

The Anti-Slavery Bugle.

BENJAMIN S. JONES, EDITOR.

"NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS."

ANN PEARSON, PUBLISHING AGENT.

VOL. 15.--NO. 37.

SALEM, COLUMBIANA COUNTY, OHIO, SATURDAY, APRIL 28, 1860.

WHOLE NO. 759.

The Anti-Slavery Bugle.

THE TWIN RELICS OF BARBARISM.

SPEECH OF THE

HON. OWEN LOVEJOY,

OF ILLINOIS.

In the House of Representatives, April 6th, 1860.

The House, being in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union—

Mr. Lovejoy said: Mr. Chairman—The House has been occupied for several days in the discussion of the subject of polygamy. The Republican party, of which I am a member, stands pledged since 1856 to the extermination, so far as the Federal Government has the power, of the twin relics of barbarism—Slavery and Polygamy. They have this power in the Territories of the United States.

Now, Sir, as we anticipate a death-blow has been given to one of these twins, I propose to pay my respects to the other. I want to see them strangled and go down together, as they both richly deserve.

Mr. Cobb, (Dem. Ala.) I rise to a question of order.

The Chairman: The gentleman will state his question of order.

Mr. Cobb: I was going to raise a question of order upon the right of the gentleman to discuss the question of the "twin relics," under the new rule we have adopted. However I will not interfere, the gentleman may go on with his speech.

Mr. Lovejoy: I am entitled to the floor; I do not yield to the gentleman; and I will proceed with my remarks within my hour, with the gentleman's permission, or without it.

Mr. Stanton, (Rep. O.) I would be glad to know what is the understanding of the Chair, and of the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, as to what is to be the course of discussion upon this bill, whether the "twin relics" are in order or not, or whether the discussion is to be confined to the bill itself? The questions properly involved in the bill itself are sufficiently comprehensive, in my judgment, to command the entire attention of the Committee, and I think we should confine the discussion strictly to it. When we are all in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union upon the President's Message, the gentleman from Illinois will be strictly in order. I have no special interest about the matter.

Mr. Sherman: I will state that, as I understand it, the debate may be general upon this bill in its present condition, as upon the President's Message. It is within the power of the House; however, at any time, to make the bill a special order; after which, debate must be confined strictly to the question under consideration. If it be the pleasure of the House, I propose in the course of about a week, to submit the motion to the House.

The Chairman: The Chair supposes that general debate is in order upon this bill, the House now being in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and no special order pending.

Mr. Lovejoy: I was about to say, when interrupted, that I am aware that the practical question presented to this House, and to the country, is, whether Slavery shall be extended beyond its present limits; as that is the only question over which we have exclusive jurisdiction. And if slavery were extended to remain restricted, and find its future where it now is, we might perhaps forget this discussion. But when it is proposed to extend what is termed an institution—but which is not an institution; which is simply a practice—the question naturally arises, what is the nature, what are the influences, and what are elements of this practice? and what will they prove to be if allowed to expand? I am aware that it has been stated upon this floor that the moral of Slavery is robbery; that its ethics are no longer to be discussed; that they were settled ages ago by the Sages of Greece, and have been reaffirmed and reestablished by the chancery of Ohio, in rhetoric or gorgonian serpent's glow. We are told that where slavery will pay, slavery will go. Presumably upon the same principle we might say that where robbery will pay, robbery will go; and where adultery pays human flesh is cheaper than that of bees, and humanism will go, because it will pay. Sir, then robbery, then piracy, then polygamy, slaveholding, and consequently more offensive to God, Slavery has been justly designated as the sum of all villainy. Put every crime perpetrated among men into a moral crucible, and dissolve and combine them all, and the resultant amalgam is slaveholding. It has the violence of robbery.

