

with the assertion that the bill of rights is similar in character to *Magna Charta*, and that that was wrung at the point of the sword from the British Government. Admitted. But are we to suppose from analogy that our bill of rights was wrung from any power? From whom? Can it be said that the people of the United States have wrung anything from themselves? That would be absurd. The theory of government that then existed, not only in England but all over the civilized world, was that the powers that were, held their title, but not immediately from the people, but immediately from God. They ignored man. Hence it was necessary then to wring *Magna Charta* and the rights guaranteed by it, at the point of the sword, from the government. But the bills of rights of the United States and of the several States in this country, are unlike that in this respect. They are mere abstract declarations what the rights of the people are.

The gentleman objects to the insertion of this article into the bill of rights, that it is a novelty. We admit that it is a novelty. We admit that this is the first time it has been proposed to place it in the bill of rights of any State in this Union. But is there not occasion for it? Have we not fallen upon evil times? Have we not been brought by false philosophy and false political doctrines of the self-styled States' rights party into the very predicament where it becomes necessary to go back to the original fountains whence our government proceeded, and to consult the opinions and convictions of the men who framed the Constitution of the United States? It is a novelty. But the times require that men should be brought to confront the doctrine of their allegiance to the Federal Government as well as of their allegiance to the State Government.

Does the article assert anything that is false? Is it not true that the paramount allegiance of the citizen is where his paramount duties are, and where the paramount power of the government is? Where is the paramount power of the government? Is it in the States? No. Yet it has been gravely argued that it was in the States. Such an utter confoundment of all principles of clear reasoning, I never heard, as we have heard this morning upon this very question. We have heard declarations that the people of the States are sovereign, that the States are sovereign, but that the Federal Government is not sovereign. If the States are sovereign, there is no room for any other kind of sovereignty; and in God's name, what is the Federal Government? If the States are sovereign in every respect, what becomes of the Constitution of the United States? What becomes of the laws made in pursuance thereof? They are a dead letter, not worth the parchment upon which they are written. What do gentlemen mean when they say that

the only sovereignty recognized by the Constitution is the sovereignty of the States? It is as absurd as a beclouded intellect can make it.

Sovereignty is supreme authority, supreme power, paramount power, a power that is over and above all subordinate power. That is what we claim for the Federal Government. We do not claim for it absolute sovereignty. We do not claim that it is to override entirely the individual States. We merely claim that it is sovereign in the sense in which the framers of the Constitution declared that it should be sovereign; in the sense that the Constitution and the laws of the United States made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made under the authority of the United States, are the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every State are bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of such State to the contrary notwithstanding.

When gentlemen talk about State sovereignty and hold that a State stands over and above the Constitution of the United States, they are involved in this predicament, that they have operating upon the self-same set of men, two sets of powers, in direct antagonism, and having no connection with each other. Surely that is not the theory of our government. Our theory is that of the planetary world. The planets and the satellites are free in their orbits and independent of each other; but the superior attraction of the great central orb governs and controls them all. They are free to move as it was designed by the Almighty that they should move, but not to wander off into illimitable space as chance may direct. But the States' rights theory is that the several States should be cut loose from the governing power of the Federal Constitution, and should wander *ad libitum* in the immense fields of political power, liable at any moment to come in jarring and crushing contact with other powers moving in the same direction, and equally wild and erratic.

It is said by gentlemen that State sovereignty is a unit, incapable of division. If so, there can be no power above it. If it is incapable of acting in harmony with or in subordination to the sovereignty of the Federal Government, there can be no authority above it. The argument leads gentlemen into the gulf of political anarchy and political madness, and civil war such as has never been described in the annals of history. This is the legitimate result of the doctrine of States' rights. It leads to anarchy and nothing else. It is the embodiment of the principle of anarchy. It is the very principle which took Satan out of heaven and which has carried mischief everywhere and will carry mischief everywhere. In the church it is ruinous. In the State it is equally ruinous. In individual communities it is ruinous. It is the principle of individualization against