

United States? Gentlemen argue about the Constitution as if the territory and the people were not parts of the Constitution; as if there could be a Constitution without a territory and without a people. I say the Constitution of the United States is nothing but the expressed will of the people. It is nothing but that organization in which resides the soul of the people; and as the human soul will go on into an eternity of existence, either of happiness or of misery, long after this body shall have crumbled in the dust, the people of this country or of any country, will live until time itself shall be no more, although every fragment of their Constitution may have perished in the dust.

What becomes then of this doctrine that coercion is not only unconstitutional but that it is immoral and unnecessary. Mr friend from Prince George's, the other day, (Mr. Belt,) seemed to be exceedingly aroused by the fact that under the despotism at Washington, soldiers of the extreme territories, that had no State existence, were marched upon the soil of Virginia, into a sovereign State, with all the powers of government and with all the history of the past clustering around her. Is there anybody to deny that every citizen of the United States has a common right of territorial ownership in all the territory of the United States? that he has a common right to go into them all? that he has a common right to live in them all? Will any man claim that he has not as good a right to walk over the county roads of Virginia as any citizen of Virginia? Is not that a portion of the land which is declared to be free to all, by the Constitution of the United States, the supreme law of the land? What does the Constitution mean by saying that it shall be the supreme law of the land? What "land?" It is the common territory embraced within the limits of all the States, and of the territories of the United States not formed into States; these are the lands over which the Constitution is supreme. I deny the right of the people of the State of Virginia or of any State to take away from me as an individual citizen of the United States any portion of that land over which the Constitution is the supreme law. The people out in Montana, no doubt, thought it was not in the power of anybody in Virginia to say to them that the Government of the United States should be destroyed and shorn of its territory, by which shearing of its territory and power they were to be left defenceless, and their position as citizens diminished, and their rights as individuals impaired, and their position among the people of the world degraded, and disgraced, unless they had the right to resent the insult and defend their country.

Who is the citizen of Virginia? Because he is a descendant of the fathers of the Constitution, has he any more rights than any-

body else. Has not the citizen of Montana as much a right to enter Virginia as if his mother were the mother of five thousand presidents? Every citizen of Montana has the right, under the call of the Government of the United States, I say it with all seriousness and I say it with regret that it should be necessary, to desolate every foot of Virginia soil, and to slay every citizen of Virginia, if Virginia undertakes to bar his way, as a citizen of the United States, when the Government of the United States calls upon him as a soldier to protect that transit. He has the right to slay every citizen of Virginia if it is necessary to accomplish that result. His moral right to do so must depend, before God, upon the rights and necessities of the case.

What a spectacle has been produced here in our own State? What is the reason we had those scenes? What would have been the position of Maryland under the arbitration which gentlemen claim? Gentlemen talk about the absolute right of revolution; a right which makes the parties who undertake the revolution the sole arbiters. I would not go back and refer at all to events in Maryland; but I will ask what would have been the result here if that doctrine had been carried out to its practical effect. Suppose under the state of things here, a majority of the people of this State, not so large in point of numbers as to command any certain physical power, a bare majority, had declared their adhesion to this new government, and seceded from the Government of the United States. What would have been the position of Maryland? Will any man tell me that that act would have stripped me of any right I possessed before? that that act would have taken from me my rights as an American citizen? that that act would have taken away my right to call the flag of the United States my flag? No, sir. If such a revolution had been attempted by a majority or a minority, they would have been a set in the streets and roads, and on the door-steps in every part of the State, by another portion of the people, majority or minority, who would have told them that if they undertook to tramp upon this flag, their pathway must be over their dead bodies, for they would protect it with their life-blood. For one, I say here, that under no consideration would I have passed under the dominion of the Confederacy, unless I had been shackled with fetters, and bonds, and prison bars. I would have remained within its bounds sufficiently long to make my preparations to move, if resistance had ceased to be possible, and then should have left it for some clime where liberty reigned and peace prevailed; and I would have followed the banner of my fathers, wherever it might float, though it might be in solitary grandeur on the fastnesses of New England.

Is not the fact demonstrable, that if there