Mr. Lovejoy: No, Sir; I am speaking in dead earnest; before God, God's own truth. It has the violence of robbery, the blood and cruelty of polygamy; all combined and concentrated in itself, with all the aggravations of either of these crimes ever known or dreamed of. Now, Mr. Chairman, the justification of Slavery is placed, so far as I know, mainly upon these grounds: The inferiority of the colored race; the fact that enslaving men imparts Christianity and civilization to them; and, thirdly, the guarantees of the Constitution. These are the three main arguments presented to justify Slavery; and consequently to justify its expansion.

And, by the way, I hold that the extreme end, as they are called, on this question, are the only ones who have the logic of it. I am right, or the slave is right. If Slavery is right in Virginia, it is right in Kansas. If it is wrong in Kansas, it is wrong everywhere. Now, Sir, in regard to the first point—the inferiority of the colored race. We may concede it as a matter of fact, that it is inferior; but does it follow, therefore, that it is right to enslave a man simply because he is inferior? This, to me, is a most ab-

horrent doctrine. It would place the weak everywhere at the mercy of the strong; it would place the poor at the mercy of the rich; it would place those that are deficient in intellect at the mercy of those that are gifted in mental endowment.

The principle of enslaving human beings because they are inferior is this: If a man is a cripple, trip him up; if he is old and weak, and bowed with the weight of years, strike him, for he cannot strike back; if idiotic, take advantage of him; and if a child, deceive him. This, Sir, this is the doctrine of Democrats, and the doctrine of devils as well, and there is no place in the universe outside the Five Points of hell and the Democratic party where the practice and prevalence of such doctrines would not be a disgrace. [Laughter.] If the strong of the earth are to enslave the weak here, it would justify angels in enslaving men, because they are superior; and archangels in turn would be justified in subjecting those who are inferior in intellect and position, and ultimately it would transform Jehovah into an infatigable Juggernaut, rolling the huge wheels of his Omnipotence.

Mr. Lovejoy had advanced into the area, and occupied the space fronting the Democratic benches.

Mr. Pryor, (Va.) advancing from the Democratic side of the House toward the area where Mr. Lovejoy stood. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Lovejoy] shall not approach this side of the House, shaking his fists and talking in the way he has talked. It is bad enough to be compelled to sit here and hear him utter his treasonable and insulting language; but he shall not, Sir, come upon this side of the House shaking his fists in our faces.

Mr. Farnsworth, (Rep. Ill.) It is not for the gentleman to say what is treason and what is not.

Mr. Potter, (Wisconsin.) We listened to the gentleman upon the other side for eight weeks, when they denounced the members upon this side in violent and offensive language. We listened to them quietly, and heard them through. And now, Sir, this side shall be heard, let the consequences be what they may.

Mr. Pryor: The point I make is this—The Chairman, (Mr. Washburn, Me.) The Chair will receive no motion and hear no gentleman unless members resume their seats and order is restored in the hall.

Mr. Cox, (Dem. Ohio.) I rise to a point. I insist that the gentleman from Illinois shall speak from his seat.

Mr. Pryor: That is the point I make. Let the gentleman speak from his seat, and say all under the rules he is entitled to say, but, Sir, he shall not come upon this side, shaking his fist in our faces, and talking in the style he has talked. He shall not come here gesticulating in a menacing and ruffianly manner.

Mr. Potter: You are doing the same thing. The Chairman: Gentlemen will resume their seats.

Mr. Cox: If the gentleman from Illinois goes on as he has, a guardian will have to be appointed for him.

Mr. Barksdale, (Dem. Miss.) (addressing Mr. Lovejoy) You shall not come upon this side of the House.

Mr. Adrian, (A. L. Dem. N. J.) To avoid all further difficulty, I suggest to the gentleman to speak from his seat. We all know him to be a man of courage and that he cannot be intimidated.

Mr. Pryor: No one wants to intimidate him. Mr. Lovejoy: No one can intimidate me.

Mr. Adrian: I know that. I suggest to the gentleman that he continue his speech from his seat.

[Thirty or forty of the members from both sides of the House gathered in the area about Mr. Lovejoy and Mr. Pryor, and there was increased confusion.]

