

dare to rise in his place and tell me that Jeff. Davis and the Southern traitors have not violated the constitution? With all their earnest advocacy of States' rights upon this floor, not one of those gentlemen has ever dared to say he was in favor of secession outright. They have argued that point right down. They have taken the premises. They have argued to the conclusion. But when they have got right up to the conclusion they have turned round and many of them have said, 'We are not in favor of secession or the conduct of the secessionists of the Southern States.' I believe that one gentleman from Prince George's and another gentleman from Somerset, if they did not say so, right out, agreed with them in their wild theories before they went that length, and I believe the gentleman from Somerset (Mr. Jones) claims the merit of consistency, having been in favor of them from 1832 or '33 up to the present time. We cannot claim consistency. We have heard to-day a great deal thrown at the majority of this house about changes. Gentlemen in the minority pride themselves upon their never having changed, some gentlemen especially.

I think I recollect, and the gentleman from Somerset will pardon me for referring to it, that some years ago in a political campaign the gentleman in a public speech—it was in the know-nothing days—said upon this very matter of his vote here in favor of secession, that he was pretty strongly beat at the time, and that it was one of the follies of his youth, and he hoped it would be passed over and forgotten.

Mr. JONES, of Somerset. The gentleman is mistaken. I have maintained these views at all times and upon all occasions. But I have never seen the time when I have advocated the application of them.

Mr. DANIEL. That is my recollection. Mr. Langford replied to the speech at the time.

Mr. JONES, of Somerset. Mr. Langford agreed with me perfectly at the time on that subject.

Mr. DANIEL. You said in that speech that that vote was one of the follies of your youth and you hoped it would be forgotten.

Mr. JONES, of Somerset. The gentleman is entirely mistaken. I never said any such thing.

Mr. DANIEL. Well, sir, that is not very important. I am sorry while I am upon this point that the other gentleman from Somerset (Mr. Dennis) is not here at this time, who spoke in such wild and extravagant terms of the administration of this government. He is not one of the gentlemen claiming that they have never changed. I believe he is an exception, and admits that he has made some changes. Although at one time he was of the school of Webster, he claims to have come to see the folly of it, and denounces it, and has taken the other track. I will say with

reference to that gentleman, that I have been in campaigns with him and heard him urge these very doctrines. I know no man who admired, according to his public statements, more than the gentleman himself, Webster and the principles which Webster enunciated. Even after the breaking out of this revolution, that gentleman was in Somerset county one of the strongest and most violent Union men who rose upon the platform to address the audiences. That gentleman was elected to the legislature as a Union man, and after he took his seat in the legislature, resolutions came from South Carolina to ask this State to co-operate with her, and no man made such a flaming Union speech against that as the gentleman himself.

To-day the gentleman is a convert to State's rights. I have to say further that that gentleman was a prominent candidate for Congress on the Union side, while he was in this very rebel legislature, if I may so call it; but he did not get the nomination. I will not say that it had any effect upon the gentleman at all, but I know that from that time the gentleman has favored and acted with those who have favored Jeff. Davis; went for peace on any terms, and signed documents which contained that proposition. It is from that time the gentleman has been a convert.

Now I say that when gentlemen get up here and talk about changes, and denounce the administration, they ought to look at their own lives, and show us some reason which has caused these changes in their own lives. Besides, I was really very much surprised to hear that gentleman, as he has upon former occasions, denounce in violent and virulent terms the administration of this government, when if any man has reason to thank this government for its clemency that gentleman has, because, if I recollect right that very gentleman was arrested, and it was only through the effort of friends that he was released upon his own oath, and is here to-day proclaiming those sentiments through the leniency of the very government he stands up here and denounces. I say that some of these gentlemen ought to look at the facts of their own history, at their own record, before they go into such violent denunciations of the government.

I do not wish to be placed in a wrong position on this point. I urge that those who defend the administration and support the administration are the friends of the constitution, and by the very oath we propose to put in here we want them to swear to support and defend that constitution which we all live under and to which we owe allegiance, as well as the government of the land under which we live.

What is the duty of the President of the United States? What does he swear to do in the very oath of office which he takes? I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I