

form of government, but that declaration of their rights stands to this day as the guiding principle of the people of Massachusetts. They are to-day asserting State sovereignty, State supremacy to the fullest extent; and their oath of office does not require their citizens or State officers to swear even to support the Constitution of the United States. When we go to Massachusetts to learn the lesson of abolition, why not learn from them at the same time the true doctrine of State Rights? "Of two such lessons, why forget the nobler and the manlier one?"

The Constitution of New Hampshire, adopted after the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, follows the same language. Their oath is:

"I, A. B., do solemnly swear, that I will bear faith and true allegiance to the State of New Hampshire, and will support the Constitution thereof, so help me God."

Their bill of rights contains precisely the same assertion of the sovereignty of the State:

"The people of this State have the sole and exclusive right of governing themselves as a free, sovereign and independent State; and do, and forever hereafter shall, exercise and enjoy every power, jurisdiction and right pertaining thereto, which is not, or may not hereafter be, by them expressly delegated to the United States of America in Congress assembled."

The State of Connecticut, in the memorable report of their Legislature in 1812, declares:

"But it must not be forgotten that the State of Connecticut is a free, sovereign and independent State; that the United States are a confederacy of States; that we are a confederated and not a consolidated republic. The Governor of this State is under a high and solemn obligation to maintain the lawful rights and privileges thereof as a sovereign, free and independent State, as he is to support the Constitution of the United States, and the obligations to support the latter imposes an obligation to support the former."

The hour having expired the hammer fell, but on motion the time was extended for fifteen minutes.

Mr. JONES, of Somerset, moved to extend the time.

Mr. SANDS. I voted against the calling of the previous question; and I would then, if opportunity had been afforded me, have expressed the wish that we should adhere

strictly to the hour rule. I now express the hope that those with whom I am acting here, the majority of this body, will strictly abide by the hour rule. It does injustice to none. For that reason I shall vote against allowing any member to go beyond the hour. Having conformed to the rule myself, I have a right to do so.

Mr. BARRON. I shall take no part whatever in this debate. I am anxious to hear the gentlemen speak their minds plainly, fairly, squarely, and for that reason I shall vote to extend the time. There are some on our side of the House whom I want to hear, and I wish for one to hear what may be said. For that reason I shall vote to extend the time.

Mr. DANIEL. If the time is extended, I think it would better be for ten or fifteen minutes.

Mr. JONES modified his motion, limiting the time to fifteen minutes.

Mr. ABBOTT. I will move to allow fifteen minutes further, although I am opposed to making the speeches over an hour.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER resumed. In pursuing this subject I propose to inquire further what testimony does the legislation of the State of Maryland bring to bear on this subject? The oath of allegiance, as prescribed in Article 55 of the Constitution of 1776, was that the party abjures allegiance to any foreign prince or power, and that he will support and maintain the government of the State of Maryland. When that oath was subsequently changed it assumed the form in which it now stands: "We swear to support the Constitution of the United States, and to be faithful and bear true allegiance to the State of Maryland."

The naturalization law passed by Maryland in 1777, chapter 12, is another illustration of claiming allegiance to the State from all persons who are to become citizens of the State. The militia law of 1793, chapter 53, did precisely the same thing.

I come now to the more important and conclusive testimony. Let us go back to the Convention which framed the Constitution, and to the lessons taught us by the men who were the prominent actors in those stirring and eventful times. Let us learn from them what they did and what sort of a government they established for us. We must learn it here or wander in utter darkness.

Permit me to cull from the Debates and proceedings of the framers of the Constitu-