

E 390  
.S79

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



00005687342









✓

## LETTER

FROM

MR. STANLY, OF N. C. TO MR. BOTTS, OF VIRGINIA.

---

WASHINGTON CITY, *Sept. 23d*, 1840.

MY DEAR SIR:

I have read with much pleasure your letter to your constituents, relative to the celebrated plan of Poinsett, and the Hooe case. I really pity the President and his Secretaries, who have made themselves so ridiculous, in their attempts to shield themselves from public indignation. There are gross inconsistencies and contradictions in their letters, which cannot be reconciled. But this you have handled well, and nothing remains for me to say.

I wish, however, to say a word relative to the conduct of the Judiciary Committee. The President, in his electioneering letter to Mr. Burras, says, "that this committee are silent upon the subject." After Mr. STORRS, of Connecticut, resigned, I was placed on that committee to supply the vacancy. The case of Lieut. Hooe was then referred to us, and the committee, worn out as we all were, by the warm weather, sitting up late at night, and the press of business, found it impossible, with the little time at our command, to consider this case, without neglecting all the other business before the Committee.

As well as I remember, there was not a full meeting of the committee after I became a member of it.

But what was it proposed that the Judiciary Committee should do? I have lately seen an article in the Government organ, commenting upon the vote in the House, on the resolution of Mr. CHAPMAN, of Alabama, and of course misrepresenting the whole affair. By reference to the journal, you will observe that on the 14th of July, "a motion was made by Mr. CHAPMAN, of Alabama, that the rules in relation to the order of business be suspended, to enable him to move the following resolution:"

*"Resolved, That the Judiciary Committee, having charge of the case of Lieut. Hooe, do forthwith report a bill to this House, prohibiting the enlistment of negroes or colored persons in the service of the Navy or Army of the United States."*

To this resolution I was decidedly opposed, and gave my reasons for it. In these, if I remember right, you concurred. By reference to the journal, on the 17th July, you will find I succeeded in having these objections entered on the journal. I asked to be excused from voting, that I might be enabled to assign my reasons, which were as follows:

"Mr. STANLY asked to be excused from voting, because the Judiciary Committee had not time at this period of the session, to examine and prepare any law on any subject; because the President and the Secretary of the Navy had already full power and authority to exclude them from giving testimony against white men, and to set aside the proceedings of

.

courts martial, if they saw any thing requiring their interference; and because he (Mr. S.) could not consent that the Navy should be deprived of the services of negroes, as cooks, stewards, and servants, for there is no necessity they should be witnesses; and because, to enact such a law as the gentleman from Alabama proposes, would, in effect, make white men negroes, by imposing on them the necessity of discharging duties heretofore discharged by negroes."

This explains my opinions, as a Southern man, and as a member of the Judiciary Committee. And after deliberate examination, I believe these views are correct: and I know a large majority of Southern men think with me.

That great laboratory of lies, the Globe, gives the names of those who voted against Mr. CHAPMAN's resolution.

If you will look at the journal, you will find, on the 14th of July, Mr. CHAPMAN introduced his resolution to have the rules suspended, and the yeas and nays are there given. The Globe would have the South to believe, that all the Loco Focos who supported Mr. CHAPMAN in his motion are good Democrats, and friends of the South. But to expose this unfounded and hypocritical pretension, I need only call your attention to the names of H. WILLIAMS, and WM. PARMENTER, both of whom are found voting with Mr. CHAPMAN. Both of whom, therefore, the Globe intends to palm upon the South as friends of the institution of Slavery, and in favor of excluding negroes from entering the service.

I have before me copies of the letters written by MESSRS. PARMENTER and WILLIAMS, before they were elected members of Congress, and I give you an extract from each. *The extracts I here give you, I read in the House of Representatives, and they were not denied by PARMENTER and WILLIAMS:*

*Extract of a letter from WM. PARMENTER to Dr. AMOS FARNSWORTH, dated East Cambridge, October 16, 1838.*

"That the existence of slavery is an evil of great magnitude is not disputed, excepting by a very small portion of the citizens of the Union. In my opinion, the powers possessed by Congress *should be exercised to prohibit inter-State slave trade and to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia*, whenever such measures can be adopted consistently with the safety of the nation; and I deem it the duty of Congress to regard the requirements of justice and humanity as well as the other obligations of the Constitution of the United States."

