

# 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. 2.

PICKENS COURT HOUSE, S. C., FRIDAY, JUNE 14, 1850.

NO 4

THE  
KEOWEE COURIER,  
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY  
TRIMMER & LEWIS.

W. K. EASLEY, Editor.

## 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 arrears 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 Publishers post paid.

SPEECH OF THE HON. JAMES L. ORR,  
OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

On the slavery Question, delivered in the House of Representatives, May 8, 1850.

[CONCLUDED.]

I will here digress, Mr. Chairman, to reply to a complaint which has been urged by several Northern gentlemen, charging that the South has for a series of years occupied the Federal offices. On reference to the past, it will be found to be true that the South has held a larger share of the prominent offices of the Government than those of the North. I am able to give a satisfactory reason for this fact, and to show whence it arises. When a Southern man enters into public life, he is brought in by the party to which he is attached, and he is continued in office, if he be a faithful representative, so long as his party continues in the ascendancy, or until he chooses voluntarily to retire. In the North a different rule prevails—rotation in office is the recognised system with all parties. The rule may be a correct one in offices of profit merely, but when applied to representatives, either State or Federal, the constituent can never be so well represented. Southern men remain longer in Congress; they have therefore, better opportunities for the development of their genius and talent, and their experience gives them the advantage over able men who are without experience; their services become more conspicuous, and when individuals are elected for prominent stations in the Government, they are placed there because they have more national reputation. But Northern gentlemen, whilst they have observed this fact, with some manifestations of jealousy, forget that nearly three-fourths of the public expenditures, of this Government fall into the Northern lap. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Harris) denied, for the first time, as I believe, this statement, and went into a minute examination for the purpose of showing that the South had received more than her proportionate share of those expenditures. He obtained the services of an experienced clerk in making the calculation, and he reports that in a period of ten years, out of nineteen millions for local appropriations, nine millions have been given to the South, while only ten millions have gone to the North. The clerk has committed a palpable blunder, and I wonder that he has not been guillotined here (his for his incompetency or infidelity. Only nineteen millions of dollars expended on local objects during a period of ten years! The gentleman from Illinois hurries to the census of 1840, to learn here that this appropriation gives to every white person in the North, \$1.02, and at the South \$1.90. I propose to advert to a few items only, which I suppose the clerk did not embrace in his calculations. They will show which section of the Union has foraged most liberally from the public treasury. The expenditure for pensions up to 1838 amounted in the Northern States to \$28,000,000; in the Southern States to \$7,000,000. New York contributed to the support of the revolutionary war \$7,179,853, and had received in 1838, in pensions, \$7,850,054.

The public lands donated by Congress to the Northern States have been worth \$7,584,899; the same in the South \$4,025,000. Since the establishment of the Government, the cost of collecting the customs has been \$33,000,000; \$10,000,000 expended in the North, and \$1,000,000 in the South. Bounties on packed fish, &c., in the North, exclusive of \$10,000,000. The forts on the Northern coast have cost, on each mile, \$338; on the Southern coast \$533 per mile. In 1846 there was one light-house to every

fifty miles of Northern coast; whilst in the South there was one for every two hundred and seventy-six miles. The expenditures for internal improvements from 1824 to 1833, in the North was \$5,194,441; in the South, \$957,000. From 1834 to 1845, for the same purpose, in the North, \$7,31,639; and in the South, \$1,171,500.

This much, sir, with reference to what the gentleman said about appropriations. I propose now to examine so much of the same gentleman's speech as to the relative number of troops furnished by the North and the South in the late war with Mexico. I adopt his figures, and assume them to be correct. The South furnished 47,649 volunteers; the North 24,712. The gentleman says that this is not the fair way of making the calculation—that the amount of service rendered in months is "the fairest way of making the calculation." His figures show that the South furnished service in months 365,500 months; the North 309,400. This still gives the South a preponderance. Not contented, however, with this result, he sets out upon a third of figures, that he may give the North the superiority. This calculation includes all the enlistments made during the war, as also for the ten new regiments, and assume that two thirds of these enlistments were from the North; and when his calculation is footed up, the North furnished service equal to 813,648 months, and the South equal to 627,525 months. Well, I go back to the census of 1840, and he, at least, can make no objection to the authority, having appealed to this source in the first branch of his argument. I therefore take his figures, and reply with his authority. If the South furnished 47,640 volunteers, according to population the North should have furnished 98,148. They furnished 24,712—deficit of their just proportion 73,436.