Mr. John Cochran, (Dem. N. Y.) I move that the Committee rise, as it is the only way we can get rid of this disturbance.

Mr. Pryor: I do not believe that side of the House can say where a member shall speak, and they shall not say it.

Mr. Singleton, (Dem. Miss.) The gentleman from Illinois shall not make that speech upon this side of the House.

Mr. Burnett, (Dem. Ky.) There is a rule of this House which requires each man to speak from his seat. The gentleman from Illinois was not in his seat when he was speaking. He cannot, and he shall not cross this hall in a menacing manner. He shall not, let the consequences be what they will. He must speak from his seat.

Mr. Grow, (Rep. Pa.) I move that the Committee rise.

The Chairman: Gentlemen must resume their seats.

Mr. Cox: Let the gentleman from Illinois take his seat.

Mr. Washburn, (Rep. Ill.) Let the others be seated, and let my colleague proceed.

Mr. Potter: The gentleman from Illinois can take care of himself without the assistance of the other side.

Mr. Kellog, (Rep. Ill.) I say to the gentleman that my colleague shall speak; that he is in order, and will not commit a breach of the rules of the House; if he does, I will be the first to rebuke him; but he shall have his rights according to the rules of the House, and in no wise shall they be abridged or interfered with. He shall be heard upon this floor, and at this time.

Mr. Briggs: Then let him go upon his own side.

The Chairman: The Chair calls the Committee to order; and if the gentlemen do not come to order, he will call the speaker to the chair and report the disorder to the House.

Mr. Florence, (Dem. Pa.) I move that the Committee rise. It is impossible to quell the disturbance without doing so.

The Speaker: The Chair calls the House to order. I desire gentlemen of the House to take their seats.

Mr. Florence: Every one, upon either and all sides.

Mr. John Cochran: The Committee has risen; has it not?

The Speaker: The Chair requests gentlemen to respect the authority of the House, and take their seats.

Mr. Barksdale, (Dem. Miss.) Order that black-hearted scoundrel and negro-stealing thief to take his seat.

Mr. McQueen, (Dem. S. C.) We will allow nobody to come over from that side of the House and bully us on this side. [Cries of "Sit down!" "Sit down!" "Sit down!" from all sides of the House.]

The Speaker: The Chair desires gentlemen to take their seats.

Mr. Boscok, (Dem. Va.) I, for one, will do so with pleasure, promptly, when the Speaker requires it. I only ask that everybody shall do so. I think this whole matter can be settled, if the gentlemen speaking and every other gentleman will take his seat.

Mr. Burnett: I rise to a privileged question.

The Speaker: The Chair cannot recognize anybody, until the gentlemen take their seats.

Mr. Burnett: Then let everybody take his seat and let order be enforced.

The Speaker: The gentlemen will take their seats, without distinction.

Members gradually withdrew from the open area in front of the Speaker's chair, and resumed their seats. Order being at length restored.

Mr. Washburn of Maine (Chairman of the Committee) said—In the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, disorder arose which prevented the transaction of business, and the Chair was compelled to call the Speaker to the chair, and to report the facts to the House.

Mr. Ely: I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. Washburn (Mr. The Chairman of the Committee states that if order is likely to be preserved so that proceedings can go on, the Chairman of the Committee will resume the chair.

Mr. Sherman: We are now in very good order, and I think we had better proceed and give the gentleman from Illinois an opportunity to finish his speech. I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and I hope every gentleman will keep his seat.

The Speaker: Order having been restored, the Speaker will leave the chair, and the Chairman of the Committee will take it.

Mr. Washburn, (Mr. resumed the chair; and announced that the gentleman from Illinois was entitled to the floor.

Mr. Lovejoy: Mr. Chairman, I desire to violate no rule of the House.

Mr. Boyce, (Dem. S. C.) The behave yourself.

