

satisfied my conscience, and, I trust, my God, I shall appeal to no other tribunal; nor do I come a candidate for popularity; my manner of life has never yet betrayed such a desire. The highest honors and emoluments of this commonwealth are a poor compensation for the surrender of personal independence. The history of England, from the revolution, and that of Virginia for more than twenty years past, show the vanity of a hope that general favor should ever follow the man who, without partiality or prejudice, praises or disapproves the opinions of friends or of foes; nay, I might enlarge the field, and declare, from the great volume of human nature itself, that to be moderate in politics forbids an ascent to the summit of political fame. But I come hither, regardless of allurements, to continue as I have begun; to repeat my earnest endeavors for a firm, energetic government; to enforce my objections to the Constitution and to concur in any practical scheme of amendments; but I never will assent to any scheme that will operate a dissolution of the Union, or any measure which may lead to it."

And then, further on, at pages 28 and 29, he says:

"The gentleman then proceeds, and inquires why we assumed the language of 'We, the people.' I ask, why not? The government is for the people, and the misfortune was, that the people had no agency in the government before. The Congress had power to make peace and war under the old confederation. Granting passports, by the law of nations, is annexed to this power; yet Congress was reduced to the humiliating condition of being obliged to send deputies to Virginia to solicit a passport. Notwithstanding the exclusive power of war given to Congress, the second article of the confederation was interpreted to forbid that body to grant a passport for tobacco, which, during the war, and in pursuance of engagements made at Little York, was to have been sent into New York. What harm is there in consulting the people on the construction of a government by which they ought to be bound? Is it unfair? Is it unjust? If the government is to be binding on the people, are not the people the proper persons to examine its merits or defects? I take this to be one of the least and most trivial objections that will be made to the Constitution; it carries the answer with itself. In the whole of this business, I have acted in the strictest obedience to the dictates of my conscience, in discharging what I conceive to be my duty to my country. I refused my signature, and if the same reasons operated on my mind, I would still refuse; but as I think that those eight States which have adopted the Constitution will not recede, I am a friend to the Union."

Then, at page 33, are remarks of other gentlemen, which I will not now read. The remarks of Mr. Lee, at page 33, of Mr. Pendle-

ton, at page 37, and further remarks of Mr. Lee, at page 42. And, by reference to the debates of the Convention of Pennsylvania, and indeed those of every other State that adopted the Federal Constitution, it will be found that every man who opposed that Constitution upon the ground of State sovereignty, opposed it because it spoke in the name of the people, because it said it had been ordained by the people, and it was the work of the people and not of the States. Why, sir, it will be found that that great and good patriot, Mr. Pinckney, of South Carolina, spoke in relation to the Constitution, in language that could not be mistaken. In volume four, of Elliott's Debates, he goes on to trace this subject, as I have traced it, from the time the colonies were first instituted, down to the Declaration of Independence. He says:

"In that declaration the States are not even enumerated; but after reciting, in nervous language, and with convincing arguments, our right to independence, and the tyranny which compelled us to assert it, the Declaration is made in the following words: 'We, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the name and by the authority of the good people of these colonies, solemnly publish and declare, that these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States.' The separate independence and individual sovereignty of the several States were never thought of by the enlightened band of patriots who framed this Declaration; the several States are not even mentioned by name in any part of it: as if it was intended to impress this maxim on America, that our freedom and independence arose from our union, and that without it, we could neither be free nor independent. Let us, then, consider all attempts to weaken this Union, by maintaining that each State is separately and independent, as a species of political heresy, which can never benefit us, but may bring on us the most serious distresses."

If the sons of the Revolutionary fathers, in South Carolina, had but followed the noble sentiments Mr. Pinckney uttered on that occasion, then there would have been no occasion for a long and elaborate discussion of this doctrine at this time, in the midst of this great rebellion, brought on by his children, because they did not advocate and live up to the doctrines he there maintained. Yet, Mr. Jefferson Davis says, with this authority before him, that the Declaration of Independence acknowledged the independence of every separate State as a sovereign State, and not all the States as united colonies; and the gentleman from Prince George's (Mr. Belt) has followed him. I consider that this authority, if there were no others, would prove