

No, sir; they never did; and if they had, the time never would have come when oppression would have been acknowledged to exist by those who committed the oppression.

I will give you the programme of my political faith, and while I condemn, as I do most certainly, the action of South Carolina in leaving this Union, not only in virtue of any claim under the Constitution which I utterly reject, while I pronounce judgment against that action as a revolutionary right, I am bound to affirm what I do think. I have not a doubt about the regularly and gradually increasing outrages upon the South by the North. I am not quoting books of history, but giving my own opinion, which may be worth very little. I believe that the spirit which has led to these outrages, originated with such men as Wendell Phillips and Garrison. I believe our property was continually growing less and less secure. I believe that increasing majorities in the two Houses of Congress would have encouraged, cultivated, continued to increase those acts which I call oppression. I believe if South Carolina had remained, had submitted to the injury—vastly less than many of her neighbors, our own State among them, were experiencing—if she had remained and had not taken a step altogether wrong, altogether to be censured, if she had remained until these Northern aggressions had assumed an attitude and magnitude which, in the language of Mr. Jefferson, made the injuries inflicted upon them no longer tolerable, every slave State in the Union would have united in the expression of the opinion that the time had come when separation was necessary for the peace both of the South and the North, that it was no longer possible for the slave States and free States to continue together. I believe, further, in my soul I believe that when that period arrived, when that Union of all the slaveholding States had thus culminated in a unanimous declaration of their wish, their purpose, no longer to continue in this Union, the answer of the North would have been—let us separate in peace. I believe there would have been no considerable objection. Prior to the attack upon Sumter, but after the declaration made by South Carolina of its intention to secede, I was in the North, and I saw some men who are now as rabid as any men can be, with virus enough to inoculate any community—I heard these same men saying: "Let them go." I doubt whether there is a gentleman here who can say that he had a notion that there would be any respectable opposition on the part of the North to the sentiment that South Carolina should be permitted to go, until after the attack upon Fort Sumter had inflamed the whole Northern mind.

(The hour of one o'clock having arrived, the hammer fell.)

On motion of Mr. STIRLING,

Leave was granted to Mr. Chambers to proceed—ayes 47, noes not counted.

Mr. CHAMBERS proceeded: I have given my opinion of the obligation upon the people of the United States to observe the mandates of the Constitution. What they are, and who is to judge of them. I say that the Supreme Court of the United States is the arbiter. But I am a little of a Jackson man in that particular. General Jackson thought that this doctrine led to a very ridiculous conclusion. He said that every man must judge of the Constitution for himself, as he certainly took the liberty to do—no doubt about that—so he did about everything else. I cannot go so far as some gentlemen do, that when laws are passed, manifestly in violation of the Constitution of the United States, you are bound to maintain them until the court decides the question. But what is meant here? Do you mean to make no resistance, or to yield obedience? If you do not merely mean non-resistance, I dissent from it. The government orders certain soldiers to seize upon certain persons or property, and the order is unconstitutional. Marshal Murray seizes upon a man and incarcerates him; and the man turns round and sues him. That is not obedience to the law. That is not allegiance to the sovereign. Marshal Murray has been sued, and a jury of New York punish him and mulct him in the sum of \$90,000. There was a similar case in Pennsylvania. The individual did not choose to submit, but tried the question of legality before a jury, in one of the western counties of Pennsylvania, and they gave him a verdict of \$60,000. That I say is resistance to the government; for I take it for granted that those respectable gentlemen who wear the insignia of major-generals would not act without orders from the government. There are many such cases of resistance.

I say that any man if seized under an act of Congress, professing to be passed by virtue of some power vested in that Congress by the Constitution of the United States, has not only a right, but that it is his duty as a good citizen, to be perfectly satisfied from the best light he can obtain, and to consult the best counsel—of course I always advise that—and if he comes to the conclusion that there is an unconstitutional exercise of power on the part of Congress, it is his duty to test that question, and to carry it to the Supreme Court of the United States. In such a case, I should certainly advise a man to sue, not in the Supreme Court of the United States, but to appeal to the ordinary judicial power of the State of Maryland, which now proposes, I think very unnecessarily, to commend itself to the favorable notice of the General Government by voluntarily tendering its allegiance to that Government *alias* the President.

I had something to say in regard to the present condition of the country, but I for-