"I am not in favor of the admission of any new State whose Constitution may tolerate slavery, and in this sentiment I believe the People of this section of the country almost unanimously coincide.

"Respectfully and truly, yours,  
WILL. PARMENTER."

*Extract of a letter of H. WILLIAMS to Rev. P. CRANDALL, Fall River, dated Taunton, November 1, 1838.*

"DEAR SIR: I have this day received your letter of the 31st ult. propounding to me interrogatories in behalf of the Bristol County Anti-Slavery Society, and for answer refer you to my course in the Massachusetts Senate, and to a letter written to Andrew Robeson, Esq. about one year since, and published in the newspapers of that time. That letter contains opinions I had long entertained and often expressed. I have since seen no reason to change them. *I still believe slavery to be contrary to the laws of God and the best interests of man; that it ought not to be extended by the admission of new States into the Union with Constitutions tolerating so great an evil; and that it is the imperative duty of Congress to adopt immediate measures for its abolition in the District of Columbia.*

H. WILLIAMS."

Now, both these men, PARMENTER and WILLIAMS, are full-blooded Loco Focos, and according to Globe logic, are genuine friends of the South; and if they are defeated at the next election, we shall hear that the Abolitionists have triumphed over these immaculate Democrats!

Anti-slavery resolutions were introduced into the Massachusetts Legislature. The question was taken by yeas and nays upon each resolution; here are two of them :

*Resolved*, That Congress, having exclusive legislation in the District of Columbia, possesses the right to abolish slavery and the slave-trade therein; and that the early exercise of such right is demanded by the enlightened sentiment of the civilized world, by the principles of the Revolution, and by humanity.

*Resolved*, That slavery being an admitted moral and political evil, whose continuance, wherever it exists, is vindicated mainly on the ground of necessity, should be circumscribed within the limits of the States where it has been already established; and that no new State should hereafter be admitted into the Union whose Constitution of government shall sanction or permit the existence of domestic slavery."

Whether those who voted for these resolutions were Abolitionists or not, I leave Southern people to decide.

Upon the passage of these resolutions, Henry Williams, with every other Van Buren Senator except one, recorded his name in the affirmative!

You will have perceived from the course of the Administration papers, that the attempt will be made to delude the Southern country by crying out that "the abolitionists have defeated the democrats in Vermont."

No man of ordinary intelligence, can any longer be deceived by this ridiculous cry. But, if there should be one, I can easily satisfy him of his error.

There are but two Administration members from Vermont in the present Congress, *and both these, are abolitionists*. They have been both defeated, and now we are told, the abolitionists have beaten these good Democrats!!

On the 16th day of January last, in a speech which I delivered in the House of Representatives, I referred to the fact that many of Mr. Van Buren's leading friends in Vermont, were abolitionists. Mr. E. D. Barber, the Loco-foco candidate for the office of Lieutenant Governor, was mentioned among others. It had been remarked, during the debate, that Mr. Slade was a Whig and an abolitionist, and in reply to this, I made the following statement:

"But, Sir, in the district represented by this member, the Van Buren abolitionists had a convention, and the Secretary of the Anti-Slavery Society, E. D. Barber, opposed his (Mr. SLADE'S) nomination. I understand this E. D. Barber is well known as a devoted friend of this Administration, the editor of a paper, and an undisguised abolitionist. There are two Administration members from Vermont on this floor, both of whom are abolitionists. One of them was here at the last Congress, (Mr. FLETCHER;) he is in favor of abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia, thinks that Congress ought to prevent the buying and selling slaves between the States, and has expressed a willingness to enter into the customary international relations with Hayti."

These remarks, I repeat, were made in the House of Representatives, in the hearing of the Vermont members, they were published, and have never been, and will not be denied.

In the Vermont election, which is recently heard from, the abolition candidate for the office of Governor, Mr. Dillingham; the abolition candidate for the office of Lieutenant Governor, Mr. E. D. Barber, and the abolitionists, Smith and Fletcher, were all beaten.