The South furnished service of volunteers in months equal to 365,500 months. The North should have furnished service in months equal to 754,620 months; they furnished 309,400—deficit of their just proportion 444,620. But if the enlistments are superadded to the above, it will be seen that the North furnished in months equal to 813,648; the South 627,625. The North should have furnished service in months 1,294,780 months—deficit of her just proportion 481,132.

I enter into these calculations for the purpose of vindicating the truth of the Southern Address—for the purpose of vindicating the truth of the allegations which have been made by Southern members on this floor, that the South contributed more than her just proportion of troops in making the acquisitions from Mexico which the North mean to exclude us from, either through the Wilmot proviso or the "non-intervention" policy. In connection with the pretence that the Mexican laws are in force. He went a little further, and introduced an estimate of the service by the North and South in the Revolutionary war. He says, for the continental line of the Revolution, the North furnished 172,436 men, and the South 59,335.

It is known, Mr. Chairman, to every one who is familiar with the history of the Revolution that a very large proportion of the troops that were engaged in that protracted and perilous contest were not connected with the continental army. If the gentleman had made an accurate examination of the number of troops furnished by each of the States, he would have found that Virginia alone furnished 56,721. Pennsylvania, with a population equal to Virginia, furnished 34,995; New York 29,836; South Carolina 31,131. South Carolina sent thirty-seven out of every forty-two of her citizens capable of bearing arms, Massachusetts thirty-two, Connecticut thirty, New Hampshire eighteen.

I will answer with statistical facts the delusion existing in the minds of some who believe that the pecuniary and social condition is more elevated in the North than in the South. We have heard that Virginia was sinking—was falling fast into decay; that her sisters had advanced in prosperity and wealth whilst she has been retrograding—all of which is attributed to her system of domestic servitude. Why, sir, this is but an assumption—a most unwarrantable assumption because it has no foundation in fact. The abolitionists make their proselytes believe that Virginia is in a most dilapidated state—that her forests have all been destroyed—the face of her fields furrowed in deep gullies—and that her low grounds have been exhausted by unskillful husbandry. Virginia has more wealth according to population than any one of the Northern States. The average wealth of each inhabitant, free and slave, is \$171; of free alone, \$741. In

Kentucky the average wealth of each inhabitant, free and slave, is \$319; whilst that of Ohio is but \$227; Pennsylvania \$219; New York \$228. And, sir, the productions of the slaveholding States will compare favorably with the non-slaveholding. The advantage will be found to be largely on the side of the former in the value of those productions. The South produces more Indian corn, and the North more wheat; but the South has a complete monopoly, by soil and climate, in the production of cotton, sugar, rice and tobacco.

The value of these four crops the last year exceeds \$125,000,000. But compare the productions of individual States. Michigan and Arkansas were admitted into the Union about the same time; Michigan is one of the most flourishing of the northwestern States, washed on three sides by navigable waters, and enjoying an extensive system of internal improvements; and her crops last year yielded to each inhabitant \$21.50. The crop of Arkansas yielded to each white inhabitant \$101; and if the slaves are counted as persons, the value of the crop was \$81.50 for each inhabitant; so that the production of Arkansas, with a fertile soil, though not a genial climate, nearly trebles that of Michigan.

London yesterday was in a state of the most feverish excitement. It was known on Thursday that the French ambassador, M. Drouyn de L'Huys, had left the British metropolis for Paris, on a day of all others when the courtesies of diplomacy were most strictly observed—namely, the anniversary of the Queen's birthday; and it was also known by the papers of the following morning that the Russian ambassador was absent from the dinner party which Lord Palmerston gave to the ambassadors in honor of the event. These two circumstances combined produced in political circles some uneasiness, in consequence of the turn which it was feared the Greek dispute had taken. Explanations in both houses of Parliament were accordingly sought for and given by Lord Lansdowne in the Lords, and Lord Palmerston in the Commons. The former described the recall of the French ambassador as 'an event of importance,' but he subsequently denied that it was of 'grave importance,' and intimated that the French government required his presence in the National Assembly, to give such explanation as the case required. Lord Palmerston, judging from the few sentences which fell from him, seems to have treated the affair less seriously. 'I trust,' said the Noble Viscount, 'that nothing can arise out of these circumstances likely to disturb the friendly relations between England and France.'