Mr. Lovejoy: I wish to learn whether it is a violation of the rules to occupy this space in front of the speaker's chair or any portion of it? If so, I will cheerfully yield; if not, I claim the right to choose my own position.

The Chairman: The Chair understands that the rules require that every gentleman shall speak from his seat.

Mr. Curtis, [Rep. Iowa.] Or from the Clerk's desk.

Mr. Burnett: The gentleman has a right to do that.

Mr. McClernand, [Dem. Ill.] Let him speak from the Clerk's desk.

Mr. Ashley, [Rep. O.] It has been the habit of gentlemen to come into the aisle and choose their own position.

Mr. Adrian: It is a very bad habit, and we had better change it.

Mr. Chairman: The Chair is aware that such has been the custom; but if the rule is insisted on, it is the duty of the Chair to enforce it.

Mr. Adrian: I hope it will be insisted on.

The Chairman: The gentlemen from Mississippi is not in order. The gentlemen from Illinois will proceed.

Mr. Lovejoy: It is simply by this contact with free communities; it is, as I said, from the fact that Christian women went from Free States; and that the Christian women of Slave States—who have not the poor privilege that Sarah of old had of sending the Hagare and Ishmaels to the wilderness—maintained their purity and their Christian character, and their testimony against the system, that they were prevented from that retrocession toward barbarism.

Several Members: That is what he said before.

Mr. Lovejoy: Sir, if you step into the Smithsonian Institute, or into the Patent Office, you will find implements of husbandry imported from Japan and China, showing just about the same development in civilization as the implements you find on the plantations. Now, Sir, the truth is, that the practice of slaveholding drags slaveholding communities further below the plane of the Christian civilization of the age, than the civilization which the Slave receives elevates him above the plane of heathenism by being held in these Christian communities. Sir, how do they impart civilization and Christianity? It is a strange mode of Christianizing a race to turn them over into brutism without any legal marriage.

Among the four million slaves in this country, there is not a single home or hearthstone among these four million. And you propose to civilize and Christianize a people without giving them homes, without allowing them the conjugal and parental relations, and without having those relations, sanctioned and protected by law. Mr. Chairman, no community can make one step of progress in civilization, unless you give them homes; you protect the sanctity of the home, as we held it should be protected in regard to those Mormons on the plains of Utah. Christianizing them, Sir! Christianizing them by a new process. The Slave States have a right to an exclusive patent for it. Taking them out in the sight of the church, as we was taken out not long ago in the State of Tennessee, by a Presbyterian elder, and laid down on his face on the ground, his hands and feet extended to their utmost tension, and tied to pickets, and the Gospel whipped into him with the broad side of a hand-saw, discolored with every time the Gospel agency fell upon the naked and quivering flesh of the tortured convict. [Laughter.]

A Democratic member: Did I get the Gospel in [Laughter.]

Mr. Lovejoy: Christianized as a young girl was Christianized in this city since the session of Congress, by being whipped and sent to the garret, and I found dead in the morning, with blood oozing from nose and ears.

A Democratic member: Where does that authority come from?

Mr. Lovejoy: I do not know whether religious rites were had or not. I suppose some Pro-Slavery priest was invited in to utter impious prayers before God that the last flagellation might have whipped in Christianity enough to save her precious and never dying soul. [Laughter.] And now, alarmed, a good black walnut coffin is made and decorated with white ribbons and placed in the hearse, followed by a hack containing, I presume, the murderer; and my attention is called to the cortege "See, Mr. Lovejoy, there is a slave funeral!" Is that treating them like brutes? Look into the coffin! Look into the carriage! You say this is horrid. I know it is horrid to hold men in Slavery. I know it is horrid to doom four million of human beings to the condition of chattels, to be held pro nullis, pro mortuis, pro quadrupedis, taken for no persons, for dead persons, for four footed beasts—men as much entitled to freedom as you and I. Sir, the testimony of all religious societies in the Slave States is, that the slaves are still heathen, and it is an utter impossibility to Christianize them and civilize them by this process. The third point which is relied on to justify slaveholding is, that it is constitutional—that it is guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have heard it declared over and over again that the Constitution guarantees Slavery. I deny it. In no article, in no section, in no line, in no word, syllable, can there be any recognition or sanction of human slavery found in the Constitution of the United States. It is not there. It always recognizes human beings as persons, and never as property. It does not use the word "slave" or "slavery." Why, Sir, when I came up to take the oath to support the Constitution, a whispered buzz, half in earnest and half jocular, passed around: "How can Lovejoy swear to support the Constitution? How can he take the oath?" I could take the oath to support the Constitution, because I believe in the Constitution, because I hold to it, because my heart is loyal to it. Every part and parcel and portion of it I believe in; but I do not believe in the construction put upon it by those who claim its recognition and sanction of the practice of slaveholding.

