

KEOWEE COURIER.

"—TO THINE OWN SELF BE TRUE, AND IT MUST FOLLOW, AS THE NIGHT THE DAY, THOU CANST NOT THEN BE FALSE TO ANY MAN."

VOL. 1.

PICKENS COURT HOUSE, S. C., FRIDAY, MARCH 22, 1850.

NO 44

THE KEOWEE COURIER,

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY
W. H. TRIMMIE.

J. W. NORRIS, JR., } Editors.
E. M. KEITH. }

TERMS.

One Dollar and Fifty Cents for one year's subscription when paid within three months. Two dollars if payment is delayed to the close of the subscription year.

All subscriptions not clearly limited, will be considered as made for an indefinite time, and continued till a discontinuance is ordered and all arrearages paid.

Advertisements inserted at 75 cents per square for the first insertion, and 37 1/2 cts. for each continued insertion. Liberal deductions made to those advertising by the year.

All Communications should be addressed to the Publisher post paid.

WASHINGTON, March 7, 1850.

SENATE.

COMPROMISE RESOLUTIONS.

Mr. Walker said he knew the immense audience present was not assembled to hear him, and he knew that there was but one man whom they expected to hear. Whatever rights he had to the floor, he willingly conceded them to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. Webster said that he felt himself under deep obligations to the Senators from Wisconsin (Walker) and New York (Seward) for their courtesy, in allowing him to address the Senate to-day. He wished to speak to-day, not as a Senator from Massachusetts, nor as a Northern man, but as an American, and as a member of the American Senate. He thought it was fortunate for the country that there was a Senate—that there was a body which had not yet been moved from its propriety—not yet lost to a just sense of their own dignity and high self-respect—a body to which the country looked with confidence for wise and patriotic action.

It was not to be denied that we live in the midst of strong agitation, and of considerable danger to the institutions of our Government. The imprisoned winds have been let loose from the North, the East, the West, and the stormy South, and they tossing the ocean billows to the skies, and expose to our gaze its profoundest depths. He did not feel that he was the suitable person to take the helm in this storm, nor had he the skill to combat the elements. But he had a duty to perform—not a duty for his own security or safety, nor to look for fragment on which to float from the wreck if wreck should ensue—but a duty to perform to the whole country, and for the good of the whole country. There was that which should keep him to his duty during the struggle and the storm, whether the sun or the stars shall or shall not appear for several days: It was the preservation of the Union. He spoke to-day for the preservation of the Union. Hear me for my cause.

He spoke to-day for the American heart; for the preservation of peace, concord, harmony and fraternal feeling, which are what renders this Union so dear to all. Believe me for mine honor. These were the sole motives which governed him in giving his opinions to the Senate and the country.

It might not be amiss to recur briefly to the events, equally sad and extraordinary, which have brought the political condition of the country to its present state.

In May, 1846, war was declared with Mexico. The American troops crossed the line of the enemy's territory, invaded her provinces, and finally took possession of her capital. The marine force of the United States took possession of all her ports on the Atlantic and Pacific. In less than two years from the commencement of the war, a treaty was made, by which Mexico ceded to the United States the territories on the Pacific. It so happened that, in consequence of the distracted and feeble state of Mexico before it was known in California, the people there under the supposed lead of American officers, had overthrown the provincial government, and run up an independent flag. When the news of the existence of the war reached there, the independent flag was torn down, and the stars and stripes hoisted in its stead. Before the war was over, our forces had possession of San Francisco, and a great rush of emigrants from all parts, took place to California. In January, 1848, the Mormons discovered an extraordinarily rich mine or quantity of gold at the lower part of the American branch of the Sacramento. This was kept secret for some time; but eventually it became known. Not long after this, gold was discovered in a higher branch of the Sacramento river. The

fame of this new discovery was spread abroad, and population crowded into the country by flocks. This all took place in the winter of '48. The digging did not commence till the spring of '48, and since then gold-digging has been prosecuted with a success hitherto unknown. All know how incredulous the American public were at first; but all know how rapidly, from that time to the present, assurances of the existence of these almost inexhaustible mines of gold have come upon us.

It was known also, that it became highly proper to provide a suitable Territorial Government for these people; but owing to differences existing in the Legislature, no such government was established at the last session.

Under these circumstances, the people inhabiting the country, under a proclamation issued by Gen. Riley, elected a convention, which framed a Constitution; that Constitution has been ratified; a State Legislature has been chosen, and Senators and Representatives have been sent here, who bring with them an authentic copy of the Constitution, and ask for their State admission into the Union.

