemen? Yet you earl all over this State but the cry of the down-trodden Southern brethren, our wronged Southern brethren, although this policy had been announced by the President, and although the declaration of Mr. Lincoln in his inaugural said to the country far and wide that the