

read to those gentlemen a few ideas of that very obsolete old teacher, George Washington. He says in his farewell address: "The unity of Government which constitutes you now"—What? The people of several independent and sovereign States? Is that the teaching of the Father of His Country? No; he knew better than that; he knew more of true principles upon which alone free Government can securely rest. He said: "The unity of Government which constitutes you one people is very dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence." Now, gentlemen talk about the independence of the States—the sovereignty of the States. And yet they would rest the independence and the sovereignty of the States upon a doctrine which has tottered your Federal Government almost into ruin, involving the ruin of every State.

"Of your tranquility at home, your peace abroad, of your safety, of your prosperity, of that very liberty which you so highly prize."

Now we have the authority of George Washington upon this point of our unity as a people; and upon the farther point that upon the preservation of that unity depends our peace at home, our honor abroad, and the very liberties which we so dearly and justly prize. And there are other readings here. I saw one of my friends taking notes, when I used that horrible word "empire" a few moments ago, as if he supposed it was some new thing, as was asserted about some fact I stated here some days ago. Here is what George Washington said:

"It may not be possible to find the spirit of party, the machinations of foreign powers, the corruption and ambition of individual citizens are more formidable adversaries to the unity of our empire than any inherent difficulties in the scheme."

George Washington called it "empire," and I guess the good old man knew what he was talking about, if some of us do not. Again, he says, "to the efficacy and permanency of your nation, a government for the whole is indispensable." Not for the thirteen or the twenty six, or any other number of independent State sovereignties; the language of the great father of his country was not that; it was any thing but that. "A government for the whole is indispensable"—looking directly to this mischievous doctrine of independent State sovereignty.

Now, gentlemen must not confound things. When we say that a State is not an independent sovereignty, they must not proceed with their arguments as though we had said that a State was not sovereign in her sphere, subordinate to that government which is paramount; not at all. But they must remember that looking to these States' rights doctrines and their consequences, the good man said: "to the efficacy and permanency of your

nation, a government for the whole is indispensable; no alliance, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute." Not a compact, as some gentlemen term what is not a compact but a Constitution. The father of his country recognized clearly the distinction which the great Justice Story so admirably makes between a compact and a Constitution. They are two very different things. And when gentlemen declare that they cannot detect the difference between a compact and a Constitution, they but make us think of what Mr. Clay once told that very class of men.

And I will just read what that great and good man Henry Clay said about those people. And I will preface it with the assertion that there has not been one attack made upon the integrity of the government from 1820—the time to which my friend from Calvert (Mr. Briscoe) just now alluded—until this time, that it has not been done under the pretext of the Constitution. And I advise gentlemen here to read the speech made by Henry Clay in 1850, in the Senate of the United States, in which he declared that the Missouri Compromise of 1820 was a Southern Compromise, that cannon were fired, bells were rung and bon-fires kindled on every hill-top through the South over the victory they had won, while northern men who had voted for it, were ashamed to go home to their constituents. And so were the compromises of 1850 southern triumphs.

But there came a time when these great constitutional Gamalies, who know more in their opinion about these things than anybody else ever did or ever will, found out that these compacts were unconstitutional. Why? Because they wanted to get these compacts out of the way of their wild race for complete political supremacy; and they knew there was only one way to do that, and that was to set up the doctrine that these compacts were unconstitutional.

When the Missouri Compromise was passed by Congress, Mr. Monroe was President of the United States, and I guess he was as good a judge of the Constitution as some modern gentlemen, and he had in his Cabinet men who were known as the best constitutional lawyers of the country. When this Missouri Compromise was passed, and presented to him for his sanction, he addressed two questions in writing to each member of his Cabinet—1st, Has Congress the power to pass this bill? 2d, Is this bill constitutional? and in the archives at Washington will be found recorded the answers to those questions.

Now, what was the result of the action of this—no, not this, but the late—Democratic party, in repealing that Missouri Compromise? In less than two years after they wiped out the Missouri Compromise line, there was civil war in this land, where before there had been peace and prosperity, and growth