

19,) and so often cited by those who maintained the absolute authority of the President over the whole question of calling out the militia. The Committee might readily dispose of it if they were willing to stand upon the same grounds with the Administration, by applying to it the doctrine of the inaugural of Mr. Lincoln, and might insist upon confining the ruling of the Court to the particular case and the individual parties concerned, repudiating its controlling authority, upon the one side or the other, on a question of administrative government. Believing, however, that the true and only "loyalty" of a free people consists in their reverence for the laws and Constitution, and their obedience to the tribunals by which these are expounded, the Committee assume that the people of Maryland will cheerfully bow to whatever the Supreme Court has determined, upon the question under discussion, or any other. The case of *Martin vs. Mott* was a controversy between a private of militia and one of the United States Marshals, who had seized his goods, in enforcement of a fine imposed by court-martial, for failure to enter the service upon requisition, according to law, during the war of 1812. The jurisdiction of the court-martial, and the authority of the President to issue the Proclamation under which the militia were called out to repel invasion, were both considered in the case; the question in chief, however, of course being the right of the individual citizen to judge, for himself, whether the legal occasion existed, upon which the President might rightfully summon the citizens to arms. This latter was the real and only point in controversy, and the Court decided, that under the Act of 1795, it was for the President, exclusively, to determine whether the exigency contemplated by the law had arisen, and that no soldier or officer had any choice but to obey.

The principle of military subordination upon which this adjudication is distinctly placed by the court, is too obvious to be confounded with the recognition of arbitrary and irresponsible power, to which the decision is sought to be perverted, by the supporters of the existing order of things. To determine that the President is the exclusive judge of whether an exigency has arisen, in a case to which his discretion is lawfully applicable, is one thing. To give to him the exclusive and irreversible authority to determine, not only the existence of the exigency, but the existence of the case in which it may lawfully arise, is quite another thing. The first is what the Supreme Court has done, the second is what no respectable Court, it is