Mr. Barksdale, (Dem. Miss.) No, Sir; you stand there to-day an infamous, perjured villain. [Calls to order.]

Mr. Ashmore, (Dem. S. C.) Yes, he is a perjured villain; and he perjures himself every hour he occupies a seat on this floor. [Renewed calls to order.]

Mr. Singleton, (Dem. Miss.): And a negro into the bargain.

Mr. Lovejoy: I swore to support the Constitution, because I believe in it. I do not believe in any historical fact can be known, that the framers of the Constitution so worded it as that it should never recognize the idea of slave property, from the beginning to the ending of it. But the advocates of slavery have affirmed a strange doctrine in regard to the Constitution. They think that because I swore to support the Constitution, I swore to support the practice of slaveholding. Sir, slaveholding in Virginia is no more under the control and guarantee of the Constitution, than slavery in Cuba or Brazil, or any other part of the

world, is under the control or guarantee of the Constitution—not one particle.

Mr. McClernand, (Dem. Ill.): I wish to ask the gentleman whether he has always held that the Constitution deserved to be sustained and accepted—whether, at any time of his life, he held that the Constitution ought to be trodden under foot?

Mr. Lovejoy: Never, Sir; never. I always defended it, and always will, whether it be against the Democrats who pervert it, or the Disunionists who trample on it.

Mr. McClernand: If the gentleman says he never said so, I am not prepared to contradict him, for I know nothing, personally, about it; but I had understood that the gentleman once uttered this language: that "the Constitution was a piece of rotten parchment that ought to be trodden under foot."

