

I have to say, and then reply by an argument in his own time.

Mr. CLARKE. The gentleman put a question to me, and I only wanted to reply to it.

Mr. SANDS. Then I will proceed with my argument without putting any interrogatories. I regard that a citizen's highest allegiance is to the United States. I acknowledge as the highest law power in the State of Maryland, the authority of the United States as expressed through the Constitution of the United States, and the acts of Congress passed in pursuance thereto. I believe that the first duty of every man in the State, from the Executive down to the humblest citizen, is an acquiescence in and support of the Constitution of the United States and the laws passed under it, until the Supreme Legal Tribunal of the United States has decided the act in question to be unconstitutional. We have late acts of Congress defining certain crimes.

Mr. CLARKE. I hope the gentleman will not misquote.

Mr. SANDS. I shall not. We have late acts of Congress defining certain crimes and abetting the military authorities with the decision of those cases. Does the gentleman suppose that we here, the representatives of the State of Maryland, shall embody that provision in the Constitution of the State, and submit to the people a provision in direct conflict with the Constitution of the United States, and the laws of Congress passed under it?

Mr. CLARKE. "In pursuance thereto;" quote verbatim.

Mr. SANDS. "In pursuance thereto" is under it, not over it.

Mr. CLARKE. "In pursuance thereto," I want the gentleman to quote correctly when he quotes the Constitution of the United States, and acts of Congress.

Mr. SANDS. What I say is this, that every citizen of the State, that we ourselves here, the representatives of the State, are bound to render obedience to the laws of the United States, passed *under* the Constitution, not *over* it, not in defiance of it, or in accordance with any higher law doctrine; but under it. I have heard of a power over and above us, that is not exercised over us, so far as the people of Maryland is concerned, we have heard that we are sovereign—I have heard that doctrine from the lips of many gentlemen—so far as the people of Maryland is concerned, she is sovereign. Now who will assert the doctrine that we are sovereign in our relations with the general government. Suppose it has provided in certain terms in regard to certain matters; would any action of ours contravening those terms be legal or binding? Most assuredly not.

Now I have shown, as this debate has taken a somewhat extensive range to-day, this in vindication of the government of the United

States. Now so far as Maryland and her citizens are concerned, taking gentleman at their word that Maryland is apart from and hostile to the government of the United States, that there are a majority of the people of Maryland who are antagonistic to the government at Washington, taking that for granted as gentlemen assert—then I say that the pages of history record no instance in which so little damage has been done to either person or property as in this State of Maryland in times of civil war. At a low calculation, I suppose, passing backward and forward, two millions of armed men, loving that government of the United States and fighting in its defence, and hearing on all hands that Maryland was a hostile province and held down by bayonets—two millions of armed men have passed over her soil. And look at Maryland to-day, after these vast armies have swept through her: all through the State she is blossoming like the rose. How many of her fields are barren? How many of her dwellings are destroyed? How many of her citizens are in prison? She answers herself; look at her to-day in every respect in which she presents herself as a State. She is as prosperous and powerful as she ever was, and free as ever. And according to the will of the majority of her people, her free will is to obey the authorities of the United States, and to cling to the government which our fathers left us.

Now in regard to gentlemen being arrested because they would not vote, I wish they had applied that principle down among these alien enemies. Just listen to the assertion that gentlemen are arrested because they would not vote, when it is known that if they had voted, they would have voted against the authorities and the party in sympathy with the government that wanted to force him to vote.

Now in regard to statutes and constitutions, there is one thing above the law, and in that respect I am a higher law man, and I am not ashamed to avow it. That higher law is the law which God has given to every man, the law of self-preservation. Will you hold that a great nation is to be denied the exercise of a law which you grant to a single individual, when that great nation holds in its hands the destinies of many millions of human beings? If you deny to the government a right which you allow to a man, the right to defend and preserve its own life, you are guilty of a legal monstrosity without a parallel. You will defend yourself and claim the right to do so. If you are attacked in the dark, are you going to stop and consider how hard you can hit with your fist, how deep you can cut with your knife, how many holes you can blow with your Derringer or your revolver, and under what law or statute you can defend yourself? No, you will defend yourself with what and all the means you have at command, and if you take the life of your opponent,