

look to the constitution of the land and the laws of Congress for that law. And I read in that constitution :

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press."

Has the freedom of speech not been abridged? Has the freedom of the press not been abridged? The gentleman from Cecil county, as I see in his printed remarks, for I did not hear them, seems to think it is an evidence of very great liberality on the part of the government, an evidence of the extreme freedom that pervades this nation, that an individual member of this convention may stand here and speak the sentiments of his mind.— He says that that is an evidence that this is not the tyrannical, outrageous government that the opponents of it would have us believe. In the name of God has it come to that, that an American of this land must look to Washington before he dares speak the sentiments of his soul? Has it come to that, that the great charter of our liberty, the constitution of the land, which guarantees and gives to us all our rights, and limits the executive power, is to be trampled under foot, and that it is a great privilege to look to Washington for permission to speak what and when we please?

Again, sir, we read in the constitution of the United States :

"A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

Has not that right been infringed? Has not every member of this convention seen your armed posses going through the land, invading the sanctity of your houses, trespassing upon the privacy of your families, breaking open the secret recesses of your chambers, under a military order searching for arms, your right to keep which the constitution says shall not be infringed.

"No soldier shall, in time of peace, be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner; nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law."

Is that observed? Is that practiced? Are soldiers quartered upon you now in a manner prescribed by law? No, sir; it is not law.

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated; and no warrants shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

That is the law. That is a part of the government of your land. That is as much yours as the right by which you live and move and have your being. It is a part of the inherent right of the free citizens of this land, that no power has the right to take away.—

Yet has it been observed? Has it been kept? Do not your northern bastiles echo with the groans of their wretched inmates? and is not the cry of the widow and orphan breaking upon the midnight hour, when the soldiers of this land and of this government, who ought to have been fighting for the defence of its laws and its constitution, have gone there to drag the trembling inmate from the sanctity of his home which even the king of England dared not violate.

"No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be put twice in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be witness against himself; nor be deprived of life, liberty or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

Is there a single solitary clause of this section that has not been violated? Is it not printed in glaring capitals that the whole world may read, that there is not a solitary right written down here, intended to be secured to the land, that has not been outraged and violated?

"In all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor; and to have the assistance of counsel for his defence."

Has that been observed? Has that been kept? Yet gentlemen tell me that all these things which have been done, are the government and the law. God save us from such a government! For one, sir, I will never willingly take the clause of the oath which this amendment requires me to take, that I will preserve such a government under any circumstances whatever.

"In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed \$20, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved; and no fact tried by jury shall be otherwise re-examined in any court of the United States than according to the rule of the common law."

"Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted."

Has that been kept? Has it been observed? Yet, sir, that is the government of the country. That is the law of the land. That is what I have conceived that every man who had ever read the written law or understood