Mr. Lovejoy: Yes; that was thrown in my face once before here, and I denied it. It never had the least foundation in truth. I always defended the Constitution, because it was for Liberty. It was ordained by the people of the United States, not by a superannuated old mummy of a Judge—and a Jesuit at that—but by the people of the United States, to establish justice, secure the blessings of Liberty for themselves and their posterity, and to secure the natural rights of every human being within its exclusive jurisdiction. Therefore I love it. These men can conceive nothing in the Constitution but Slavery. A young man leads a blushing bride to the altar, and takes the marital vow before God and attendant witnesses, to love, cherish, and protect her. There she stands—the divinity thing that God has fashioned and placed upon earth—radiant in the beauty of youth; her cheek glowing with the color of the rose, which expands and fades away into that of the lily; her eyes sparkling like the stars from the depths of blue, and her tresses falling around her neck like the locks of the morning. Is the mole on that fair round neck, or the wart on that plump, soft hand, the woman whom the bridegroom swore to love and cherish? So there is the Constitution—instituted with freedom, radiant with the principles of universal liberty, seizing the inspired utterances of our *Magna Charta*, and reducing them to practical and organic realization. Now, Sir, I insist that if the clauses that are deemed to refer to the subject of Slavery mean all that the wildest enthusiast claims them to mean, they bear no other relation or proportion to the Constitution which I swear to support, than the excrement on the hand or neck does to the woman whom the bridegroom swore to love and cherish. He loves her not for these things, but in spite of them. But you will say the woman had a right to appear an excrement on her hand if she chose. I concede it; and as a Federal law-maker, I concede that the States have the right to sport this fungus of Slavery, because it is beyond my reach. But time rolls away. This youthful pair have years of middle age upon them. Olive plants have sprung up around the parent stem. The woman has gone mad. She glows over the excrement which has spread and covers her entire head. She exclaims "husband, this is a dear sweet darling, a real love of a wart, and I want to ingratiate it on the hands of all our daughters. I had it when I was married; you vowed to protect me, and I claim the right to transfer it to all the children. If you do not, I will go to Indiana and get a divorce. I will dissolve the union between us, and I claim the right to transfer it to all the children. The husband, calm and firm, replies, "My dear, I have indulged you in this whim about your hand, because I took you for better or for worse, and I thought it one of your individual rights, which I was not at liberty to disturb. But if you propose to transfer this deformity to my daughters, I say distinctly and decidedly, it cannot be done. This is my prerogative, and I must exercise it." So say to the Slavery Propagandists who desire to transplant Slavery to the Territories, and thus fasten it upon the daughters of the Republic. "My dears, it cannot be done." I say, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that there is no justification for the practice of slaveholding, from the fact that the enslaved race, are an inferior race, no justification, from the pretended fact that it imparts Christianity and civilization to them; and none in the guarantees of the Constitution. Now, there are some Christian men on the other side of the House; I want to put it to them in all candor—for while I intend to speak of slaveholding with as severe reprobation as I possibly can, I do not intend to offend any individual personally—I want to know of you, Christian gentlemen, how you are going to Christianize men when you do not give them homes?

A Member: Give them what?

Mr. Lovejoy: Homes, and a legal sanction to the conjugal and parental relations. How are you going to Christianize men whom you turn out to herd together like the buffaloes that roam upon the Western prairies? You cannot do it. It may be asked, Sir, when I confess that I have no control over this matter, why discuss it? why talk about it?

Mr. Singleton, (Dem. Miss.): I want to know if the gentleman gives homes—

Mr. Lovejoy: I must decline to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. Singleton: I want to answer the gentleman's question by asking him another. I want to know if he gives homes to the negroes he carries from the South to Canada and other places?

A Member: The negroes he steals?

The Chairman: The gentleman from Mississippi is not in order.

Mr. Barksdale, (Dem. Miss.): I hope my colleague will hold no parley with that perjured negro thief.

Mr. Lovejoy: It is asked why discuss this question? Why talk about it, when it is confessed that we have no constitutional power to legislate upon it? I will tell you, Mr. Chairman. It will be recalled that Mr. Webster once said, when speaking of the threatened interposition of Russia to snatch Kossuth from the protection of Turkey, for the purpose of sacrificing him on the altar of despotism: "Gentlemen, there is something on earth greater than arbitrary or despotic power. The lightning has its power, and the whirlwind has its power, and the earthquake has its power; but there is something among men

more capable of shaking despotic thrones than lightning, whirlwind, or earthquake; and that is the excited and aroused indignation of the whole civilized world."

"The Avon to the Savern runs;
The Severn to the sea;
And Wickliffe's dust shall spread abroad
Wide as the waters be."

To continue the quotation with a different application and a slight variation of the language, I say, gentlemen, if the blood of innocent men is taken by an absolute, unqualified, unjustifiable violation of natural law, what will it appease, what will it pacify? It will mingle with the earth; it will mix with the waters of the ocean, the whole civilized world will sniff it in the air, and it will return with awful retribution on the heads of those violators of natural law and universal justice. I cannot say when, or in what form, but depend upon it, if such acts take place, then Slavery must look out for the consequences. Sir, before the public sentiment of the Christian and civilized world I propose to hold up to universal reprobation this practice of slaveholding. I propose to hold it up in all its atrocity, in all its hideousness, just as gentlemen have been holding up the practice of polygamy, and reprobating it; and, Sir, that public sentiment of the civilized world will burn upon this practice of Slavery, and ultimately secure its removal in the only proper way—by the action of the Slave States themselves.

