

Cp970.71
B878r

Brown

Remarks Made in N. C. Senate

Dec. 19th, 1860

The Library
of the
University of North Carolina



Collection of North Caroliniana

This book was presented

by
Grandchildren of
James Graham Ramsay

Gp 970.71

13878r

UNIVERSITY OF N.C. AT CHAPEL HILL



00032721298

**This book must not
be taken from the
Library building.**

REMARKS

OF

HON. BEDFORD BROWN, OF CASWELL,

*Made in the Senate of North Carolina, on Dec.
19th, 1860, on the Resolutions of Mr. Hall,
of New Hanover, on Federal Relations.*

Mr. Brown said, the time had arrived when it was not less demanded by a sense of duty than of interest, safety and honor, that the Southern States should make a united demand for a final settlement and definitive adjustment of the questions of difference which are now unhappily the sources of discord between the North and South, and to forever exclude them from the halls of Congress. To effect an object which should be so dear to the bosom of every lover of his country and her institutions, no terms could or would be received as admissible, that did not fully go to the root of the evils of which we had such undeniable cause of complaint. He would ask, could this most devoutly wished for consummation ever be effected, while the extremists of the North and the extremists of the South are fanning the flames of sectional animosities by one-sided appeals, sketching the one side of the picture without giving the bright as well as the dark shades, which stern justice, as well rigid history, both require? Mr. B. was certain that an immense—an overwhelming majority of the people of the slave-holding States, desired most anxiously a safe and honorable settlement of these differences in the Union, if possible. He was almost as positively certain that a decided majority of the people

P 30615

of the Northern and North-western States now see the necessity, and are ready, by State legislation by repealing their personal liberty bills and other hostile enactments, together with adding amendments to the federal constitution, to yield such terms as would meet the requirements of both our honor and security. How was it possible for the majorities of national men in both sections who wish to remedy these evils to act with effect, when the extremes of the two sections were daily, in Congress and elsewhere, plying and lashing popular sentiment with *one-sided* statements and irritating denunciations?

Was this the manner of proceeding among the great and revered statesmen of our revolution? When sectional jealousies sprung up during the revolution, and when the present federal constitution was about to be framed, mark the difference, and behold with sorrow the lamentable descent in statesmanship! Men of higher resolve and nobler purpose never lived than the statesmen of that day. With what wonderful dignity, argument, and elevation of character, did the speeches and addresses of these almost inspired men go forth to the world. Most of the present generation of popular speakers and debaters in legislative halls, might, he thought, find at least benefit in recurring to these purest and best of models. They were the great men of a great age.

Mr. B. said he had beheld with astonishment—with inexpressible amazement, the scenes which here, in the legislative halls for the last four weeks, had been enacted. It appeared to him more like the vision of a disturbed imagination, than a sad reality. How suddenly—nay with what rapidity had the scenes been shifted from those of cheerful unanimity to those of dark sombre disunion, with the motto *Hope* impressed on its banner, and its followers invited to pull down the stars and stripes, and plant in its stead the *Union*! Was this the entertainment to which the people of North-Carolina were invited, in the elections for members of the Legislature and President and Vice-President? When the honest voters of the State were asked for their confidence, and asked to confide their dearest rights in this great crisis, did the scenes of the political drama give token

of any note of preparation to tear down the federal Union, unless for aggression or refusal of justice? Did the actors in the political drama, with rare exceptions, proclaim any such purpose, grounded on the election of a President? On the contrary, did not the actors with rare and few exceptions repel the charge of disunion in language indignant, and in terms sometimes scarce fit for "ears polite?" Strange shifting of scenes! Sudden re-cast of characters! Unparalleled facing to the left about! The proclaimed promises yet from breath not long since uttered—the recorded declarations made in ink not long since dry, are gainsayed in a few moons, and it seemed to be the very "error of the moon." The parties in this drama and actors could not claim even the benefit of a three months statute of limitations, to protect themselves against the charge of political tergiversation and almost unexampled inconsistency.

Are we to be hurried on by the principal actors in this great drama—he would say tragic drama—are we to be pressed headlong with no time to think, and told in effect, that we are not free agents to act, and that circumstances and necessity, the latter the tyrant's plea, leave no other alternative than to *follow* blindly the lead of one or more States?