This Constitution contains an express prohibition of slavery in California. It is said, and he supposed truly, that in the Convention which formed this Constitution, there were thirty members who formerly resided in the slave States, and fifty who had not.

[The noise in the passages leading to the galleries and the Senate floor was here so great that Mr. W. had to pause for several minutes till order was restored.]

It could not be denied that it was this circumstance—the prohibition of slavery—which has contributed to raise the dispute about the propriety of admitting California as a State.

It could not be said now—whatever might have been given at first as a reason for the war with Mexico—that it was not prosecuted for the acquisition of Territory. It was argued that the only proper mode of obtaining indemnity for the expenses of the war was to take Territory. And as the acquisitions all laid south of the United States, and in warm climates, it was naturally expected by the South, all acquisitions of territory in that region would be added to the slaveholding States. Events have not turned out to be so; their expectations have not been realized; and hence their discontent. And now that question, slavery, which has so often alarmed the wise and good men of the country, comes upon us for fresh discussion.

He said he would review historically the question of slavery, partly because its character and the mode of discussing it have been the cause of great alienation of kind and friendly feelings.

Slavery existed in all ages of the world. It existed among the oriental nations. It existed among the Jews, and the theocratic government of that people made no charge of injustice against it. Slavery existed among the Greeks, and the philosophy of that people found the same excuse for it as is set up in this country by its defenders and advocates. They justified slavery on the ground of the inferiority of the African, compared with the white race. They did not undertake to show, by close logic, that the right consisted in the power of the strong over the weak, but placed it on the ground of the inferiority of the negro race.

The more manly jurisprudence of the Romans justified it on one other ground. From the earliest jurisprudence down to the fall of the empire, it was held that slavery was against natural law, but justified on the law of nations then recognized; they argued by that law captives taken in war might be held till ransomed; or they might, in exchange for death, voluntarily become slaves; that their condition as slaves descended to their posterity. They also held that a man might voluntarily sell himself to another, as a slave, for debt; and thirdly, that persons could be made slaves of for crimes.

At the introduction of Christianity the Roman world was full of slaves; and no injunction against that condition of man was found in the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ, or of any of the apostles. The object of instituting, of founding Christianity, was to touch the heart and improve the mind of man. Its object was to operate on the individual heart and mind of man.

Now, on the general nature and character of slavery there was a wide difference of opinion between the Northern and the southern portions of the country.

On the one side, at the North, it was held, even in the absence of injustice, to be a right founded in power and might over feebleness, and slavery is held not to be in accordance with the meek spirit of the Gospel. These are sentiments cherished recently with augmented force

by the people of the Northern States, and it has taken hold of, and pervades their religious feelings.

The South, on the other side, treating their slaves with the utmost kindness and consideration, have been taught with the Greeks to look upon the African as an inferior creature, whose natural state is of bondage. There are, at the south, thousands of men who, having consciences as tender and as upright as any at the north, cannot take the northern view of this subject. There are others who look upon things as they are, and without inquiring further, declare, conscientiously, that they have neither the responsibility nor the power to clear themselves of the institution.

The Senator from South Carolina, (Mr. Calhoun,) the other day alluded to the separation of the Methodist Episcopal Church. This separation took place on this subject of slavery. He had examined the subject, had looked at the separation with anxiety, for he looked upon that denomination as one of the great props of religion and morality of the whole people; he had read all the arguments on both sides, but never had been able to see any good cause for the separation, nor that any good could result from it.

When question of this kind take hold of the religious mind, and creep into religious assemblages, they must lead to excitement. All history shows that religious disputes led to war. Upon all such subjects and in all such controversies, men think themselves absolutely right, and all others differing from them as absolutely wrong, and mark out a strong line between what they think right and what they think wrong. There are men who cannot see that in too hotly pursuing one truth they are apt to fall into many errors. They are disposed to mount this one duty as a war horse, and ride upon it over all others. They deal with morals as with mathematics; and think that morals are as easily demonstrated as an algebraical proposition. They think that if in their perspicacious vision they beheld a spot upon the sun, the sun should be stricken down; they would prefer to be in total darkness rather than receive light from an imperfect orb. Others there are who are too impatient for the slow progress of moral effects. They forget that the truths and the miracles of Jesus Christ were preached, and yet how few were converted; and they forget also, that even in christian lands how frequently are vices and crimes—and that between nations professing Christianity, how wars, unjust wars are waged.