That is why I discuss it, Mr. Chairman, my time is passing away, and I must hasten on. I want to come to a few things that have been under discussion during the inchoate condition of the House, while this Hall was echoing with ululations that would have drowned the lupine chorus of the Alps, of Helper, and John Brown and incendiaries, the torch of the incendiary, and the knife of the assassin: One gentleman from Virginia stood up in his place, and wanted to know where there was a man who would indorse the Helper Book. He wanted such a man it there was one here, to stand up, that he might look upon the traitor.

Mr. Chairman, I for one signed the paper recommending the circulation of the Helper Book. I signed it intelligently. I was neither engrossed nor abstracted. I did it because I wanted to do it; and now, if the gentleman wants to look upon that kind of a traitor, *me, me, adum qui facti, in me convertite letum*; I did it. I will sign a recommendation for the circulation of any book that I choose, without asking permission of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Clark], or any other gentleman in the house or out of the House. I will sign a paper recommending the circulation of the Bible or the Koran, Young's Night Thoughts, or Tom Moore's *Anacron, Jonathan Edwards on Deceit, or Tom Paine's Age of Reason*, just as I please. I claim the privilege, as an American citizen, of writing my name and recommending the circulation of any and every book, without being held amenable to gentlemen upon this floor, or anywhere else. That is my answer in regard to it. I have more than that to say. I say nothing about some points in the book. I have no doubt that there is considerable bombast and fustian and violence of language in it, because the author was educated in a Slave State, and the rhetoric which comes from that quarter is apt to have these characteristics. [Laughter.] But the philosophy—the gist of the book—is what? It is the address of a citizen of a Slave State to his fellow-citizens in regard to the subject of Slavery, recommending in substance the organization of a Republican party in North Carolina and in all the other Slave States. I hope to see that done; and I expect to see it done before very long. You may kill Cassius M. Clay, as you threaten to do; but the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church. You may shed his blood, as you shed the blood of my brother on the banks of the Mississippi twenty years ago; and what then? I am here to-day, thank God, to vindicate the principles baptized in his blood. You may shed his blood; and what then? A Republican party will spring up in Kentucky and in all the Slave States are long, and these Disunionists and gentlemen who you see so violent now will be displaced by more moderate, and—if may say so without being offensive—more sensible men. I believe in that doctrine. I do not indorse every expression in the Helper Book, for I have not studied every expression; but the philosophy of the book, the idea of organizing a party in the Slave States against Slavery, I am in favor of, and I expect to see it accomplished. What is the objection to the book? The objection is that a citizen of the United States, an American citizen, addressed himself to his fellow-citizens, in a peaceful way, through the press, and for this you find fault with him and say that he must be hanged, and that any man who signed a recommendation for the circulation of his book is a "blighting, blasting, burning, withering curse," and must not occupy that chair. I want to know if it has come to this? Has not an American citizen a right to speak to an American citizen? I want the right of uttering what I say here in Richmond. I claim the right to say what I say here in Charleston.

Mr. Bonham, (Dem. S. C.): You had better try it.

Mr. Lovejoy: Yes, Sir. I am going to invoke the aid of the General Government to protect me, as an American citizen, in my rights as an American citizen. I can go to England to-day, and in London, or anywhere else, discuss the question of Church and State; I can discuss the question of a monarchial government as compared with a Republican form of government. I can do this anywhere in England, but I cannot go into a Slave State and open my lips in regard to the question of Slavery—

Mr. Lovejoy: I cannot go to a Slave State and utter my sentiments to free citizens, like myself.

Mr. Miles, (Dem. S. C.): Can you go to England and incite the laboring classes to murder the aristocracy, or to assassinate the Queen?

Mr. Lovejoy: I have no desire to, nor have I any desire to incite such things anywhere else; but I do claim the right of discussing this question