The Times of yesterday, which evinces the same fondness for the Foreign Secretary that a nameless personage does for holy water, showed in a leading article that matters were far more alarmingly entangled than the 'explanations' of the previous night would induce the public to suppose. It is needless to inquire from whom the Times derives its information, but it is evident that the Foreign Office is infested with traitors, and it seems to us most discreditable that a paper which wears the ministerial livery, and is literally, in all other respects, the organ of the ministry, should, in its anxiety to stab a member of that ministry, who is obnoxious in its eyes, carry its vindictiveness to an extent which is really calculated to embarrass the relations between the two countries. The funds, which are always the test of public feeling on these occasions, experienced a decided shock. Consols which stood the previous evening at 96 1/8, immediately declined, but they subsequently rallied, and closed at 95 to 95 1/8.

The explanation which Lord John Russell gave last night, in the House of Commons, does not throw much light on the matter; but as far it goes, it exhibits the soreness which the French government feels at what is evidently regarded as our cavalier treatment of its representative, the Baron de Gros, at Athens. Lord John stated that this would have been fully and satisfactorily cleared up if the Baron had remained at Athens three days longer. It is also clear, from the admission somewhat reluctantly wrung from the prime minister, that if Lord Palmerston had not in his possession at the time he gave his explanation the previous evening the letter from the French Secretary for Foreign Affairs, recalling M. Drouyn de L'Huys from London to Paris, and assigning as a reason the insult put upon the French government arising out of the Greek dispute, that the letter

of recall had been nevertheless read to him. It would be too much to say that the explanation of Lord Palmerston the previous night was disingenuous, for official explanations of the kind are often very enigmatical; but certainly the cool and composed manner in which he treated the subject showed either that he thought the affair would blow over, or that his own nerves were not easily shaken. An accomplished diplomatist requires the boldness of the lion and the cunning of the fox. Has Lord Palmerston both, or only one of these qualities?

The worst feature of this ugly business relates to the proceedings of the National Assembly on Thursday, where the announcement by the Foreign Secretary, that he had recalled M. Drouyn de L'Huys because of the insult England had put upon France, produced the greatest possible excitement and delight, followed by cries of 'bravo!' and the clapping of hands, and other demonstrations which showed how palatable the act was to the National Assembly. In this unseemly manifestation, the leading men of all parties in the Assembly are said to have joined. It is difficult to say, in the present position of Louis Napoleon, what part his necessities may compel him to act. The question will be speedily and amicably settled if the vindication of French honor be his object. But if ulterior ends are to be attempted, a quarrel arising out of circumstances in themselves so trivial, may lead to results which are fearful to contemplate. We await the issue with hope, and without fear.—Wilmer and Smith's Times, May 18.

A THIRD PARTY.—Major Noah whose political sagacity and ripened experience render his suggestions and predictions very valuable, seems to think that the old basis of parties cannot continue hereafter even in the event of a settlement of the vexed question now agitating Congress and the country.—Telegraph.

He thinks that a third or Constitutional party, will be formed on the ruins of the former organizations, which have done their work and had their day. At the close of one of his recent editorials, the veteran thus speculates: "The speeches of Mr. Calhoun, Mr. Clay, and Mr. Webster, on slavery, were merely arguments in favor of right on the one hand, and grounds of settlement on the other. There was room for patriotic appeals, for solemn warning, for just admonitions, but the principle involved was but slightly referred to; and when a settlement was proposed which looked as if both sides were amply protected, it gave satisfaction to neither. The South wants a different arrangement, which the North will not consent to. We must, therefore, look for no extraordinary demonstration of Parliamentary ability while this local question is pressing like an incubus upon us.

Another view of this subject presents itself. Suppose the whole question is settled, apparently to the satisfaction of both sides, can parties settle down in harmony upon their old platforms, and sustain their former lines of Division? We think not. A high tariff, a national bank, a distribution of the public lands, and several subjects which have heretofore divided parties, cannot again attain any leading ascendancy. The struggle, under whatever name it may be carried on, will be a struggle for power for place, for position. The old ground of principle cannot be again occupied, beyond the support of our national institutions, in which support no difference of opinion exists: If we settle the Slavery question, the wounds of the South are cicatrized not healed.

