

Union of the States. The internal policy of the States has nothing whatever to do with the question. The internal policy of the States the gentleman may arrange according to his judgment of what may happen in the future, as he sees fit. The reason why he is bound to swear to support the Union is the very reason that I suggested—that it means the nation—it means the people of the United States, who even now, after the terrible conflict in their midst—all the people of the United States represented by their government, by the President whom they constitutionally elect—have certain great public properties belonging to them—the capitol at Washington, the military school at West Point, the various arsenals, a name among the nations, great in the past, and as I hope in the future, still to be great. He is bound to respect, and to swear to defend that Union which, in my judgment, as I before said to him, is only the representative of the nation.

Mr. EDELEN. With or without slavery?

Mr. PUGH. Certainly, with or without slavery; I said that before. That is a matter of mere opinion with me. I religiously believe that this people will never be united as any other than a free people and until the institution of slavery as a system is removed. That is merely my opinion. But the gentleman must recognize the existence of the Union, or of the nation as characterized by the word "Union," and swear to support that nation. I come to the conclusion that the word is used in this amendment to mean nothing else than the United States of America as they are known to the world. There is no difficulty in knowing what is meant.

Mr. NEGLEY. In the vote which I am about to give upon this amendment I shall not be governed by many of the reasons adduced by the gentleman from Cecil (Mr. Pugh.) I certainly do consider the constitution of the United States in a different light from that in which he has placed it. I expect to see the abolition of slavery all over this land, not by any extra constitutional means, but by means perfectly constitutional. I expect to see this government subsist, not without law, but with law. I expect to see this constitution go on and this government subsist for years, and perhaps it will continue for centuries, not as it is now, but under the power of change which the constitution has provided in itself.

Is there no way constitutionally to get rid of slavery? Is there not a great moral revolution going on now in this country? Are not the minds and opinions of men changing from one end of it to the other. Every revolution brings with it a moral change. There never was a revolution without a moral change, a change in the opinions of men on some subject or other at the epoch of that revolution. At the epoch of this

revolution it is upon the question of slavery. The people are never stirred up by revolution without its bringing to the surface the results of that moral change.

How shall we get rid of slavery in a constitutional way? We shall soon have two-thirds of the States in the country free States. They can propose amendments to the constitution by which slavery shall be abolished all over the country when those amendments become a part of the constitution.

Another way is that the President has issued his proclamation emancipating the slaves within the States in revolt. Now it is a question for the Supreme Court of the United States to decide, whether that as a war measure, was a constitutional measure or not. If they declare that it was a constitutional power to liberate the slaves in the States in rebellion as a war measure, then slavery is gone.

But we are to get rid of slavery not in any extra constitutional way at all.

I think that the amendment of the gentleman from Baltimore city is not such a monstrous thing as it has been supposed by some gentlemen, who say that it is an abridgment of the liberty of speech an invasion of the liberty of the press. Is a man permitted to say anything and everything? Is he permitted to write and publish anything and everything? Can he publish a libel? If liberty does not mean unbridled license, this is just the restriction I wish to put upon it here, if it be a restriction at all, that a man shall not use his speech in such a way as to violate his duty to the country and endanger the public good. Why is not a man allowed to publish an obscene picture and spread it broadcast over the land? Because it is detrimental to the public morals and strikes at the foundation of society. Why do we here purge a man's conscience upon these questions? It is because treason strikes at the foundation of society. You can endanger the safety of the community just as much by treason in one way, as you can by the publication of obscene pictures in another. Liberty of speech is not unbridled license, nor is liberty of the press unbridled license.

I do not think we are living in a time without any law. The President of the United States has not violated the law. Has not Congress given him the right to suspend the writ of *habeas corpus*? Is not the President of the United States imprisoning these home rebels under that process granted by law? I cannot see in that such a monstrous departure from the law. I cannot see any peculiar hardship in the way of passing this section. That is a matter for gentlemen themselves to consider. They are the judges of their own consciences; and if they are convicted out of their own consciences, whom can they blame but themselves when they ostracise themselves? If they are rebels, if