"My Author and Disposer, what thou bid'st,
Unargued, I obey."

They have spoken—we have no right to speak, but to echo their will. *They* have acted—we have no right to act, only to say *we are to obey*. Where is the professed devotion to liberty when this language is uttered, and where the love of States's rights so often spoken of, when this course with respect to North-Carolina is urged? The true English of it is that the rights of States belong only to the States about to secede, which he wished them to exercise undisturbed, and that others are to be shorn of their own sovereignty—stripped of the attributes of sovereignty, the right to *think and to act*, and to wheel into line as attendants and satellites by a law above their own control. In other words, we are to have a *Southern* "higher law" overruling the will of our people, and overruling the very sovereignty of our States;—showing that Northern and Southern extremes meet in a

“*higher law*,” setting aside State rights and constitutional obligation.

Mr. B. would not consent to surrender the rights and sovereignty of North-Carolina to any people on earth, foreign or domestic. Let us deliberate as freemen in this great emergency, wisely, firmly, prudently, as becomes the intrepid men of a Republic as to what is best for our safety and honor. Let us yet, in the hope, even after States have seceded, that by maintaining our position firmly in the Union, the border slave States and those adjacent may yet demand and receive terms to enable them to re-construct the constitution—about which I have no doubt, and by which we shall be the greatest, happiest, and most prosperous people on earth; and that all the sisterhood of States will again be numbered in one great confederated family with ample guaranties to protect all. Let us act like the prudent Mariner, who, when his vessel is tempest-tossed, casts around, observes the weather, looks on the broad ocean before him, and determines on what course is best to save the vessel from the peril which surrounds it, before he takes a new departure. And so with a bewildered traveller when he comes to several forks leading in different directions, a little delay in examining for the right road will often save him from being involved in difficulties—sometimes in bogs and quicksands, and the trouble of taking to the back track to escape from the consequences of precipitation and rash decision.

Mr. B. had heard with sorrow and profound regret, the sad notes with which the Senator from New Hanover, (Mr. Hall,) had pronounced the funeral knell of the federal Union and consigned it to “the tomb of all the capulets.” He regretted that while the Senator had paid such marked respect to such names of evil omen as Sumner, Seward and others, in reading their fanatical effusions to the Senate, that he had paid *like respect* to such names as Franklin Pierce, Geo. Dallas, Daniel S. Dickinson, Commodore Stockton, the eloquent Vallandigham, and many other pure and intrepid patriots of the North, whose noble sentiments in favor of the constitutional rights of the South would be more refreshing to us. He regretted that the Senator had not dwelt more at

large on the million and a half of undaunted patriots of the North, who had stood by us and cast their votes against Lincoln. The Senator's speech was a sample of that kind of one-sided speeches, by which extreme men North and South had lashed up sectional feelings to their present height. Because bad men in the North, taking advantage of the disruption of the Democratic party had banded together—*old whigs, freesoil democrats and abolitionists*—and for the first time in the history of our government elected a President, is that any reason for denouncing the whole North?

Mr. B. said Southern chivalry, Southern honor, severe historic truth, all required that these illustrious names, and a million and a half of men of the North, called by us in the Breckinridge campaign our brothers and allies in a common cause, should not be ignored. Is it, he would ask, in the true spirit of knighthood, because they had fallen—and not by a large majority of the popular vote—to abandon them? Their defeat and that of the Democratic party was, he was confident, brought about by the conduct of the delegations of the seven cotton States, which seceded at Charleston, and which fatal movement, by a train of events, had compelled constitution, Union-loving men to withdraw afterwards at Baltimore. If the delegations of the seven cotton States had not withdrawn at Charleston, there would have been a moral certainty of obtaining a platform of principles, substantially as strong and with principles the same, as the platform required by their State conventions. The resolution to which he referred, was adopted by a committee of the New York delegation in conference with the seven slaveholding States which remained in the Convention—was submitted to the entire New York delegation, assented to by them in full meeting, and a pledge given by them to support it in Convention. The resolution is as follows, to be found in the proceedings of the Convention at Charleston :

“*Resolved*, That the citizens of the United States have an equal right to settle with their property in the Territories of the United States; and that, under the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, which we recognize as the correct exposition of the constitution of the United States, neither the right of persons or property can be destroyed or impaired by congressional or territorial legislation.”