In all this lies a cause of the great dissensions and exasperations existing amongst us.

Slavery does exist in the U States, and did exist in the States before and at the time of the adoption of the Constitution. He proposed to show what was the state of public sentiment in relation to it, at the North and at the South, at that time, and what the great and wise men of all parties of the country thought of it in 1847. At that time there was no great diversity of opinion, and it will be found that both parties—South and North—held slavery to be a great moral and political evil. Not much, though some inductive against it as a cruel condition, was uttered; but the great objection was, it being a political evil, as taking the place of free labor; as a labor which was less strong and less productive. All held it to be an evil, and ascribed it justly to the evil policy of the mother country, who entailed it on the colonies. Eminent men held it to be a blight, a mildew, a scourge, a curse; and the North was not then so excited against it as the South.

This was the light in which the Convention which formed the Constitution held it. The question then was, how to deal with the evil. They thought slavery could not continue if the prohibited the importation. Hence a limit to importation of slaves was proposed. Twenty years was proposed by a Northern man. Southern gentlemen opposed it as being too long. Mr. Madison was warm in opposing it as too long.

The term "slavery," nor "fugitive slaves," is not used in the Constitution. "Persons bound to servitude," is the term used. Mr. Madison said the word was not recognized by the Constitution.

The Convention met in Philadelphia, and sat from May to September, 1787. Congress was, during the whole time in session at New York. All the great men of the country were in either one or the other body. A few perhaps held seats in both.

It was in the summer of 1787, and while the Convention was framing the Constitution, that Congress was framing the ordinance of '87. There was a perfect concurrence between the two bodies.

The ordinance applied to all the Territory then belonging to the U. States, being that northwest of the river Ohio.

Virginia had a few years previously ceded to the U. States all this Territory. It was a magnanimous act. It was one of the fairest claims of Virginia to our respect and gratitude, and only second to that other claim, that from her counsels and from her statesmen first emanated the idea of forming a general Constitution.

This ordinance was in full operation when the Constitution was adopted and the Government put in operation in 1789.

It was clear as an historical truth, that at the framing of the Constitution it was the general expectation that upon the ceasing of importation of slaves, slavery in the country would begin to run out. It was also an historical truth that so far as power existed in the Congress to prohibit the spread of slavery in the United States, that power was exercised to the fullest extent.

The Senator from South Carolina had said that this ordinance was the first of the series of deprivations of the privileges and equalities of the South, but that it was done by the Confederation. It was the act of the Confederation, but was done with the concurrence of the whole South. The ordinance was adopted by an unanimous vote of the Southern States, and the only vote against it was a Northern one. Here he might pause and reflect on the perfect accord in the opinion of the North and South on this subject at that time.

But opinion had changed both of the North and the South. Slavery was not now considered at the South as an evil. Soon after these events, a change in opinion began and a severance of opinion showed itself—the North going more strong and warm against slavery; the South more strong and warm in favor of it. What has been the cause of the change in the opinion of the South—a change which has given slavery a new nomenclature? It is now an institution, and not a scourge, as it was formerly. It is now the cause of the rapid growth of the cotton planting interest. It was this gave the desire to increase the slave labor, and to spread it.

In 1790-'91, the exports of cotton were not more, annually, than forty or fifty thousand dollars; now, perhaps, it is a hundred millions a year. At that time there was more wax, indigo and rice raised than cotton. It was not believed in England that any cotton was raised; and Mr. Jefferson says, that after the treaty by which American produce was allowed to be carried to England in American vessels, a vessel loaded with cotton was denied permission to land by the officers of the custom house; they declaring that cotton was not raised in this country.

They know better now. The age of cotton has been a golden age to the South. It has excited a desire which has grown on what it fed upon, and soon it became the rage for new areas of Territory to raise cotton.

In 1802, Alabama was added to the Confederacy. In 1803, Louisiana, including what now composes the slave States of Missouri and Arkansas. In 1819, Florida was purchased, and here was more slaveholding Territory.

The Senator from South Carolina said that he had seen in the policy of the Government, in the mode of regulating the revenue, causes for the more rapid growth of the North. This may be so. But if any operation of government can be shown to increase the population and growth of the North, it can be nothing to the operations of the government to promote slave territory. It was not the operations of time that brought in Florida and Louisiana, but the acts of man. And among these acts of man might be included the annexation of Texas in 1845. This last closed the chapter and settled the account, for the annexation of Texas by the resolutions adopted did not leave one acre of land that was not settled as slave territory. By those resolutions it was guaranteed by law.

