

men in the State, especially among those who own slaves, and I have not one word for them except a brother's word of hearty greeting. I want gentlemen to understand that when I say rebels I mean rebels; and they need not get up in this hall to defend themselves. There are men whom I denounce, and whom I have a right to denounce, as guilty of the worst of crimes. I want gentlemen hereafter to understand that when I speak of rebels I mean those who are rebels, and have no personal allusions to which they may feel called upon to resent.

Now, in regard to the arguments urged here against this reconsideration. My friend from Somerset (Mr. Jones) has insinuated that it was the bad faith upon the part of the government that has put its currency where it is, at 2.50 in the money market.

Mr. JONES, of Somerset. That was not my statement. I said that our action here of bad faith in preserving the guarantees of the constitution upon this subject was calculated to impair the public faith in the government. I did not say that the effect of it had been to depreciate the currency. There have been other causes for that.

Mr. SANDS. I understood the gentleman to argue that the failure of the government to carry out the fugitive slave law, and other things, was the cause why a dollar in gold was worth two and a half dollars in greenbacks. Now, if bad faith on this side of the government has depreciated our currency to this extent, what under heaven must have been the character of that faith upon the other side of the Potomac which has carried it down to twenty and thirty for one? It is not that which affects the currency of the government; or of course down below there their paper would demand a premium in gold. For are they not the pink of all that is honorable? Do not they live up to all their constitutional obligations down there? Has not every body got his rights down there? Is any body harmed or molested down there? Of course not! And the legitimate conclusion is and must be that down there, their paper currency is at a premium, because it rests upon the faith of plighted obligations, which are immortal, unchangeable, eternal, never to be broken.

Now one word more in reply to the gentleman from Charles (Mr. Edelen.) He wants me to vote for this proposition of the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Stockbridge,) or to declare, if I do not do so, that he (Mr. Stockbridge) and those who voted with him are dishonorable men. Certainly not. Is it a rule that because gentlemen differ in their views and their ideas of duty, of course the one side or the other must be dishonorable? That is the first time I ever heard such a doctrine announced. We all have our own ideas of our duty, and all that any man can do in this world, however conscientious and good a promise-keeper he may be, is to live up to his

idea of duty. Now I doubt not the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Stockbridge) has lived up to his idea of duty; and I do not say he is dishonorable, or dishonest, or that he has done anything that a gentleman should not do. I know him to be a man of the purest honor and integrity. But it does not follow that because he and I separate upon a proposition before this body, either he or I are doing a dishonorable thing.

There are other reasons why I oppose the proposition embodied in this section. It does discriminate, and discriminates in favor of a class of persons who, in my humble opinion, have the least claim to discrimination. I voted yesterday for the proposition embodied in the preceding section; that the legislature should have power to pass all laws necessary for the distribution of any grant in land, money, or securities that the government of the United States might tender the citizens of Maryland, to be distributed according to the terms of the grant. There was my vote declaring simply—and it received the unanimous vote of this convention with a single exception—that I would be glad, if the general government felt itself in the condition, if it had the right and power to do it, to have it done. Most of my friends and relatives are people who are interested and have been in that species of property. I have many warm personal friends who are interested in the institution. Would I stand in the way of repairing any fortune of theirs that had been impaired, if a party having the power to do so was willing to do so? Certainly not; most assuredly not.

But I know that in my part of the State, as a class, those who are interested in this species of property, are not persons who, by their conduct, and their votes, and their voice, have been supporting and sustaining the government. In the congressional election which resulted in elevating Mr. Calvert to the Congress of the United States, in the evening when the polls were closed, and when I knew there was a large majority of ballots deposited for Mr. Calvert, as I was passing away from the court-house I saw one of our good, earnest Union men sitting upon the steps of the court-house. I said to him: "Well, Sam, what is the matter? It is all right; Calvert has a tremendous vote." Sam studied awhile, and then said: "I have no doubt about that, but it is not all right." Now Sam is as good a man as lives in Maryland to-day, though not a very elegant or highly polished gentleman. I asked him why it was not all right? Said he: "I have voted here for years and years; and this is the first time I have ever seen the line drawn between slaveholders and non-slaveholders." There were but two persons in the first-named class in the whole district that came up that day and voted what we called the Union ticket.

Mr. BERRY, of Prince George's. Was not