

Edward Everett, from a letter from Reverdy Johnson, an intimate friend of Calhoun, to Mr. Everett. Mr. Johnson says :

"The letter I read in the speech which I made in Frederick, should be conclusive evidence that, at its date, Mr. Calhoun denied the right of secession, as a constitutional right, either expressed or implied.

"But, in addition to this, I had frequent opportunities of knowing that this was his opinion. It was my good fortune to be a member of the Senate of the United States, whilst he was one of its greatest ornaments, for four years, from 1845, until I became a member of Gen. Taylor's administration, and during two sessions (I think 1846 and 1847) I lived in the same house with him. He did me the honor to give me much of his confidence, and frequently his nullification was the subject of conversation. Time and time again have I heard him, and with an increased surprise at his wonderful acuteness, defend it on Constitutional grounds, and distinguish it, in that respect, from the doctrine of secession. This last he never, with me, placed on any other ground than that of revolution. This, he said, was to destroy the Government; and no Constitution, the work of sane men, ever provided for its own destruction. The other was to preserve it, was, practically, but to amend it, and in a Constitutional mode. As you know, and he was even told, I never took that view. I could see no more Constitutional warrant for this than for the other, which, I repeat, he ever in all our interviews repudiated, as wholly indefensible as a Constitutional remedy. His mind, with all its wonderful power, was so ingenious that it often led him into error, and at times to such an extent as to be guilty of the most palpable inconsistencies. His views of the tariff and internal improvement powers of the Government are instances. His first opinions upon both were decided, and almost ultra. His earliest reputation was won as their advocate, and yet four years before his death he denounced both with constant zeal and with rare power, and, whilst doing so, boldly asserted his uniform consistency. It is no marvel, therefore, with those who have observed his career and studied his character, to hear it stated now that he was the advocate of Constitutional secession."

So I say that some of the gentlemen seem to have got beyond Calhoun.

What is the proposition when fairly stated? because to much of the argument of the gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Miller) and to much of the argument of the gentleman from Prince George's, who first addressed the Convention (Mr. Clarke,) I have no objection.

It is certain that States are sovereign as well as the United States Government, each in its own sphere, clearly defined by the Constitution. I would adopt even the analogy

presented by the gentleman from Prince George's (Mr. Clarke,) that as the planets in the heavens revolve around the great central sun of the system, each pursuing its own course, within its own sphere, so the General Government and the States are sovereign in their several spheres. But I would carry the figure a little farther, and say that when the great central orb pours its rays upon the earth, it is the source of heat and vegetation and life, and the stars pale away before it, but when it ceases to operate directly, then these planets give forth their feebleness as they revolve in their respective spheres. So the great central government operates directly within its sphere and with greater power upon the State as well as the individual. It does not act upon me through the State sovereignty; but it demands of me directly military duty, and it operates directly upon my rights of property and person. The States operate in a more limited sphere.

What is the objection to this section? Let us analyze it, and see what it amounts to. "Paramount allegiance" to the Government; that is the difficulty with gentlemen. They are willing to say they owe an allegiance to the Constitution of the United States and the laws made in pursuance thereof; but this "paramount allegiance to the Government" stuns them. Let us examine the words and see what they mean:

"Paramount" means "superior," or supreme. They are unwilling, therefore, to say that they owe any superior allegiance to the Government of the United States; and therefore the gentleman from Calvert, (Mr. Briscoe,) desires to strike out "paramount;" and is willing to let it stand that he owes allegiance, not paramount.

Next, what is the meaning of "allegiance?" Some of the law dictionaries define it to be derived from the Latin "ligo," to "bind," or to "tie." It is the bond that ties the natural born subject or citizen to his government on account of the protection that it affords. Are gentlemen unwilling to say that they owe allegiance to this government? Will they say that it does not protect them, and that therefore they are unwilling to render allegiance to it? What is the protection which the States give? One gentleman from Prince George's, (Mr. Belt,) said the other day, as I recollect, that the General Government gave no protection at all, but that the States afforded all. Can the States levy war or make peace? When you go beyond the seas to a foreign land, if an injury is done to you, do you appeal to the little petty State of Maryland to redress it? No, sir; it is the pride of every man that he is an American citizen; and the American flag protects him everywhere, on land or on sea, wherever civilization has gone. Do they owe no allegiance for protection?

But I fear it is the "Government," after