

who claimed that they ought to have these rights, but they did not possess them. There was doubt now as to our really possessing these rights, although there was no doubt that we ought to have them.

Mr. Barry read the article from the Bill of Rights of the State of Massachusetts, and said we should not surely be behind Massachusetts in asserting the rights which undeniably belonged to us.

Mr. Jones said this principle was claimed by Massachusetts in 1777, but that State had considerably modified her views on this subject. There was no community which had gone further than Massachusetts in maintaining the doctrine of State rights. But the minds of people had changed very much since that time. The very foremost advocates of State rights before the war were names now high in radicalism, and the most violent assailers of the principles for which they had formerly contended. The government at Washington had ignored all the restrictions of the constitution, and it had been supported by the people of the North, and recent elections indicated the same temper. State rights was no longer a practical issue; it was a mere metaphysical abstraction.

The proposed amendment was further discussed by Messrs. Jones, Ritchie, Barnes and Hayden.

The question was then taken on the amendment to strike out the words "ought to," which was agreed to by yeas 53, nays 42.

The question was then taken on the amendment to insert at the end of the article the words "as a free, sovereign and independent State," which was adopted by yeas 60, nays 43.

The article as amended now reads as follows:

"Art. 4. That the people of this State have the sole and exclusive right of regulating the internal government and police thereof, as a free, sovereign and independent State."

The reading of the articles was then proceeded with down to the 15th article, no amendments being offered.

The 15th article was reached. It is as follows:

"Art. 15. That the levying of taxes by poll is grievous