

By the aid of such a power, skilfully employed, you may 'bridge your way' over the Hellespont that separates State legislation from that of Congress; and you may do so for pretty much the same purpose with which Xerxes once bridged his way across the Hellespont, that separates Asia from Europe. He did so, in the language of Milton, 'the liberties of Greece to yoke.' You may do so for the analogous purpose of subjugating and reducing the sovereignties of States, as your taste or convenience may suggest, and fashioning them to your imperial will."

Now, sir, it seems to me that the view taken of this question by this distinguished Marylander, comes home to our minds to-day with additional force, and that before we adopt a measure which entirely breaks down those guards which our fathers erected around us as a sovereign State of this Union, we should consider well the times in which we live and the circumstances by which we are surrounded. I saw the other day that a proposition, which I think bears practically upon this question, was advocated by one in high place here in Maryland, by one who represents this State in the Congress of the United States. It was a proposition touching upon this very question of States' rights; a proposition before Congress to prohibit the State of Maryland from taxing the holders of bonds of the United States within her limits. That proposition in Congress was advocated by this representative of Maryland, at the head of this consolidation party in power; and advocated upon the ground that the State of Maryland had no right, if the Congress of the United States undertook to assume a power of that character, to write upon her statute books a law in contravention of it. If the law had been passed as advocated by him, it would have been in direct opposition to this article of your bill of rights, which says that the State of Maryland has the right to regulate her own internal polity in her own way. It would be striking at one of the dearest rights of the State; the right to tax the property of her own citizens. And when we hear these doctrines advocated in this State, when we find them coming from every quarter of our land, it becomes us to be careful and cautious before we undertake to lay at the feet of this theory of the paramount authority of the National Government, every safeguard and protection which the State of Maryland holds over her liberties. Now, sir, not one word has been adduced by these gentlemen upon the floor who advocate this doctrine of paramount allegiance, in its favor. It is a doctrine so clear that no man can dispute that the State of Maryland is deeply concerned in it, for if this article is adopted, it leaves it to the Government of the United States to pass any law, no matter of what character, and your bill of rights will say that it is the overriding law of the land, and you

are bound to bow and submit to it without any right of protection on the part of the State against any edict which may be issued by the Government at Washington.

As I said before, I do not intend to go into a thorough discussion of this question. I simply desire to present these views to the Convention and ask them to consider this question before they vote in favor of it, and to hear what reasons may be given by gentlemen on the other side to induce them to come to so grave a conclusion.

Mr. SANDS. It was my purpose, Mr. President, not to have addressed this Convention upon the subject embraced in this article. But I cannot consent to sit still here and listen to doctrines promulgated in this hall, and promulgated with all the tones they would be promulgated with if they were original,—doctrines from which sprung all our present woes. And how in the light of present events, gentlemen can spend hours here in reasserting principles which have been asserted before, through the life of such men as Calhoun, Baranwell, Rhett, Orr, Jeff. Davis and others of the extreme States' rights school—how they can reproduce them in the face of the events of this day, when it is potent that those doctrines have borne but their own legitimate, bitter, ashens fruit in civil war, rapine and bloodshed, I cannot for the life of me understand.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the gentleman allow me one moment?

Mr. SANDS. The gentleman will have an opportunity to reply to me.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman must not be interrupted when speaking.

Mr. CLARKE. The gentleman interrupted me yesterday. I wanted to ask him but a single question.

Mr. SANDS. The gentleman had a whole day for his speech; I have but one hour. I say that, in the face of the fact that those men have committed those doctrines to the terrible arbitrament of war, when the battle may be raging at this very instant, how men can broach those doctrines here, is what I cannot understand.

My friend from Calvert (Mr. Briscoe) said that he had not heard a word from the majority here in advocacy of the doctrine that the Government of the United States was supreme, or, in the language of this article, paramount. Now, I would simply advise gentlemen here to pursue a course of reading which is familiar to most men, and which I think will fully enlighten them upon this point. Is it a doctrine proclaimed here the first time that we are a nation, that we are an empire? Now, I do not mean to talk merely. I would rather refer gentlemen to some books. And just upon that point I beg leave to refer them to that very obsolete old document, the farewell address of George Washington. I propose, with the permission of the House, to