

government had no right whatever over the subject.

They ask us to keep still; to keep the peace. I say this to my friends, as I have always said. Just make it certain that there is a peace party elsewhere, that if we ground arms, are willing to do so, upon terms which the government of the United States can respectably accept, and you will have more peace men here. It is peace all on one side. They had an election the other day in North Carolina. I suppose gentlemen know how that election was conducted. Talk about test oaths and bayonets! There was an exemplification of the peace-loving men at Richmond. When Mr. Holden was elected by the peace men of North Carolina, by men anxious to get back to their allegiance, and sent up to Richmond to preach there the doctrine of peace, he was met before he got there, through the organ of the Richmond government. What were the mob told to do to him? What was the express language? "Crush him out! Hiss him down! Hustle him out of the hall!" That was the talk. "This man comes to talk to you about peace; crush him out! Hiss him down! Hustle him out of the hall!" Who would have supposed that, after all the talk here? This peace movement has no sense in it.

The people have fought four years for nationality; and now are they to be juggled out of it by the delusive hope held out to them that there are peace men elsewhere in favor of peace upon honorable terms? Gentlemen have spoken here eloquently of the mission of the Hon. Henry May. I never ran away because I was afraid his persuasive eloquence would convert me. I did not think he had much of the Henry Clay, Cicero, or St. Paul about him. I know what he said when he got back, and the country know what the response was to his mission. If you were to give the South a blank sheet of paper to write its own terms upon, she would not return. With twenty millions of people, the representatives of an outraged and wronged nationality, we are to be put in the attitude of begging them for peace, when they spit upon the people of this country and say they do not intend to submit to them, and declare that if their country is to sink they will go down with it to universal ruin, before they will ever submit.

I am sorry I have had to trespass upon the convention again, and should not have done so, if it had not been for the announcement upon the opposite side with reference to the policy of the government in 1861.

Mr. DENNIS. I have two objections to this amendment. Of the matters before the house, I decidedly prefer the report of the committee; but to the amendment now pending I have very grave objections. One of these objections is founded upon the sentence which contains the word "loyal"—"but that I

have been truly and loyally on the side of the United States against those in armed rebellion against the United States." The convention will bear in mind that we are here determining the qualifications of office-holders, of those who shall hold office under the laws of your State. Who is to determine the question whether or not they are loyally on the side of the country? Gentlemen tell us that it is the individual himself. Yet if a man is elected to an office against whom some enemy may come forward and prefer a charge, where is the tribunal that he is arraigned before? It may be the present judge or the present legislature who were elected under precisely the influences and circumstances that seem to pervade this convention.

There is another sentence in the oath: "And I do further swear or affirm that I will, to the best of my abilities, protect and defend the Union of the United States, and not allow the same to be broken up and dissolved, or the government thereof to be destroyed under any circumstances, if in my power to prevent it?"

In listening to the remarks of gentlemen heretofore, and particularly to the remarks of the gentleman from Howard (Mr. Sands) this morning, I might well ask myself the question whether or not we are living under a government of laws or the arbitrary will of a monarch. Really sir, the word "government" has now reached that point when it is very difficult, in this republican land as it used to be, to determine what is the government. My idea of it has been that it is the written law, pervading the land, regulating and controlling all the departments that administer the affairs of the people. Yet we have seen in the course of the last three or four years, and particularly within the last twelve months, doctrines advocated and theories put in force which may well make the people of the nations believe that the government of this country is the person of one at Washington.

My colleague (Mr. Jones, of Somerset,) read to you this morning some remarks of Mr. Clay; words uttered long ago, and which have become true as words of prophecy. Let me read to you the words of another man, more distinguished, more eminent, justly more eminent, than even Henry Clay:

"Let there be no change by usurpation, for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield."

That is the advice of Washington, the immortal father of his country. "Let there be no change by usurpation." Has it been so? I have been under the impression that this was a government of law—written law; and I