Some weeks after the publication of the speech referred to, I received, through the mail, two pamphlets from Mr. E. D. Barber: One of them was "Mr. Barber's oration, delivered before the Addison county Anti-Slavery Society, on the 4th of July, 1836," and the other was, "An oration delivered before the *democrats* of Washington county, at Montpelier, on the 4th of July, 1839, by Edward D. Barber."

On one of these pamphlets, which this impudent Loco-foco sent to me, he wrote, "From the author," and informed me that what I had been told, as to his opinions, was "true beyond all possible denial," as I would perceive by reading these pamphlets. I think I exhibited the pamphlets to you when they were received by the mail. I have them now before me, and this Mr. Barber, over whose defeat the Loco-focos are mourning, writes on one of his orations, that he is "*a democrat, true to his principles, as taught by Jefferson, himself an abolitionist!*" I quote his own words. And this is one of the men, the Secretary of an Anti-Slavery Society, and a devoted friend of Mr. Van Buren's, who calls Jefferson an abolitionist, this is the man whom the Van Buren party supported as their candidate for the office of Lieutenant Governor, in Vermont! and still, we shall be told that the abolitionists are all Whigs, and have beaten the "democrats" in Vermont.

The Whig victory in Maine, has overwhelmed the Tories here. They confess their astonishment at the result. Judging from what they have already said, as to the Vermont elections, I should not be much surprised, if they boldly charge the Whig victory in Maine, as an abolition triumph. You may expect to hear this next. Of course the Whig majorities in Kentucky, Louisiana, and North Carolina, will all likewise be imputed to abolition influence.

As to Maine, it may be as well to refresh the memories of those who have forgotten the circumstances. Mr. ALBERT SMITH, of Maine, who was recently defeated, gave satisfactory answers to the abolitionists before his election. Mr. Smith said in his letter: "No man can be more decidedly opposed to slavery in the abstract, or more deeply desire the freedom of the whole human family than myself." Mr. Smith was also opposed to the admission of Texas, and in favor of the right of petition.

Mr. FAIRFIELD, the Governor of Maine, who has just been defeated, was a member of the last Congress; he also wrote a letter to the abolitionists, in which, he assured them that he regarded slavery as a "moral and political evil," to which he is, and has ever been, both in principle and feeling, utterly opposed, and that its entire abolition could afford to no one, more sincere pleasure than himself. But he is now regarded as one whom the abolitionists have defeated. Mr. Fairfield was in Congress when Mr. Calhoun, of Kentucky, on the 13th December, 1839, introduced the following resolution, which I copy from the journals before me:

"Mr. CALHOON, of Kentucky, moved that the rules be suspended to enable him to move the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary be instructed to report a bill making it unlawful for any person to aid fugitive slaves in escaping from their owners, and providing for the punishment in the Courts of the United States of all persons who may be guilty of such offence.

"And that they be further instructed to report a bill making it unlawful for any person in the non-slaveholding States of this Union to use any means to induce slaves from their owners, and providing for the punishment, in the Courts of the United States, of all persons who may be guilty of such offence."

Now, surely, no man friendly to the rights of the South, no good "democrat" could object to the passage of such a resolution, but as the entire abolition of slavery could afford to no one more sincere pleasure than to him, he was found voting against Mr. Calhoun's motion. The names of H. J. Anderson, Thomas Davee, John Fairfield, and Virgil D. Paris, Loco-focos, from Maine, will be found in the journal, with the names of Alexander Duncan, Isaac Fletcher, William Parmenter, and William Slade, all opposing this reasonable, just, and honest proposition.



Before I conclude, I wish to examine a portion of the President's letter—a letter full of subterfuge and prevarication, the reading of which filled me with shame at the thought that its author was President of the United States. The President says, “There is no act of Congress which prohibits the admission of colored persons as witnesses in Courts Martial.” Again, he says: “If it be wrong to admit them, the fault is in the law, and the remedy is to be found only in its alteration.”

I have selected these passages for remark, as the letter has already been fully exposed, and repetition is useless. The President tells us, with as much distinctness as he can, that in all cases hereafter, where negro testimony is admitted against a white man, he cannot interfere. This should be understood. If Martin Van Buren is re-elected (of which thank Heaven there is now I believe no danger,) he will never interfere in setting aside the proceedings of Courts Martial, in which such testimony has been admitted. And he expects the votes of Southern States with this insulting declaration!

