

Christ as their Saviour, and having drunk at this pure, unadulterated fountain of true happiness, they have ventured to point their fellow men to the same crystal fountain. In other words, they have ventured to teach the way of life and salvation. And for this offence they must be stricken from the political firmament and consigned to eternal oblivion, so far as all preferment is concerned, in the civil government.

Mr. President, a little more than eighteen hundred years ago, the lawyers and doctors assumed the responsibility of casting reflections upon the Saviour of the world. They charged him with being a wine bibber and a glutton, the friend of publicans and sinners. The Saviour himself said, "If they do these in the green tree, (meaning himself,) what will they not do in the dry?" (referring to his followers.) "As they have despised me, so will they also despise you."

Sir, the lawyers, doctors, scribes and Pharisees did not cease to exist with that age; but to the present time they say to Christ's ministers, "Stand aside, we are more holy than thou," or at any rate, beyond all controversy, we are more *worthy* to fill all civil offices; you are not to be *trusted*; that is a settled point.

But, Mr. President, perhaps you may think that I am under the impression that honorable members upon this floor, who favor this oppressive measure, and who wish, by constitutional provision, to disfranchise a large portion of our fellow citizens, are wholly destitute of principle. No, sir! In the language of one of Virginia's distinguished statesmen, John Randolph, they have *seven* principles at least, *the five loaves and two fishes*; nor are they destitute of generosity; they divide, with a good grace, the five loaves and two fishes amongst *themselves*, and then write in large capitals the words, *equal rights and privileges to all*; and this inscription, when written, is nailed up to every sign post along the road that leads to higher office and a greater division of the spoils. And these words, *equal rights and privileges to all*, are trumpeted forth, to deceive that class of our fellow citizens who are not even permitted to gather up the fragments or partake of the crumbs that fall from the lordly tables of those who consider *themselves worthy* to rule.

Sir, this prescribed class of our citizens, are not so stupid as not to see through such deception. They know their rights, and if they do not maintain them, it is because they love peace, and had rather suffer loss than engage in contention and strife.

But I may be told that ministers are engaged in a higher and more noble calling, and that they should not leave their profession to make laws. Very well! But is this any reason why you should say in your Constitution that they are *unworthy* of a lower calling? that they have no *right* to participate in the affairs of government? Why, the thing is absurd, perfectly absurd!

You might tell me with the same propriety that the man who has no knowledge of letters, though he have other qualifications, ought not to be elected President, and therefore some provision should be introduced in the Constitution of

the United States to render such an one ineligible.

Sir, I ask if this would not be a direct reflection upon the sovereign people themselves. Are the people not capable of being their own guardians? Why then say to them, you shall never elect a President who cannot write his name? Why say to them you shall not do that which they never intended to do. In proscribing ministers of the gospels you are in effect saying to the people, you are not capable of choosing for yourselves; we have the matter in hand; we will choose for you.

But why single out this particular profession? Why not as well proscribe lawyers? Do they not leave their profession and their clients to suffer? while they come to the Legislature to engage in law making? Why not proscribe doctors? Do they not leave their patients to linger and die while they are in the Legislative Halls? Why not proscribe the farmer? But for the farmer *all professions* would languish and die. And is he to be taken from his lawful pursuit to engage in the work of Legislation? Why sir, this eternal hatred to ministers or teachers of religion? Why should they be proscribed and crushed to the earth more than any other profession? Why, Mr. President, according to the hypothesis contended for on the other side, that every man should stick to his profession, then, sir, you ought not to occupy the honorable position you do, as the presiding officer of this body, nor should you ever think of coming to the Legislature, however much your constituents might desire it. But as a *General*, sir, you should be training soldiers for the war, which we may expect in a few years with *Great Britain*. The language used playfully by the honorable gentleman over the way, (Governor Grason,) on yesterday may yet be prophetic.

Sir, the fact cannot be disguised that the Stars and Stripes must soon wave over Cuba! Then we shall have war with *England, France, Russia, Prussia, Austria, all the world and the rest of mankind, and the Eastern Shore of Maryland*.

Mr. President, let us look for a few moments calmly at this subject. As you pass along your streets you see a poor unfortunate man in the gutter, beastly intoxicated. That man is eligible to the office of Governor! On the other side you see another equally intoxicated, who feels called upon, by every consideration to *defend his most sacred honor*; and for this purpose measures off the proper distance, and *fights a duel with the lamp-post for flying around the corner and knocking him down, when he was passing peaceably by*. That man is eligible to a seat in the *General Assembly*!

But walking on a little farther, we meet two gentlemen passing along accompanied by a little army of bright eyes and happy faces. They interfere with no one, but quietly proceed towards the house of God. Their mission is one of peace and good will to men. Let us inquire who they are. They are the minister and the Sabbath school teacher, both *proscribed* as *unworthy* to participate in the affairs of civil government.

In conclusion, Mr. President, permit me to say that I have not offered this amendment, or these remarks from any ambitious motives. I am here