Here, then, was a resolution as explicit and as comprehensive as language could make it, declaring the equal rights of the citizens of the States to settle with their property in the territories; declaring that the decision of the Supreme Court is a correct exposition of the constitution of the United States, and that neither the right of persons or property can be impaired or destroyed by Congressional or Territorial legislation. The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States declares that slaves are not only property in the Territories, *but that it is the duty of every department of the government to protect them as property.* The delegations of the States which withdrew at Charleston, or most of them, remained some days there, expressing a desire to return if their platform of principles was complied with. The resolution referred to, as he knew, was shown to many of them in private interviews, and known to all, yet they declined doing so. By this course they prevented the passage of a resolution—for by their votes it could have been carried—as strong virtually as their own State conventions had adopted, for the resolution by adopting the decision of the Supreme Court, which asserted it to be the duty of the government to protect property in the Territories, recognized fully the principle of protection. The presence of these delegations would not only, as he believed, have secured the passage of the resolution, but they could under the two-thirds rule have defeated Mr. Douglas, and in all probability have nominated and elected some such national man as Daniel S. Dickinson; and a united nomination would no doubt have been victorious over Lincoln. Should those who brought this calamity on the country, or at least, who are largely responsible for it, now be followed in their precipitate course in overthrowing the federal Union, without exhausting all proper means first for a settlement, just, safe and honorable to ourselves? Let the States interested in slave property act together in making their demands, and act as one, if proper terms are not conceded.

The Senator from New Hanover, (Mr. Hall,) in his recital of the wrongs and injuries which the North had inflicted on the South, had continued the same one-sided statement, and

ignored, or seemed to ignore the great and essential aid which the true-hearted national men of the North had rendered us. Mr. B. said there were no words of reproach, no epithet of denunciation that the abolition traitors of the North, acting in conjunction with British emissaries, did not merit. On the other hand, there is no language of eulogy that the good and true men there, who, rising above sectional feelings, and standing with us on questions of peace and war, were not entitled to from our hands. Let the *anathema maranatha* be pronounced against the traitors who had nullified the laws and constitution in the North. On the other hand, in the spirit of Southern honor and Southern chivalry, let justice be done though the heavens fall—give honor to whom honor is due.

The Senator in charging grievances and injuries by the North, again ignores the noble deeds of our friends there.—By their aid Southern Presidents have been elected and directed the policy of the government for two-thirds of the time the government has been in operation; and when Southern men were not Presidents, with rare exceptions such men as Pierce and Buchanan have governed with principles in harmony with ours. History awarded to Robert R. Livingston, of New York, more credit for the purchase and acquisition of Louisiana than any other statesman next to Mr. Jefferson.—He was the untiring negotiator, who, afterwards joined by Mr. Monroe, effected the treaty with Napoleon. True-hearted national men of the North voted with Southern men for the fifteen millions to purchase it, and for the ratification of the treaty. Its acquisition not only saved the federal Union from the alarming spirit of discontent and disunion pervading the entire Western and South-western States—from the fact that the free navigation of the Mississippi had been denied them, and the great outlet to the Gulf of Mexico closed—but it established the institution of slavery on a greatly *firmer basis* than before, by the incalculable resources which it opened to slave labor, and the command which it gave to the slave States of the Gulf of Mexico. The larger portions of the States of Mississippi and Alabama, held then as territory of the State of Georgia, had been purchased of Georgia

by the United States, and erected into great and flourishing States by the aid of votes from Northern statesmen. Florida had been purchased of Spain; a Northern Secretary of State having negotiated the treaty for its purchase. The Indian treaties, wars and removal of Indians from Florida had cost the government of the United States, first and last, he supposed, not less thirty millions of dollars. The same national men had contributed speeches and votes to effect these objects. The Indians occupying a portion of the soil of North-Carolina, Tennessee, near a fourth of the entire soil of Georgia, a large portion of Alabama and Mississippi, were treated with, the soil purchased and they removed, thus amplifying immensely the agricultural resources and population of the South. These great measures were effected by the aid of such men as Silas Wright, Franklin Pierce, and their compatriots. The acquisition of Texas was also made by the same kind of patriotic aid.

