

protect itself against the General Government "every one of the citizens acting under the authority of the State would be guilty of treason?" If there was no power to coerce, why was it that General Washington put down the whiskey rebellion in Pennsylvania, in 1798, by force of arms? If there was no power to coerce, why was it that General Jackson registered on High his oath that the Union should be preserved, and compelled South Carolina to humble itself in the dust, and comply with the terms of the compact? The gentlemen forget that when in Boston a fugitive slave was to be reclaimed, they thought the General Government had the power of coercion to compel the State to comply with the terms of the compact.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman's time is up.

On motion of Mr. JONES, of Somerset, time was granted to Mr. Thomas to conclude his remarks.

Mr. THOMAS. I have but a few more remarks to make. Allow me to adduce a few authorities to show that the paramount allegiance of every citizen is due to the United States; I do not intend to read them, but merely to refer to them so that gentlemen will examine them. The Constitution of the United States says so in so many words. The framers of the Constitution said so. The Supreme Court of the United States, for which gentlemen have such reverence, says so. The Constitution and the Court of Appeals of our own State say so. I refer gentlemen to the case of *McCullough vs. State of Maryland*, to be found in 4 Wharton, 400; 1 Wharton, 825; and 3 Gill's Reports, 13. The case in Wharton is a most remarkable case. It goes on to discuss this whole doctrine, the Supreme Court of the United States saying in so many words that the Constitution was not only ordained by the people, but that it was not a compact; and that every citizen owes a paramount allegiance to that Constitution, regardless of the Constitution and laws of any State in the Union.

I would ask gentlemen to whom is allegiance due, if not to the government of the country? If gentlemen will refer to the first article of the Constitution of Maryland, in relation to citizenship, they will find a citizen cannot exercise the right of elective franchise in the State of Maryland unless he first be a citizen of the United States. What does that mean? It means that if he is not a citizen of the United States in the first place, he has no right of elective franchise in the State of Maryland. The United States then confers the right of citizenship. To whom, then, is allegiance due—to the power that makes the citizen, or to the power that can neither make nor unmake a citizen? When the Government of the United States makes a man a citizen, can the Government of the State of

Maryland decitizenize that citizen? Certainly not. There is a provision in our code allowing foreigners to hold property in this State; but a further provision of that law says that before a foreigner can hold real estate in the State of Maryland he must at least have declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States. Still that citizen, it is said, owes his first obedience to the State of Maryland, and not his paramount allegiance to the Government of the United States. If that be so, then I would ask to whom is this paramount allegiance or obedience due? To the power that makes him a citizen, that confers upon him all the right of citizenship, and without whose authority he cannot exercise the rights of a citizen, or to that subordinate power which can neither make him a citizen in the first place, or decitizenize him when once made a citizen? Is it due to the power which protects you when abroad, the ample folds of whose flag spreads from the rising to the setting of the sun, as a shield to defend you from all harm, or is it due to a State that is hardly known beyond the limits of this country, and to a flag whose escutcheon not ten men in a hundred could ever recognize? Is your allegiance due to that government that was in its origin but thirteen feeble States, and that has now increased to thirty-five powerful States, stretching from ocean to ocean, and which has been the pride, the glory, and the hope of the world; or is it due to that narrow, contracted and feeble power that would assert the right to destroy the government whenever in its whims it might see fit?

The gentleman from Prince George's (Mr. Belt) has said that the country was ruined and distracted. How has it been ruined, I would ask him? If the rebel States that are now waging war against the people of the United States had but been true to their allegiance, and given paramount obedience to the General Government rather than to the States, then there would have been no war; then there would have been no occasion for vast armies, iron-clad navies, and heavy taxes; then our midnight slumbers would not have been disturbed by the call to arms; then our brothers and friends and countrymen would not have been slain on the battle-field, nor the red torch of war have laid waste fields, once gladdened by the golden sheafs of an ample harvest, now the sepulchre for the bleached bones of many a noble patriot.—Then the nation would not have been called upon to mourn the loss of so much blood, of so many noble spirits, whose allegiance to their country was paramount to life itself. A country ruined and distracted! well might the gentleman say so; but whilst he was describing the "howling wilderness" between the Potomac and the Rapidan, why did he not think to cast his eye to Kentucky, Tennessee and Missouri? Why did he not think of his own native State, and wander to South Moun-