Now, in all this, I think the course of the President, merits the severest reprehension. According to the inclination of my mind at present, I should feel bound to oppose such a law, and for several reasons. In the first place, I trust we shall never have a President again who could be guilty of such conduct, and because I prefer to let the matter rest where it now does—upon that spirit of concession, by which, as General Harrison said our union was effected, and without which, it could not be preserved. If we are to depend upon Legislative action for the protection of all our rights, the Union had as well be dissolved. There are obligations of a higher character than mere acts of Congress. Besides if Congress can pass a law making negro testimony illegal, Congress can repeal that law. Suppose a bill should be introduced in the House of Representatives, declaring that Congress should not, during the next two years, abolish slavery in this district? Would any Southern man vote for it? Surely not, for it concedes to Congress the right to abolish slavery in this district. Or suppose a bill should be introduced, declaring that the people of Virginia should not be molested in taking their slaves from that State to Alabama. What Southern man would vote for it? None, because Virginia holds her right much more securely than if it was only protected by an act of Congress. The President, therefore, to my mind, does not regard this question as a Patriot should—his “southern principles” are not found in operation here. The right of a white man, in a slave-holding State, to object to the admission of the testimony of negro servants, cannot be effected by an act of Congress.

But let me illustrate the unsoundness of the President's argument further. The act of Congress of 1794, which provides for a naval armament, directs that there shall be employed on board each of the ships of 44 guns, *one Captain, four Lieutenants, &c. &c.* The act says nothing of *white* Captains, or Lieutenants. What prevents the President from appointing a negro Captain or Lieutenant? The act of 1798, which established the department of the navy, in the first section provides as follows:

Sec. 1. *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, That there shall be an Executive Department, under the denomination of the department of the navy, the chief officer of which, shall be called the Secretary of the Navy, &c. &c. &c.*

The law does not say he shall be a *white* “chief officer.” According to the President's argument, he would be authorized to appoint a negro Secretary of the Navy! Again, the act of 1809 which authorized the employment of an additional naval force, authorized and empowered the President of the

United States, "to appoint, and cause to be engaged and employed as soon as may be, three hundred midshipmen, three thousand six hundred able seamen, ordinary seamen and boys," &c. &c. Nothing said of *white* midshipmen, or *white* able seamen. No one can doubt that under this law many white midshipmen were employed, and many *black* sailors. But according to the argument of the President and his Secretary of the Navy, "there is no act of Congress which prohibits the admission of colored persons," as midshipmen in the navy. And I cannot see according to the views of the President, why he should not appoint a few negro midshipmen, in the navy of the United States, and I should be glad to hear any supporter of his give any reason for his not doing so, that would not with equal force apply against their being admitted as witnesses against white persons.

And if a President should appoint a negro as his Secretary of the Navy, I should like to see a southern Senator who would confirm the nomination, and then return to his constituents and tell them "there was no law forbidding it," and he might say so, with as much truth and propriety as the President has said in the case of Lieutenant Hooe. A President who disregards the moral sense of the whole southern country, who pays no respect to their prejudices, except so far as the laws of Congress compel him, is unfit to preside over the destinies of these United States, which could never have been united without concession, and which will be disunited when that patriotic spirit of concession shall depart from among us.

The President understands his game with the Abolitionists. They may quarrel with him for his promised veto, but then, as in the case of William Legget, who boasted he was an abolitionist, he can send a few of their leaders abroad as foreign ministers. The abolitionists already praise him for his conduct in the case of Lieut. Hooe, and the Emancipator remarks, "unless "the President has given some very foolish reasons, (which is not unlikely) "his conduct in this case will rebound as much to his honor, and afford him "as much satisfaction, in a future day, as any one measure of his administration."