While, therefore, he would again repeat, that no language could express the contempt for the sectional traitors who had made war on us, no language was too lofty, no eulogy too great, to commemorate the deeds of those who had stood by us in sunshine and in storm, and the million and a half of true men who stand on the solid rock of the constitution. If they and their services are to be ignored—if they are to be included in the sweeping denunciation against the entire North—this language, striking *at friends* as well as foes—he would ask, where has good faith among men fled? where is that sentiment of brotherhood which was proclaimed in all the highways a few months since? and where is nationality gone? Is the plighted faith, which binds men together who stand together in a common cause—no matter in what latitude—to be violated? Are we, because defeat has perched on our banner, and that brought on by the violent men of our own party, *with Yankee calculation* to cut loose from one million and a half of true Northern friends, and cry save himself who can? If this is in the code of Southern honor and Southern gallantry, I confess I have now for the first time learned it.

Mr. B. said this million and a half of national men of the

North are the only friends which the slaveholding States have, *outside* of those States, in the civilized world. We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that England—which has been *the evil genius* that has haunted us as colonies and independent States—is the deadly foe of our government and the slave institution. The visit of her Prince and *the noble spies* who accompanied him to this country, shows their old rancor.—Slave States were treated with no respect, while their visit to Richmond gave an opportunity to their calumnious writers and editors to libel us. *That a deep design* lurked beneath this visit, he fully believed. The Canadas were *the ostensible* objects of the visit, while the United States were the real objects of *diplomatic attack*. The Prince was the mere decoy duck to conceal more effectually the old crafty *diplomatic spies*, who were cunningly, under the guise of smiles and friendship to our country, to look *deeply* into the affairs of state here, and sound the union or disunion sentiment, and to insinuate as much British influence as possible in Northern sentiment, to re-establish their ascendancy. It was a remarkable incident in our history with England, that when Jefferson from Paris joined Adams in London, soon after the acknowledgment of our independence, to make a commercial treaty, on being presented to George the Third, after a cold reception, he turned his back on our Ministers. Our independence had just been gained; hatred followed its establishment. It is another striking incident, that, for the first time in eighty-four years, since our independence, a British Prince makes a general tour *through the Northern and Western States* just at the moment when the elements of sectional strife were doing their work of destruction, in overthrowing our federal system, and with it, paving the way to monarchy. A profusion of smiles and a shower of noble and royal compliments have suddenly, and for the first time, fallen upon us. The British government and the British nation are notoriously the most selfish and heartless on earth. They move only for a purpose; when they smile on the masses, it is to betray. They were pirates on the ocean for five hundred years, violating the flag of every nation and capturing their vessels, until, in the war of 1812, we taught them some lessons as to the law of nations. Their history is crimsoned with the blood

of Ireland and the East Indies and other regions of the world, where the iron hoof of British conquest has trodden. He honored the Irish Regiment of New York for refusing to attend at the ceremonies of receiving the representatives of a government, which government was stained with the murder of Robert Emmett and his compatriot United Irishmen. The train which she had laid more than sixty years since, for the dissolution of our Union, was now in a rapid state of consummation. Had her wily statesmen come at this period of our national woe to look on, *under the guise of friendship*, and witness its too successful workings? He feared the Greeks bringing presents. *It was Nero fiddling while Rome was burning.*

Mr. B. would say a word or two to the Senator from Jackson—a county, he would say, bearing a very good name.—The Senator (Mr. Thomas) has discovered that those who are opposed to rash action are submissionists—an imported phrase from some other States, where it has been used, for the want of a better argument, to enlist the weak and timid; and that the Tories of the revolution had counselled submission to George the Third. The Tories were of that desponding class of persons, said Mr. B., who had *no hope*, and doubtless if there could be a resurrection of them, on this occasion, the Senator from Jackson would receive their loudest applause for aiding in the attempt to pull down the free government which the patriots of the revolution won by their valor, and which the Tories so hated. The privileged orders of Britain would no doubt join in hosannas to those who were doing the self-government of man so much injury, and that of crowned heads so much benefit.

