

tendency of the present day is to cede more and more authority to the National Administration, yet there is certainly no disposition to take away all inherent power from the states as such, or vest in the Federal Government all authority not absolutely guaranteed to the state by the United States Constitution. This last is clearly the result to which the article tended.

This movement on the part of the majority was the direct outcome of the war as caused by the assertion of state's rights on the part of the South, and as waged according to the necessarily radical measures of Mr. Lincoln. Though evidently subject to the greatest abuse, it was in reality an attempt to assert the absolute indivisibility of the Union, and the paramount authority of the National Government when acting within the letter of the Constitution.

The members of the minority in the Convention, most of whom were firm believers in the doctrine of state's rights as held by the South, and in a large measure of sovereignty vested in the states as such, in some cases even went so far as to practically justify the South in its action on the question. They were naturally much aroused by this enunciation of paramount allegiance to the National Government, and were unable to condemn the article in sufficiently strong terms.<sup>87</sup> The debate on the article was long and brilliant, consuming a large part of the time for over two weeks, and was a careful treatment of the history of our country from earliest colonial times down to the causes of the war, as well as a review of the growth of justice and freedom from the days of Runnymede to the present time. Although the question was touched upon to some extent during the consideration of other subjects throughout the entire session of the Convention, Mr. Clarke on June 1 opened the regular debate

---

<sup>87</sup> A minority report from the committee condemned this article in addition to the one embodying emancipation. (Proc., 63-4.)