

in pursuance of the Constitution, being of no binding obligation upon the citizen, that he would make every individual in all the length and breadth of our land an authority to decide the constitutionality of a law of Congress? By what right does the gentleman pronounce an act of this Government unconstitutional before the Supreme Court of the United States has so decided it? By what right does the gentleman declare this war waged for the enslavement of the white race, until the Supreme Court of the United States has so declared? By what right does he tell us that to-day we are enacting a clause for the enslavement of the white race because we declare the supremacy of the General Government? Is the gentleman aware that he is assuming upon the floor of this house prerogatives which the possibly defective education of our youth taught us belonged only to the Supreme Court of the United States?

And then the gentleman brought us to the Dred Scott decision, and I thank him for doing so. I thank the Almighty that for once in the course of my life I have an opportunity to raise my voice in protest against an iniquity so foul that I wonder the man who perpetrated it would ever appear in the face of honest men again. Forgetting that the court over which he presided was a court of appellate jurisdiction alone, he travelled out of the record, and assuming original jurisdiction for party purposes, gave voice to language which set at nought every fact of history and every truth and principle of the Government under which he lived. I will read to gentlemen from the opinions of a Democrat, a member of the party to which the Chief Justice himself belongs, concerning this Dred Scott decision. I refer to the Hon. George Bancroft, the historian of America. Hear what he says:

"During all these decisions the United States stood unchanged, admitting none but the slightest modifications in its charter, and proving itself the most stable Government of the civilized world. But at last 'we have fallen on evil days.' 'The propitious smiles of Heaven,' such are the words of Washington, 'can never be expected on a nation that disregards the eternal rules of order and right.' During eleven years of perverse government, those rules were disregarded; and it came to pass that men who should firmly avow the sentiments of Washington, and Jefferson, and Franklin, and Chancellor Livingston, were disfranchised for the public service; that the spotless Chief Justice whom Washington placed at the head of our Supreme Court could by no possibility have been nominated for that office, or confirmed. Nay, the corrupt influence invaded even the very house of justice. The final decree of the Supreme Court, in its decision in a particular case, must be respected and obeyed. The present Chief Justice has, on one memorable

appeal, accompanied his decision with an impassioned declamation, wherein, with profound immorality, which no one has as yet fully laid bare, treating the people of the United States as a shrew to be tamed, by an open scorn of the facts of history, with a dreary industry collecting cases where justice may have slumbered or weakness been oppressed, compensating for want of evidence by confidence of assertion, with a partiality that would have disgraced an advocate neglecting humane decisions of colonial courts and the enduring memorials of colonial statute-books, in his party zeal to prove that the fathers of our country held the negro to have 'no rights which the white man was bound to respect,' he has not only denied the rights of man and the liberties of mankind, but has not left a foothold for the liberty of the white man to rest upon."

The gentleman has told us that the Constitution of the United States was made for white men alone. The gentleman forgot that in five States of this Union, on the question of the adoption of the Federal Constitution, free black men voted, and that their disfranchisement arose afterwards from particular State statutes. The gentleman forgot the facts of history, when he told us that the Constitution was made alone for white men. The gentleman forgot that at that day the free black man in North Carolina voted upon the question of the adoption or rejection of the Constitution of the United States, and that the vote of one black man might in that State have controlled the question of the adoption or rejection of the Constitution under which we have lived so long. And why have gentlemen who have gone before the gentleman of Prince George's (Mr. Clarke), in more extended political arenas than this, why have they deliberately falsified the facts of history, why have they perverted the truth, except as a course of education for their people which should finally bring on, what it has brought on, the present civil war?

And then the gentleman tells us that there is a day of retribution coming in Maryland, for those of us who vote for this article. Now to those of us who have lived for the last three years in Maryland, who have felt that if the day ever comes when the supremacy of the Federal Government is not acknowledged, then there will be no place in Maryland for us, this idea of a day of retribution matters not. It is not an idea which should influence us, under any circumstances. For the vote in this body that can be controlled by the fear of possible retribution is a vote that can always be bought. From mere respect to the essential manhood of those of his associates here, who he thinks may vote for this article, the gentleman might have spared us that reflection; from the mere fact that, if we are not the best sort of men, we are at least white men and brothers, the