The Senator also had ridiculed the idea of delay in our action. A wise delay was oftener right than wrong. Precipitate action was generally both unwise and wrong. Gen. Washington, at many periods of the revolution, and especially in his campaigns in New Jersey, was often reproached by some of the hotspurs of that day with pursuing a Fabian policy—sometimes charged with cowardice; and if living now would probably, by some of the young America's, be called an old fogey. Washington, unsurpassed in moral as he was in physical courage, spurned the reproaches of military

fops, and when they rudely asked him how long he was going to retreat, replied that he would retreat, if necessary, to the mountains of Virginia—plant the flag of the country there, and rally its brave inhabitants to its defence. What was the result? Why Washington, by a little delay, gained the splendid victory of Trenton, and made the glorious attacks at Princeton and Monmouth, and ended the war of the revolution in a blaze of glory at Yorktown. What went with his accusers, Generals Charles Lee and Horatio Gates, both native Englishmen, and who had been trying to supplant him as Commander-in-Chief? Why, in a short time after the conspiracy was formed, and Washington was accused of timidity and delay, Lee was disgraced in the battle of Monmouth; and Gates having been sent South to take command of the Southern army, in hot haste made an attack on the British army at Camden, and was signally overthrown, and such was his precipitate flight, with whip and spur, that it is said he reached Hillsborough, from the field of his defeat, in a day and night. The moral of this is, that rash precipitation is often great folly, and prudent delay, generally, great wisdom.

If, said Mr. B., the country should unfortunately become involved in civil broils, he hoped the Senator from Jackson would fly to the rescue—place himself at the head of the red men, who yet linger in his region of country; and, from his gallantry, we may expect that he will not be found in the rear, but will lead on the front in defending the country.

Mr. B. said, if he had not known so well, by actual personal observation in Congress many years since, how and when this slavery agitation received aid and comfort, and first began to assume any thing like size and proportion, and narrowly watched its progress ever since, he might, too, be for immediate disunion. The abolition party undoubtedly laid the foundation of it. Their strength, however, did not, in the last one or two years of General Jackson's administration, consist of more than eight or ten abolitionists proper in the House of Representatives, and three or four in the Senate. The States of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Maine, New Hampshire, Connecticut and all the North-western States, including the State of Ohio, had resolutions on their statute books at that time almost as strong as respected our constitutional rights regarding slavery, as North-Carolina or Virginia. The debates in Congress of that period will show that the miserable effusions of such miscreants as Garrison, then in utter obscurity, and his paper of very limited circulation at that time, even in Massachusetts, were brought into the Houses of Congress, held up as *Northern sentiment*

by extreme men of the South who were then bitterly opposed to General Jackson and the Democracy, and whose names were afterwards found recorded against him in the resolution of censure which the Senate afterwards expunged, and which he had the pleasure of voting to expunge. These extreme men at the same time denounced the *entire North* as abolition, while at the very moment the Northern Democracy and other conservative men were voting with us on all questions of practical importance—on the slavery question, on the treaties and appropriations to remove the Indians, to admit slave States, and all others in which the South had essential interests. These speeches were eagerly republished and circulated by the abolitionists among the people of the North, with insulting comments on those of the North who acted with the South. At the same time, *the contemptible effusions* of the few abolition members of Congress would be sent forth among the people of the South by extreme men of the South and its newspaper organ at Washington, as *Northern sentiment*. The newspaper organ at Washington of the extreme men of the South, soon after the tariff question was settled by Mr. Clay's compromise, declared that it was manifest that *the South could not be united* on the tariff question, and that the *slave question* was the only one that could unite them. Agitation on the slave question, with this as the motto and rule of action, then commenced between *the extreme North and South*, thrown like a shuttle back and forth, by which the monster of abolitionism was fed, and its size greatly increased. It had been a system of action and re-action, of operation and co-operation more or less ever since, the abolitionists of the North abusing the slaveholder and his sentiments, *and his ravings*, instead of the speeches of Pierce, Buchanan, and such like men, sent forth in the South as *Northern sentiment*; while the speeches of extreme Southern men in the Senate of the United States, placing all the laboring classes, farmers and all of the North on an equality with our slaves, were eagerly and falsely seized on by the abolitionists, and circulated with provoking comments as *Southern sentiment*. This system had been kept up by demagogues and disunionists of both sections for twenty-four years past, until it had enabled the abolitionists to break down the noblest, and at one time the most powerful political organization on the side of the constitution, whether as to number or talents, that had ever existed in this or any other country. Whatever difference of opinion may have existed between these extremes as to the institution of slavery, they were co-workers and allies in their common purpose of destroying the Union. Andrew Jack-

