

the several States bear to one another as members of one political family, mutually contributing to promote the happiness of each other."

I have thus, Mr. President, without any pretension to originality but from the study of principles as enunciated by the great men who have discussed these topics, endeavored plainly to enforce upon your consideration the true theory of our Government.

It has been my aim to vindicate the "pestilent pretension of State rights" from assaults, and to show that while properly understood and acted upon, they will save us from a consolidated government, they do not involve as a logical conclusion the assertion of the right of secession, ending in anarchy. State rights do not logically lead to secession. Under a true State rights theory of the government, secession is *revolution*. There is a real practical difference between secession as *revolution* and secession as defined by its friends and advocates. In the latter case, the Government may be broken up at any time, at the will of a State, or a few States. In the former case it is never justifiable, except for causes which would render revolution justifiable on the part of individuals, and would never be resorted to, except for like causes, by the States.

Will we preserve our form of Government? Will we cling to time honored principles of liberty? Will we preserve our State pride and our State rights, or shall we at the bidding of men who seek to destroy our form of Government as organized by and under the constitution—

————— Strive

Which shall propound most abject things and base—

And leave our consciences to smite us with the reproach?

"Well all is worthy of us, were it more
Who, with our riots, pride and civil hate
Have so provoked the justice of the gods;
We that within these four score years were
born

Free—Equal laws of the triumphed world
And knew no masters but affection;
To which betraying first our liberties
We once become the slaves to one man's lusts,
And now to many. Every ministering spy
That will accuse and swear, is lord of you—
Of me—of all our fortunes—all our lives—
Our looks are call'd in question, and our
words,

How innocent soever, are made crimes.
We shall not shortly dare to tell our dreams,
Or think, but t'will be treason."

But, Mr. President, there is another consideration connected with our action upon this article of the bill of rights, which has not yet been alluded to in the discussion. We are *sworn* representatives of the people. We have taken the oath in the sight of high Heaven prescribed by the Convention Bill.

Will gentleman accept it in all its provisions, in its *length* and *breadth*—its depth and thickness? And while I hold myself bound to its *strict* observance, I purpose to hold others equally bound by it. Now, to what does this oath bind each and every member of this body? It is unnecessary for me to read it. I was a member of the last Legislature, and discussed both the provisions of the House bill introduced by the gentleman from Baltimore city, and the Senate bill. And I must confess that while I regarded some of the provisions of the House bill *unconstitutional*, it was a bill which in my humble judgment did more credit to its author, inasmuch as it was *frank, plain* and *clear*, than the Senate bill, which was a kind of bringing into hotch potch of the *principles* of the radical emancipation party, intermixed with the *Constitutional* scruples of the conservative emancipation party, in which the latter under the cover of *ambiguities* yielded to the radicals practically all the *Constitutional scruples* which they had not the manliness to maintain, and in which the former secured most they wanted, stripped of its *clearness* and want of ambiguity—and clothed in that *non-committal, non-action* form in which it is the pleasure of some men in Maryland to aim to appear before the people.

The House bill contained the oath of allegiance to the Constitution and Government of the United States, but there was no provision in it which recognized any allegiance to the State of Maryland. To meet this very case—this apprehension that this Convention would surrender the State, soul and body, into the embraces of the consolidationists, who believe in the doctrine of *paramount* allegiance—I offered, when the bill was under consideration, an amendment which prescribed a form of oath—which while it did not go into the *past*—required allegiance to the Constitution and Government of the United States, within the limits of the power conferred by the Constitution, and allegiance to the State of Maryland.

That oath, in the form of the amendment offered by me, was rejected in the House, but was so far as allegiance to the United States and the State of Maryland was involved, engrafted into the law assembling the Convention. Not only so, but many of the members are members of the Legislature, and hold other important offices. What oath have they taken? See the Constitution of the State of Maryland:

"I, A. B., do swear (or affirm, as the case may be) that I will support the Constitution of the United States, and I will be faithful and bear a true allegiance to the State of Maryland and support the Constitution and laws thereof."

How, I ask in the plain terms of these oaths, can we vote to incorporate this article in our Constitution without the commission