There was not a foot of land in the U. States the character of which, as far as slavery or Free Soil was concerned, which was not settled firmly by high and irrevocable laws. At the time of the annexation of Texas, the Senator from S. Carolina was at the head of the State Department; there was then in the Senate a gentleman remarkable for his activity and adroitness, who has since been Secretary of the Treasury, (Mr. Walker,) and between them both they had settled the character of the Territory of Texas for all time. It was neatly done—a close piece of joiner's work.

Mr. W. read that part of the resolutions of annexation of Texas particularly referring to new slave States to be marked out of her territory with her consent, and

making this a part of the compact.

He said that by these resolutions it was solemnly secured that out of the territory of Texas new States to the number of four may be formed, those South of 36 30 to be slave States, those North to be free. No act of Congress can add strength to this guaranty. Texas accepts the terms and comes in upon them. He saw no way in which the Government can release itself from this obligation.—Slavery was fixed there by positive guaranty.

The resolutions provide that free States can be formed north of 36 30; but the consent of Texas is required. How could such a compact be formed if the North had the overshadowing power which the Senator from South Carolina says it has had?

In the House of Representatives these resolutions were adopted by eighty Southern and fifty Northern votes. In the Senate, by a vote of twenty-seven to twenty-five. Of this twenty-seven, thirteen were from States—four were from New England. Nearly one-half of the vote was Free Soil votes. He knew nothing so remarkably in history as this affair. This Territory of Texas—over which a bird could not fly in a week—annexed, and positively guaranteed to be slave Territory, and three-fourths of the liberty-loving members of the House from Connecticut, and one-half in Senate, voted for it. One vote was given it from Maine, one from Massachusetts. These men called themselves the Northern Democracy. They went for the acquisition of Territory, they went for the introduction of a new world, and after its introduction they propose to apply to it the saving grace of the Wilmot Proviso.

Two senators one from Connecticut and one from New York—voted for the resolutions of annexation, with their eyes wide open to the fact that the then Secretary of State had openly and with manliness advocated its annexation because of its being slave territory. With the aid of Abolitionists here, was endeavoring to abolish slavery in Texas. It was on this ground he advocated its annexation.

Mr. Webster said it was near the same thing. Those two senators who had voted to annex Texas—who had voted for acquiring new territory—have gone home to lead the great Free-soil party. They had left to the Senate the odium of voting to carry into effect the guaranty to admit new slave States, or the greater odium to vote to violate that guaranty, while they have gone home and are now engaged in making flaming Free-soil speeches.

Mr. W. then gave a history of his course on the subject of the annexation of Texas, and on the principles of the Wilmot Proviso, showing that, from the year 1836, he had uniformly opposed the former and sustained the latter; reading from speeches delivered on these subjects. He had voted against the bill to consummate the annexation of Texas. He had been always opposed to the annexation, accession, or acquisition of territory, north or south; he always adopted the Spartan maxim: "Improve, adorn what you have, seek no further."

But, in the present state of affairs, he could see no other mode of proceeding, than to carry out the guaranties of the Texas annexation resolutions, whenever the proper time comes. He may not be there, but he wished it to be understood, that this Government is bound to admit new States out of Texas territory; and out of the territory south of 36 30; admit them as slave States. That was the meaning of the compact made by the Northern Democracy. He would carry it out.

In his opinion slavery could not exist in California and New Mexico, at least as it exists in this country. It was impossible to carry slavery there as it was to do any other natural impossibility. Mr. W. described the soil and character of the country, and held that no slaveholder would carry his slaves to such a country. It was a fixed fact that California and New Mexico were destined to be free, and that too by the arrangement of things by the power above. If a law was now before the Senate providing a territorial government for New Mexico he would vote for no prohibition of slavery. He would make no effort to carry out, by law, an ordinance of nature, or to re-enact the will of God. He would not vote for it in such a case, because it was wounding to the feelings of Southern gentlemen, who hold opinions that they are theoretically at least allowed to carry their slaves there.

He would treat the Wilmot Proviso, so far as New Mexico was concerned, as Mr. Polk did it with regard to Oregon, that is as a nugatory act, and in that case