

gentleman wants people to administer this government who believe that the State of Maryland ought to separate from the United States, and to set up an independent nationality of her own, in order that here the principles of free government may be established. If the State of Maryland has been unable to protect herself in this war, and to protect her citizens whose rights have been ruthlessly trampled upon, I ask how she is to be expected in the future to be able to protect the lives and liberties of the people of the State? This war has shown the people of Maryland that there is no safety for them except in the preservation of this government.

What would the gentleman from Washington county think of the perpetuation for all time of the state of things along on the Western Potomac? Does not everybody know that if the Potomac is made the line of division, the western part of the State must become depopulated; that these guerilla bands which for the last two years have been consolidating in that neighborhood, would come over and prey upon them at will? Could anybody live there for the next twenty years? No, sir; the condition of things would arise which has prevailed in France and other countries in times past, when bands of outlaws trained in civil war roamed through the country for years together. Men who have taken up arms in civil conflict upon the open battle field, will not lay them down for some time, unless there is a strong power to force them to do it. It will require some common government, here upon the border line, to prevent the perpetuation of these robber bands throughout the whole border country on the Potomac down to Tennessee and Kentucky. And if Maryland is to separate from this country or consent to a division as a public policy, she must become a border State, whether in the Northern or the Southern confederacy. We have seen a practical exemplification of the result of being a border State, since the events of 1860; and we know that Maryland could not be defended. The State of Maryland must become the Belgium of this continent, if there is to be any other result of the war than the restoration of the government of the United States over at least a large portion of this country. It is evident therefore the Union is the absolute necessity of our people.

The gentlemen object that this oath makes them swear to support the Union under all circumstances. It is because we believe that under all circumstances it must be preserved.

What has usurpation to do with this question? Suppose these gentlemen were citizens of France, acting under a king or a despot, what would they do? If the revolutionist makes an infernal machine and blows him up, there is an end to the king only. But if he goes to work and gets France divided, the result is that each divi-

ion has its king or its despot. Would it not be a more manly act to fight the king, as was done in our own country, than to divide and destroy the nationality of the country, and leave it subject, after its nationality has been crushed out, to be acted upon by external forces, worse than the despotism which controlled it?

Are we to be told that the President has usurped authority in this country? He has, at any rate, but a four years rule; and besides the principle of impeachment exists in our constitution by which we may reach even the President of the United States, if he shall usurp power not rightfully belonging to him. And when a man swears to support the government, that does not bind him not to resist usurpation if it is attempted. I do not care whether Mr. Lincoln has usurped or not, so far as this question is concerned. What is the obligation to support the government bounded by? It is necessarily bounded by the practical power to support it. It would be very foolish to make a man swear positively that he would preserve the government under all circumstances, because external force might prevent him from preserving it. I suppose that no one ever thought this amendment required of any man to preserve the Union, if impossible, but it only means that to the extent of his power and ability, he will try to preserve it.

It has nothing to do even with the question of peace. I do not want to see any man hold office in this State who is in favor of peace upon any terms other than the entire restoration of the power of the government over the whole territory of the Union; but I do not know that this proposition prevents a man from judging honestly and fairly about the practical mode of acquiring power, further than that it must not be by entering into any combination the object of which is to destroy the government and destroy the Union. Is there a man in the democratic school who does not deny that his object is to dissolve the Union? What do they say? They say that the war has demonstrated to them that the government has failed, and that therefore they may be obliged unwillingly to consent to the dissolution of the Union. The answer is that the man is to swear that he will to the best of his ability, protect and defend it, if in his power to defend it; and that he shall not be estopped from doing so except by circumstances outside of his own will or his own feeling, circumstances which it is impossible for him to control.

All I have to say here as to my feelings with regard to this matter is, that if gentlemen think this is the result of any partizan feeling or partizan bias, I may be mistaken in this, as every human being is liable to be mistaken in his feelings; but if ever I came to a conclusion solemnly and deliberately, in