

that that is one of the very objects for which it was created. It was to decide upon all questions arising under the laws and Constitution of the United States, all disputes between two States, or between citizens of one State and citizens of another. What becomes of the position of the gentleman who harped so much upon the Dred Scott decision, if that was a decision which it was never designed that the Federal Government should have the power to make.

The States' rights party had control of the destinies of this Government for a great number of years up to 1860, nearly uninterruptedly; and a pretty fist they have made of it. See where they have landed us. In one of the grandest civil conflicts this world ever saw; and it is the legitimate result of their infamous doctrine of State rights. It is just where I have expected they would land us ever since I understood their principles. The gentleman said rightly that General Jackson stemmed the tide of events for the time being, the corrupt and rushing wave that was carrying the nation down into the deep gulf of anarchy and civil war. Eternal honors to his name; and may his memory live so long as this Government shall be known. But while I say this of General Jackson, I say, may the memory of James Buchanan rot in eternal oblivion.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Amen.

Mr. NEBLEY continued. May it go down unwept, unhonored, and unsung. May no flowers ever bloom upon his grave. May naught but the deadly night shade grow there. When he dies and is carried to his tomb, may the hungry worm that riots there crawl away in disgust and abhorrence from his carcase. That is my opinion of James Buchanan. He is the chiefest villain of them all.

What was his declaration when he was in the Presidential chair, in the message that the gentleman lauded to the skies, the last annual message of that imbecile, infamous old man? What was it but a public invitation to revolt? What was it but a public declaration to those Southern rights men? "Go to war; get ready; steal the arms of the United States; steal the ships; steal its money; but for God's sake don't do it until after the 4th of March." That is what Jimmy Buchanan did, and that is his history. Sir, in the streets of Lancaster, where he lives, honest men turn away in disgust from him and none but a few miserable and duped copperheads still associate with him at all.

So much for the argument of the gentleman from Prince George's. I shall now have a little to say upon other points.

It has been said that the tendency of this clause is to centralize the federal power and thereby endanger the peculiar rights of these States' rights gentlemen. They are taking fright. They are seeing perhaps *in prospectu* a long way ahead, a halter, or something of

that sort. They say it has a tendency to invade the rights of the people and the rights of the States. What does the Federalist say upon this subject? Here is what Alexander Hamilton says:

"It will always be far more easy for the State governments to encroach upon national authorities than for the National Government to encroach upon the State authorities. The proof of this proposition turns upon the greater degree of influence which the State governments, if they administer their affairs with uprightness and prudence, will generally possess over the people; a circumstance which at the same time teaches us, that there is an inherent and intrinsic weakness in all Federal Constitutions; and that too much pains cannot be taken in their organization, to give them all the force which is compatible with the principles of liberty.

"The superiority of influence in favor of the particularly governments, would result partly from the diffusive construction of the National Government; but chiefly from the nature of the objects to which the attention of the State administrations would be directed.

"It is a known fact in human nature, that its affections are commonly weak in proportion to the distance or diffusiveness of the object. Upon the same principle that a man is more attached to his family than to his neighborhood, to his neighborhood than to the community at large, the people of each State would be apt to feel a stronger bias towards their local governments, than towards the Government of the Union, unless the force of that principle should be destroyed by a much better administration of the latter."

That is the reasoning of Alexander Hamilton; and it is reasoning which needs no elaboration. It commends itself at once to the judgment of all. He says also:

"The separate governments in a confederacy may aptly be compared with the feudal baronies; with this advantage in their favor, that from the reasons already explained, they will generally possess the confidence and good will of the people; and with so important a support, will be able effectually to oppose all encroachments of the National Government."

Here is the reasoning of James Madison, which I suppose is good authority upon the other side: He has written a number of papers, the tendency and argument of which are to show that all confederated governments in the history of the world had been weak, and their uniform tendency had been to go to pieces, and therefore it was necessary to make them very strong.

"Several important considerations have been touched in the course of these papers, which discountenance the supposition that the operation of the Federal Government will by degrees prove fatal to the State governments. The more I revolve the subject, the