As to Mr. Secretary PAULDING, his feelings have always been of an unfriendly character towards the South. Some years ago Mr. Paulding wrote a book called "Letters from the South," in which he endeavors to make the people of Virginia contemptible in the eyes of her sister States. In the first volume of this book, in Letter the 11th, Mr. Paulding gives the following account, which I copy from the book before me:

"Jogging along from the house where we left the cartiff, who will one day I fear bring down some great calamity on the country of his birth, it was our fate to meet with another example of the tricks men play "before high Heaven," when not only custom but the laws sanction oppression. The sun was shining out very hot, and in turning an angle of the road, we encountered the following group: first a little cart drawn by one horse, in which five or six half naked, black children were tumbled like pigs together. The cart had no covering, and they seemed to have been actually broiled to sleep. Behind the cart, marched three black women, with their head, neck and breasts uncovered, and without shoes or stockings; next came three men bare headed, half naked, and chained together with an ox-chain. Last of all came a white man—a white man! Frank, on horseback, carrying pistols in his belt, and who, as we passed him, had the impudence to look us in the face without blushing. I should like to have seen him hunted with bloodhounds. At a house where we stopped, a little further on, we learned that he had bought these miserable beings in Maryland, and was marching them in this manner to some one of the more southern States. Shame on the State of Maryland! I say, and shame on the State of Virginia! and every State, through which this wretched cavalcade, was permitted to pass! Do they expect that such exhibitions will not dishonor them in the eyes of strangers, however they may be reconciled to them by education and habit?"

Then Mr. Paulding speaks of this picture drawn from his imagination, as "a flagrant and indecent outrage on humanity." This I copy from his letter published soon after his journey through Virginia. But afterwards, in 1835, Mr. Paulding published a new edition of his work, and in this edition of 1835, all that I have quoted is *entirely omitted!* In the old edition, the letter 11th "occupies more than *thirteen* pages, but in the edition of 1835, (published after Mr. Van Buren became a "Northern man with Southern principles,") this letter the 11th, occupies only *three* pages! No wonder such a man will say the President had nothing to do with the proceedings in Hooe's case, and also say that it had been the *uniform practice* to admit negroes to testify against white men, when he was not able to produce a single instance.

This letter has already extended much further than I expected, but before I conclude, let me apprise you of some of the contemptible designs of the Loco-focos.

I have seen two letters from gentlemen of character and intelligence, communicating the fact, that the Van Buren party intend, shortly before the Presidential election, to issue hand bills, and start reports of intended insurrections in the South. I have no doubt that some such plan is in contemplation. We know that many of them are wicked enough to do any thing. They are not only struggling for bread, and they fear the investigation which is to come. Let our friends, therefore, be prepared for these villainous tricks; but let it be understood that when the insurrection takes place, Benjamin Tappan has promised to furnish five hundred dollars, to buy powder and shot for the negroes, and he is a good Van Buren democrat.

Our friends, every where, are full of confidence, and feel assured of victory. No man can doubt any longer, that General Harrison will be elected; elected in spite of the persecutions of unprincipled officeholders, and the furious assaults of the Globe, and the abolition papers, which continue to denounce him, most violently. I hope, in this most important struggle, Virginia, the land of Washington, Madison, Henry, and Marshall, will be found as she was in the revolution, among the first, in resisting, strenuously, the encroachments of power, I trust she will, not only, in defence of the character of her own distinguished son, but for the sake of the whole country, express her opposition to the man who has, by wretched experiments, brought a prosperous country almost to ruin, who has by pitiful equivocations, caused every patriot to feel ashamed of his country, and who has sanctioned the admission of negro testimony against one of her own sons, and declared he must continue to do so.

I have travelled through the State of New York, and, of course, saw many of the people of that State, and many from New England; I saw them in private social intercourse, and saw them in public meetings, consisting of ten thousand and twenty thousand persons, and I assure you, every decent man I met, with whom I conversed upon the subject, spoke with contempt of the abolitionists, and expressed surprise that any southern man could imagine the majority of the people were infected with that villainous heresy. This I speak of my own knowledge.

I believe nearly nine out of ten of the cut-throat abolitionists, the Duncan and Tappan abolitionists, are real "barn-burning" Loco-focos.

I congratulate you upon the glorious prospect before us, that our country will soon be free from the dominion of the plunderers, who have so long neglected and crushed her best interests.

Very truly, yours,  
EDWARD STANLY.

Hon. JOHN M. BOTTS, *Richmond, Va.*













































































WERT  
BOOKBINDING  
Crantville, Pa.  
MAY - JUNE 1989  
We're Quaintly Bound

