

REMARKS OF MR. WARREN, OF BRAFORT,

Upon the Resolutions of the Majority of the Joint Select Committee in relation to the suspension of the writ of Habeas Corpus, in the Senate of North Carolina, Wednesday, May 25, 1864.

MR. SPEAKER: I feel great embarrassment in taking to discuss the subject of these resolutions before this body. It has been fully discussed by some of the ablest statesmen and lawyers in the country, and their arguments are before me. I can scarcely hope to present the question in new light, yet, as the organ of the committee I call upon, as far as I may be able, to indicate and sustain the resolutions.

I feel embarrassed also because of the great divide of debate in which the Senator from New Hanover (Mr. Hall) has thought proper to indulge. He has circumnavigated the globe in search of topics which he chooses to say are germane to the subject. He has regretted the introduction of the resolutions because, in his opinion, they have a tendency to revive party feeling and distract and divide us, and has referred to the condition of parties in this State at the beginning of this revolution. He has also discussed the subject of slavery, the Wilmot Proviso and the manifold encroachments of the North upon the South, and has not omitted the question of the genealogy of different portions of the American people, and the comparative purity of Northern and Southern blood. I should be glad to know what any or all of these things have to do with the subject before us? They belong in no way to this occasion, and I will only say in general terms, that if any party feeling shall be aroused here, the Senator is responsible for it. He has, in the very beginning of the debate, uttered the rallying cry of party, and in the course of a long speech has only briefly touched the propositions we are considering. But I shall not follow him in his rambles. The resolutions involve nothing but dry questions of constitutional law and the question of the necessity for the suspension of the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus, and to these I shall confine myself.

Upon the question of the necessity for the act of Congress I shall say but little. The reasons which induced Congress to pass the act were communicated to that body in secret session. We do not know what they were. The Vice President (Mr. Stephens) intimated that the law was intended mainly to operate upon N. C. Carolina, and we have much reason to believe this to be true, from what we have learned of an interview between the President and the North Carolina delegation in Congress, near the close of the last session. There is reason to believe it also had the avowal of the Senator from New Hanover, who uses the Governor as authority, that there is wide spread disaffection in this State; although the Governor simply says that there is some disaffection here, but only to Mr. Davis' administration. And it is stated by a member of Congress, that Mr. Baldwin, of Virginia, recently declared that four reasons were assigned at the time, for passing the act. First, because (as he said) negro testimony could not be used against treasonable persons; second, that it was to prevent the assembling of a Convention in North Carolina; third, that when a man was condemned there might be no chance for him to get out of the army; fourth, to prevent the discharge of persons arrested as spies. The first is too absurd to comment; but it will be observed that the only one of these reasons applies particularly to North Carolina, and if the blow was aimed especially at her, it struck also Mississippi and Georgia, both of which States have passed resolutions condemning the legislation of Congress. They tell us, I trust we feel, that it strikes at the civil liberties of all the people of the Confederacy. But whatever may have been the reasons given by the President for the suspension, it is fair to presume they were general, in favor of some cause, of particular, in favor of the present act—the desire to show the necessity for suspending the writ according to the constitution, not the necessity for unconstitutional enactment. And at all events it failed to satisfy any of our present representatives in Congress, except Mr. Gaither.

The act is a most extraordinary one. It would seem from the preamble that we are to be treated to a little constitutional legislation. Congress has power to suspend the privilege of the writ "when in cases of rebellion or invasion, the public safety may require it;" and Congress is the sole judge of the occasion for exercising the power. There is an invasion; Congress has decided that the suspension is necessary for the public safety; and Congress has itself suspended the writ without undertaking to delegate authority to do so. All this the preamble very carefully recites together with the fact that the President requested the passage of the act. Now, sir, the Senator from New Hanover says in his minority report: "Nor does he accept as true, facts stated in the resolutions. He denies the repeated and manifest infractions of the constitution by the Congress of the Confederate States, and has yet to be pointed to a single instance." Yet it so happens that Congress, on two occasions, passed acts by which they expressly delegated to the President the authority to suspend the writ whenever in his judgment the same might be necessary. There have been, then, "repeated and manifest infractions," and it is significant that the preamble of this act contains a clear declaration that the two previous acts of the same Congress on the same subject were unconstitutional. A death-bed repentance is better than none; and it is a peculiar consolation to know that in one of the latest acts of its existence, Congress seemed to have had "compunctions visiting," and to be inclined for a moment to regard the obligations of the constitution.

The preamble is carefully drawn, and so far as it asserts a strict constitutional principle, is to be admitted. It is shrewdly drawn also, and was probably intended to convey the proper idea, that the entire government, so far as it has yet been organized, concurred in the necessity for the act. It is plainly to be inferred, however, that Congress saw the exigency with the President's eyes.

Now, sir, with respect to the act, it is, in its general import, an abiding declaration that here are, among the citizens of the Confederate States, traitors, conspirators, plotting to overthrow the government, to defeat its military operations, to assist the enemy, and even to excite servile insurrections, spies, emissaries of the enemy and others, and that these traitors are too numerous or too formidable to be dealt with in the ordinary way by the civil tribunals. I will not dwell on the intense flattery of the patriotic and unflinching of the people. The composition is aggregated, that be possible, by the fact that everybody is now entitled to consider himself "suspected or being suspicious," since Congress has locked up in its

own breast those "conditions of public danger" which were made known to it by the President—not foreseen. By itself and when made the act "a measure proper for the public defence."

But the fault of constitutional legislation, promised in the preamble, turns to bitter ashes in the act. The constitution declares: "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated; and no warrants shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the places to be searched, or the persons or things to be seized." Again: "No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service, in time of war or public danger; nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law." Now the act only requires an "order" of the President, or of the Secretary of War or General commanding the Trans-Mississippi Department, acting under his authority, for the arrest of any citizen of the country. There is no responsible accuser, no oath, no warrant. Upon the bare suggestion of any of the enumerated offences, the person arrested is imprisoned for an indefinite period; and although by the well settled law of the land, the State courts have concurrent jurisdiction with the Confederate courts in cases of unlawful imprisonment by Confederate authority, no State can protect its own citizen by its own writ. It is sufficient to say that the "orders" or *lettres de cachet* of the President are not "due process of law" under an American constitution.

"To make imprisonment lawful it must either be by process from the courts of judicature, or by warrant from some legal officer having authority to commit to prison; which warrant must be in writing, under the hand and seal of the magistrate, and express the cause of the commitment, in order to be examined into, if necessary, upon a habeas corpus. If there be no cause expressed, the gaoler is not bound to detain the prisoner; for the law judges in this respect, saith Sir Edward Coke, like F. St. John, Governor, "that it is unreasonable to send a prisoner, and not to signify with the crimes whereof he is accused to be suspended," &c.

This is what was understood to be "due process of law" in England and in America at the time of the adoption of the federal constitution, and the phrase is used with this meaning in that instrument. So the act does not stop at a suspension of the writ, the object of which is to keep a party in custody, but it also leaves the *etiam propter processum* without which a criminal proceeding without which a criminal proceeding cannot be made.

Mr. Brown of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and the Senator said the House of Representatives did all most unanimously reject it.

Mr. Brown, of Caswell, with leave, stated that it was then declared that the act of 1807 proposed to substitute the writ of President Jefferson for the law of the land, and