son, in the presence of hundreds now living, charged this agitation at the time on the extreme men North and South, and charged them with designs of breaking up the Union. The newspaper organ at Washington at that day—known to have spoken the sentiments of Andrew Jackson—is filled with these charges, with the actors designated. He knew also that that pure patriot, the late William R. King, of Alabama, also beheld with decided disapprobation the agitation of the slavery question at that time, by the extremes of the North and South. Thus, by a system of extreme doctrines and extreme measures—the latter sometimes yielding only the most bitter fruits—had our noble Democratic, and other constitutional allies of the North been borne down, and the abolitionists and other political combinations who hated with a deep hate the old Democracy, had been victorious; for which, with the causes mentioned, they had been largely indebted *to the seceders at Charleston*, for striking a blow at the Democratic organization which rendered it powerless to contend with the enemies of the constitution.

Was it, he would ask, generous, when our noble allies were prostrated by these causes, in which extreme Southern men had acted a conspicuous part, to cut loose from them and desert them because of temporary defeat? Was it manly after such strong appeals to stand by us in the late election, to fly with precipitate haste out of the Union, and make no common struggle with our allies to repair the losses of the past and demand security for the future? No, said Mr. B. let us for the present stand by our colors, and not retreat panic-stricken from the Union. Wellington had won his great victory at Waterloo by standing firm in position—precipitancy would have destroyed him in two hours. The position of strength of the border States and others who do not secede now, is to call State Conventions—lay down our principles of action, call a general convention of all the slaveholding States; let that Convention distinctly set forth the terms on which we will alone consent to continue members of the Confederacy. Let these terms be presented *to the Northern States*, either in their capacity as separate States, or in a National Convention of all the States, and he had no doubt that we could obtain every guarantee demanded by our safety and honor—co-operation and a united demand by all the Southern States, would carry with it a weight that could not fail to be respected and responded to favorably. There is weakness in separate action, strength in Union. Whether we make demands before or after Lincoln's inauguration, we can, he had no doubt, get them complied

with. The idea of resistance or disunion on account of Lincoln's election, if carried out in practice, is fraught with destruction to Democratic principles and at war with all social safety. If there is to be an appeal to arms by the defeated party in presidential elections, it opens up a more horrid future than ever fell to the lot of any nation. We at once fall to the level of Mexico and Mexicans, the most degraded and abject nation on earth. That nation has been scourged for forty years by wars among themselves on account of defeated parties for the Presidency. It has become a bye-word of reproach among the nations of the earth—the country impoverished, property destroyed, and no one safe from the hand of violence and rapine. Miramon and Jaraz—one the candidate of the party claiming rightful election, the other the leader of the opposite party, are the present actors in the bloody tragedy in that country. If the sword is to be substituted as the arbiter of elections instead of the ballot box, the horrors of civil war would be more aggravated here than almost in any other country, because of the daring character of the American *Anglo-Saxon* race. When "Greek meets Greek, then comes the tug of war."

Is the glorious principle of self-government by the people to go down in blood, civil war and darkness, asked Mr. B.? Are mankind again destined to be rode by desperate military adventurers, with no safety for persons or property—property seized by the strong hand of power, and the liberty of the citizen trampled under the bloody hoof of civil dissensions? These said Mr. B., are most solemn and serious considerations, addressing themselves with more than solemn emphasis to those in every relation of life.

