

States; and now we find that South Carolina and other States are allowed to violate these laws at pleasure. It would have broken up the government. We should have had State against State, and continued anarchy would have taken the place of the prosperity of which the gentleman speaks.

Then follow our history up to the year 1850. Did not the same State rights school of politicians then try to break up the government again, and was it not the power that existed in Clay and Webster that came to the rescue, aided by the noble Douglas and Foote and others, who saved the country again and again by compromises. Then this same Franklin Pierce rode into power; and because they could not kill the government, it recuperated. That was the reason of our prosperity.

So we went on until these good old men died; until Clay and Webster and such men had departed; and then they commenced with these doctrines again, and again they tried to break up the government. Was it for any fault of the government? No, sir; their great Vice-President Stephens said it was the best government the sun ever shone upon; and he went on to describe the state of affairs; that the South had had the majority of Presidents, Vice-Presidents, members of the Supreme Court, foreign Ambassadors, and officers in every department of the government. Yet because Abraham Lincoln was elected President of the United States, before he had even taken his seat, this same South Carolina seized upon the pretext to go out of the Union, and other States followed, upon the States' rights doctrine. Far from sustaining the government, they did all they could to break up the government, and to dishonor the power that checked and restrained them, until at last they got a poor, weak, decrepid old granny in the Presidential chair, who first connived at their action and then announced the paradox, that there was no right of secession, and yet that there was no power contained in the Constitution by which a State could be coerced; a paradox which I did not think any gentleman would stake his professional reputation here at this enlightened day in maintaining; but I find the old poison still in the blood of some of the men who cannot get rid of it. While the President announced this new doctrine of the Constitution in such a way as to show his sympathy for Southern traitors, he allowed them to scatter his navy, to seize upon the government and to plot treason under his nose until they had brought about this state of war and bloodshed which we now see around us. If General Jackson had been in the Presidential chair, or Millard Fillmore, who dared to execute the fugitive slave law in the very streets of Boston, do you believe we should have been in this terrible condition now? No, sir; it is the legitimate re-

sult of this political heresy, this damning doctrine of States' rights.

We have thought proper to let gentlemen expound their theories here, although we believed that they were long since exploded, as they seemed to want them to go down to posterity. We have often been admonished that posterity will cry "shame" upon us if we allow our liberties to go, and allow this usurpation on the part of the National Government. I am willing to meet the responsibility of opposing to the very death such a dangerous doctrine as this. Posterity will cry shame upon them who in the midst of civil war brought upon us by this doctrine, still stand up in this Convention, allowed to stand here by the leniency of the central government and nothing else, and proclaim to us that the people are not with us and that posterity will cry "shame" upon us. We are willing to take the responsibility, and when it comes to the vote we will show the gentleman that the ratification of the people of Maryland that they mean the same thing.

But I will now come to the arguments of the gentlemen. They do not exactly agree it seems to me upon this point; which shows that when they come to these political abstractions and heresies they get muddled and do not all come out in the same place. Each one strikes out in a track by himself through the swamp, and no one knows where to get out. But I will not reach the helping hand to get them out, but will leave them where they have placed themselves.

One gentleman from Prince George's, (Mr. Belt,) has declared that the State had all the sovereignty as colonies, as States, from the very beginning; that they never ceded any; that the general government was the mere agent for the time being to execute the behests of the sovereignty of the State. That goes a good deal beyond Calhoun. We have the Scripture reversed; for the Scripture tells us that the disciple shall never be above his Lord, nor the servant above his master, while they have got above everything.

But the other gentleman, (Mr. Clark,) did not want to go so far; because that doctrine leads right out into secession, and even beyond, if there is such a thing as going beyond it,—because it is not even a compact, but the relation of principal and agent merely, and if so, the principal can withdraw at any time he pleases and leave the agency out in the cold. Unwilling to go so far, because afraid of this word secession, and unwilling to come square up to it they dodge around and say they do not mean secession—they mean revolution. I shall show before I am through that Calhoun said he did not mean secessionist either. He never called himself a secessionist, but a revolutionist. Lest I should forget it, I will now read what Calhoun said upon that point, contained in the appendix to a speech by