

Mr. CHANDLER said, that was fanaticism, not religion.

Mr. JENIFER. It was religious fanaticism, and the same spirit which seeks to justify a violation of the Constitution of the United States, by a superior law of conscience.

If any religious sect had a right to complain it was the Quakers and other friends, conscientiously scrupulous of bearing arms. They pay a tax for carrying on war against their conscience.

In the section of the bill now under consideration, and which the reverend gentleman has moved to strike out, judges, clerks and all other civil officers, are placed upon the same footing with clergymen. It is not deemed consistent with a proper discharge of their respective duties that they should hold seats in the legislature. There is no exclusion for conscience sake. It is because the positions they have assumed, of their own free will, render the discharge of legislative duties incompatible.

Mr. CHANDLER called attention to what had taken place in the State of Rhode Island, referring to the character and conduct of Roger Williams, who was the first minister and Governor of the State, and who was the first to proclaim the doctrine of an unfettered conscience and of the right to worship as they might think right. Religion and fanaticism are as opposite to each other as night is to day. He presumed the gentleman had reference to the abolitionists, who have taken leave of religion and morality, and of common sense also. They had shaken hands with common sense. If the church were made up of such persons as these, he would be willing to quit it. He regarded the abolitionists as the greatest curse of our country.

Mr. CHAMBERS desired, in few words, to assign the reasons, or some of them, which would influence his vote, and he believed many others. He did not exactly accord with the gentleman from Charles, (Mr. Jenifer,) in his apprehensions of religious despotism. He did not, however, mean to interpose between the contending parties on the subject of persecution, &c. The gentleman before him, (Mr. Chandler,) had made the most of his case. He had asked "if they were excluded from seats in the legislature, he and his clerical brethren, because they were murderers or drunkards, or were they hated because they preached the Gospel?" Why, does the gentleman forget that we judges are in the same category? Does he, or can he, for a moment suppose that because a man is a judge, therefore he is considered a murderer or drunkard, or becomes hateful? Certainly he cannot. The reason is obvious, the one station is supposed to be inconsistent with the other. He regretted to find the gentleman disdain to keep company with the judges.

Mr. CHANDLER, (in his seat,) said he certainly did not.

Mr. CHAMBERS. They were all in the same sentence, each equally excluded and for similar reasons. The contemplation of the Constitution was, that their peculiar avocation was not calculated to qualify them to fill the office of a legislator as well as others. The people had a right to

select, as their agents in different departments, those best qualified to fill the various stations assigned to them. An astronomer would not go to a ploughman to assist him in calculating an eclipse or the distance to a star—nor would a farmer apply to an astronomer to plough his field or seed his grain. "Every man to his trade," was an old rule and a good one. He supposed it quite obvious, that the appropriate duties of a clergyman were altogether unlike those of a politician, and that it is proper to encourage the usefulness of each, at all events not to do anything calculated to destroy their usefulness. He then described what he regarded as the appropriate duties of a minister of the Gospel of peace and salvation. He professes to have a mission from his Divine master—a mission of love and charity. His great duty is to contend against the lusts of the world—he renounces its pomps and vanities—he seeks honor of God, not of men, and lays up his treasure in Heaven, not on earth. His high and holy office is with the souls of men, not with their political favors; he is sacrificed to the world and its honors and its emoluments, and they are sacrificed to him. His whole object and aim is to lead sinners to the fountain of eternal life. Would you arrest such a man in his holy calling and place him in a legislative hall, where every man is a political antagonist to one portion, and a political partizan to the rest—amongst men whose leading motive is to acquire worldly distinguishment and preferment, and to acquire them at the expense of the political destruction of contending parties—amongst those whose passions and prejudices are continually kept alive by the anticipation of earthly honors and emoluments, and whetted by continual opposition and frequent defeat? Political assemblies, composed of party men—and such are generally those which occupy our legislative halls—present the least possible aid in the cultivation of the cardinal christian graces of love and charity to our fellow man, to say nothing of their influence on the "first and great commandment." Why then take the messenger of "peace on earth and good will to man," to place him where his labors would be confined, not to conversions from sin to holiness, but from one political doctrine to another? Ministers who rightly appreciated their condition and their duties, never would make these temporal honors and profits an object of pursuit.

Mr. CHANDLER here said, the gentleman from Kent and himself agreed on that point. He also thought that ministers should not come to the legislature, but should pursue the work to which they are called. But he desired that it should be left to the people at the ballot box, to say if they would elect ministers, and to the ministers, if elected, to act according to the dictates of their own consciences. What he was opposed to, was, the insertion of a disqualification in the organic law as a principle.

Mr. CHAMBERS resumed. The gentleman then admits, that the removal of the disqualification would not introduce into the legislature those ministers who have a just and conscientious appreciation of their religious duties and obliga-