Let us then, said Mr. B., take no rash step. Let the slaveholding States all act together; let them make a united demand *on the Northern States as States*, not on the shuffling politicians at Washington, who, so far as extreme men are concerned are the political ephemera of the day, who were generated in sectionalism, and could not politically survive a month if the corrupt atmosphere in which they live and have their being, could be purified by the more healthy tone of a true public sentiment. Let it be demanded that the slavery question be forever taken from the halls of Congress, where the slave institution has so long been made the foot ball of sectional demagogues, and moved as men are on a chess-board to win a game or answer a selfish purpose. Justice to the slave-holder—the best interests of the slave-holder, nay, the peace and harmony of the country all require that it should at as early a period as practicable,

by constitutional amendments, be taken out of the hands of trading politicians, forever settled, and forever taken from the halls of Congress.

Mr. B. said, by the border and other States not now seceding and remaining in the Union, these guaranties he most sincerely believed, and did not doubt could be obtained, and by amendments and a re-construction of the federal government—the reasons for secession being removed—the States that had seceded would joyfully be hailed on returning to the Union, and the Southern and Northern States rejoiced at the dangers which they had escaped, forgetting past dissensions, remembering in a generous patriotism only glories and friendship, would, like Brutus and Cassius, after an angry quarrel, become the better friends.

Mr. B. said that he had heard with pleasure mingled with pain his friend, the Senator from Brunswick. While the opinions declared by him in favor of separate State action and despairing of the continuance of the present federal Union gave him pain, he would say, that the Senator had, on his part, conducted the debate with a dignity, an ability and parliamentary decorum that contributed to lessen the pain incident to such differences of opinion. He Mr. B., like the Senator, admired the history of South Carolina—to one of her lamented sons, Robt. Y. Hayne, he was more attached than to any member of Congress with whom it had been his fortune to form an acquaintance;—he had lived in the same house with him at Washington, had been honored with his intimacy, had received acts of kindness from him, when himself comparatively a young man, that he could never forget. He was the gentleman, the scholar, the statesman and soldier. South Carolina had left the family of States. He had always contended that she or any other State had that right, as a last resort; and while he regretted that she had not, in concert with all the slaveholding States, united in a common demand upon Northern States for a redress of our wrongs and all acted together, if refused, yet he had no word of reproach for her. While she acted on the defensive and confined herself to that line of action, he would say that she was entitled to a common sympathy and a common resistance against force, come from where it may. He could not permit himself to doubt that her own wisdom and patriotism, as well as respect for her sister States of the South, would induce her to pursue the course indicated. In secession, without all proper efforts to settle difficulties with the North, he could not see the benefits which the Senator from Brunswick saw. He could only see in it, at this time, an incalculable aggravation

of present evils. There would probably be twenty fugitive slaves in the border States for one at present, on a hostile border line of fifteen hundred miles, with no law to recover them, civil war in a few weeks would be inevitable—a standing army in North-Carolina alone of fifteen or twenty thousand men, with an annual expenditure for its support, with some war steamers to defend our seacoast, amounting to at least six millions per annum, besides coming in conflict with the glorious principle of our Bill of Rights, that standing armies are dangerous to liberty.

In entering on this movement of secession, he, Mr. B., would like, before taking the leap, to know what kind of government we are to come under? Before a family removes from one house to another, a prudent head of the family always examines the new premises to be occupied. He would go under no government that did not take great State right and democratic principles as its fundamental doctrines. Any constitution that does not acknowledge that all government, to be just, is derived from the consent of the governed, is a usurpation. He doubted not that the great mass of our countrymen were right on this principle; yet, when standing armies and military power are in the ascendant, all history proves that they override the authority of the people and become *the government*.

It may be said that he had been too frank in stating the dangers of disunion. It required more moral courage to do this, boldly, than to pass over and conceal the dangers. The man of true moral courage, in every age, before entering on an expedition or adventure, looks the difficulties *squarely in the face* and candidly weighs and states them, to see if he is justified in taking the proposed course of action. He would now, in conclusion, say, that let all the slaveholding States meet together, in convention, make a definite demand of the North of such constitutional guarantees as are demanded by our safety and honor, as equals in the Union—a much more effectual plan than for fifteen separate States to make as many different demands; and if those demands are refused, it will then be conclusive evidence that wrong to us is intended, and will justify us in the eyes of the whole world in standing to our arms and seeking safety in a separate form of government.



