saw the light in Boston, Massachusetts, four years before the now United States had declared their independence.

The whole controversy then is shut up in these two documents—the Articles of Confederacy of 1781 and the Constitution of 1787. By the deed of 1781, sovereign rights were expressly reserved—by the deed of 1787, all rights were expressly reserved, except a few, which were minutely specified; and the sovereign rights of separate States are certainly not among the list of powers secured to Congress. The common sense of the whole transaction is, that the "Articles" Constitution failed because of its peculiar faultiness in not appointing an executive independent of the Legislature, and in its not providing a strong enough machinery to enforce the specified powers. The essential principle on which the Constitution of 1787 differed from that of 1781 was, that the former did provide an executive. All else in which the two Constitutions differ is comparatively matter of detail. Certainly the question of more or less sovereignty as reserved to the particular States, is not one of these differences. The impudence of those who pretend such to be the case, is absolutely inconceivable: 1781 reserves sovereignty, 1787 takes care not to revoke this reservation, but merely talks of "forming a more perfect Union,"—*i. e.* creating an executive independent of Congress to act in the cases set apart for Federal action, and giving powers to the Federal authorities to make their jurisdiction felt so far as it was lawful under the constitution itself. "More perfect Union" does not involve any abrogation of the dignity or powers of the States within themselves.

Can proof be stronger as to the licence which the framers of the Constitution meant to allow to the States' rights' principle? What they placed in the other hamper