

ment, as it ought to be—the federal government did not give to the free and independent States their distinctive constitutions, their rights, their powers and their privileges; but the independent States gave a constitution and a power, but limited, to the federal government—hence the weakness of the Executive and the weakness of the supposed Supreme Head. But the federal government has been gradually encroaching on the rights of individual States, and even statesmen and politicians have been divided upon the correct interpretation of the constitution of the United States. The justly celebrated Calhoun distinguished himself as the champion of State rights; while the no less distinguished Webster, and such men as Clay and Adams, were the defenders and advocates of federal rights, and a national interpretation of the constitution. One of the most splendid orations ever delivered by the great statesman, Webster, was in defence of the federal government, and a national interpretation of the constitution of 1789. He said, “The government is the independent offspring of the popular will. It is the creature of State Legislature; nay, more of the whole truth must be told, the people brought it into existence, established it, and have hitherto supported it, for the very purpose amongst others, of imposing certain salutary restraints in State sovereignties.—The States cannot make war—they cannot control alliances—they cannot make, each or itself, separate regulations of commerce—they cannot levy imports—they cannot coin money;”—The Arsenal, the Mints, the Customs, the Post Office, belong to the federal government. The great statesman, Calhoun, contended for the right of the State to nullify acts of Congress, by adverse legislation. The present troubles in the South are the conse-

quence of opinions thus propounded by great men, men who took adverse views of the same constitution—adverse views of the rights of States when coming in collision with the rights of the nation. The difficulty will, in all probability, lead to a dissolution of the family compact. For difficulties must necessarily arise out of it. Take, for instance, the Fugitive Slave Law. The Northern States complain, and complain justly, that this law is an encroachment upon their rights as Sovereign States, and hence they have passed “personal liberty bills” in order to nullify this act of Congress. The federal government cannot be strong and permanent, while it is possible for adverse legislation to take place, and an individual State may come at any time in collision with the federal government. Thus Wisconsin, resisted, and resisted successfully, the federal powers, and the Supreme Court of the State justified the State authorities in resisting, opposing and setting at defiance the authority of the federal government. The checks and balances imposed by the respective States in order to ward off the encroachments of the central power, must eventually weaken and destroy the authority and influence of the central government, and ultimate ruin must be the consequence. The great question of Slavery, the crime and the national sin of the United States, is the great question of the present time. It has taken deep hold of the public mind, and the moral feeling of the North is awakened to the sin of holding mankind in bondage; and now, being roused to a sense of the wrong thus inflicted, they feel the necessity of tramping slaves and even slave-holders into the very dust, at the very earliest possible period. Of course they form a part of the great model Republic, and they must suc-