No Southern man will ever vote for a freesoil man, abolitionist, or Wilmot proviso man. Their own position, and rights will always be paramount to party usages. They may not insist on a Southern man for President; but they will vote for no man that has ever been hostile to the South. In the North the fires of abolition will still burn, fanaticism will fan the embers, and political apostasy will provide the fuel.

Under such a political state of things we cannot see how the creation of a third or constitutional party is to be avoided. A large portion of the whigs and whig press of the North still cling to abolition, and many leading democrats of the Northern and Eastern States are tainted with the same doctrines.

The whigs of the South have been driven from the ranks of their brethren in the North on the slavery question, and they never again will cordially assimilate. The South, if not too ultra in the settlement of the pending difficulties, will hereafter vote together in a solid body, and two-thirds of the Northern democra-

ty will join them in the formation of this new constitutional party, presenting, as we think, a democratic constitutional party, the elements of which will be strength and success. We shall then hear of no more discussion on slavery in Congress.

Late and Important from Buenos Ayres.—A letter from Buenos Ayres, dated April 13th, confirms the account that the English forces have abandoned the blockade of the ports, accompanying the act with an acknowledgement that they were wrong. They have also given up all the vessels captured by them during the blockade, and to pay for all the property they took.

A French Admiral has just arrived at Buenos Ayres, who was said to be fully empowered to settle all the difficulties so far as the French were concerned. The markets were dull.

Singular Scene—Royal Actors.—A singular scene is represented to have occurred at the Royal Palace at Madrid, which show how a hen-pecked husband is usually treated, whether of royal or simple blood. The King had been for several days pressing his royal consort in the most earnest manner to free herself from, as he termed it, the "slavish subjection" in which she was kept by her ministers. The Queen resisted, and sent for General Narvaez. A scene of some violence is said to have taken place between the three, in which the King declared that on the day of Her Majesty's accouchement he should quit the Spanish territory, and publish to the nation a manifesto, explaining his reasons for not choosing to be present at the birth of the royal infant. Divesting the business of all courtly form, and speaking plainly, the King denied the legitimacy of the forthcoming scion of Spanish royalty. In this emergency a council of ministers was held, and it was decided, in order to save the Queen's honor, that the King should be prevented from quitting the palace. His Majesty was, therefore, placed under arrest. Sentries were placed at the door of his apartment, and he remained a prisoner for four hours, when he capitulated, and consented to ride out with the Queen in an open carriage in the evening. The conduct of this imbecile man is attributed to the intrigues of the Carlists, who not only wish to overthrow the present ministry, but to cast doubts and impediments in the way of the succession to the crown of the issue of Queen Isabella. The crisis is considered to be over for the present.

The Census Law for 1850.—This law has been published, and it is very comprehensive. The information which it proposes to embrace includes population, profession, color, occupation, place of birth, number of marriages, deaths, the persons who can read and write, deaf, dumb, blind, insane, fugitives and manumitted, the acres of land improved and unimproved, the cash value of each farm, the value of farming implements and machinery, the live stock, the produce during the year, ending June 1, 1850, and the quantity of each particular article; the products of industry and the values; names of towns, counties and cities; the aggregate valuation of real and personal estate, the amount of taxes assessed, the number and character of the public schools, the extent of public libraries; the number class, and circulation of the periodicals and newspapers; the number of criminals; the cost of labor, the average price of board to a laboring man per week, the average wages of female domestic per week, the average payment of a carpenter per day, the average wages of a day laborer, the average wages of a farm hand, the number and value of the churches, and indeed every species of social statistics which can make those tables valuable as sources of public information and reference.

A TRUE LAWYER.—Alexander Hamilton was once applied to as counsel by a man having the guardianship of several orphans, who would, on coming of age, succeed to a large and valuable estate, of which there a material defect in the title deeds, known only to their guardian, who wanted to get the title vested in himself. Hamilton noted down the faithless executor's statement, and then said to him: 'Settle with these unhappy infants honorably to the last cent, or I will hunt you from your skin like a hair.' The advice was strictly followed.

LITERARY.—Miss Fennimore Cooper, daughter of the celebrated novelist of that name, is about publishing in London a new work entitled 'Rural Hours in the United States.'

I am indebted to the author of a pamphlet entitled "The Union, past and future—how it works, and how to save it," for many of these statistics.