

LEWISTOWN GAZETTE

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY GEORGE FRYSSINGER, LEWISTOWN, MIFFLIN COUNTY, PA.

Whole No. 2549.

THURSDAY, MARCH 1, 1860.

New Series--Vol. XIV, No. 17.

A NEW STOCK OF Cloths, Cassimeres AND VESTINGS... WM. LIND. Lewistown, April 21, 1859.

THE MINSTREL. THE MOUNTAINEERS FAREWELL. I have come from the mountains of the old Granite State...

POLITICAL. Douglas and Popular Sovereignty. A SPEECH BY CARL SCHURZ, OF WISCONSIN. Delivered at Springfield, Mass., January 4th.

When great political or social problems, difficult to solve and impossible to put aside, are pressing upon the popular mind, it is a common thing to see a variety of theories springing up...

Of all the expedients which have been suggested for the settlement of the slavery question, Mr. Douglas' doctrine of Popular Sovereignty is certainly the most remarkable...

It is to be regretted that the success of this doctrine is in the hands of the people of the Territories, and that the struggle grows fiercer than ever...

There certainly was something in his theories that captivated the masses. I do not speak of those who joined their political fortunes to his, because they saw in him a man who might be able some day to scatter plunder and favors around him...

It is a dark mystery, a pitfall, and we may well take care not to fall into the trap of such sophistry. Why does he not speak of the admission of slavery by positive enactments? Why not even with the power of the people to exclude it by law?

fought each other before. What does the Constitution mean in regard to slavery? That question remains to be settled. What does the Nebraska bill mean? This question depends upon the settlement of the former.

Of all men, Mr. Douglas ought to be the first to know what the true intent and meaning of the Nebraska bill and the principle of popular sovereignty is. He is said to be a statesman, and it must be presumed that his measure rests upon a positive idea...

What? Slavery is the creature of local law, and yet the slaveholder has the right to take his slave property into a Territory before any local law has given him that right? A slave does not become free, when voluntarily brought by his owner upon the soil of a Territory, where no positive local law establishing slavery exists?

Mr. Douglas having been so positive, he cannot deny us the privilege of making a few logical deductions from his own premises. We expect him to proceed in the following manner: 'Since a slave is held under the laws of a State, and not under the Constitution or laws of the United States, slavery exists only by virtue of local law'

Mr. Douglas has been so positive, he cannot deny us the privilege of making a few logical deductions from his own premises. We expect him to proceed in the following manner: 'Since a slave is held under the laws of a State, and not under the Constitution or laws of the United States, slavery exists only by virtue of local law'

Mr. Douglas has been so positive, he cannot deny us the privilege of making a few logical deductions from his own premises. We expect him to proceed in the following manner: 'Since a slave is held under the laws of a State, and not under the Constitution or laws of the United States, slavery exists only by virtue of local law'

invent, the dilemma stares him in the face, (and here I put myself on his own ground,) either slavery is excluded from the territories so long as it is not admitted by a special act of territorial legislation—or if a slaveholder has the right to introduce his slave property there before such legislation is had, he can possess that right by virtue of no other but the only law existing there, the Constitution of the United States.

Which side will Mr. Douglas take? Will he be bold enough to say that slavery, being the creature of local law only, is excluded from the territories in the absence of positive law establishing it; or will he be honest enough to concede that according to his own proposition in his New Orleans speech, slavery exists in the territories by virtue of the federal Constitution?

Such is Mr. Douglas' doctrine of popular sovereignty. But after having given you Mr. Douglas' own definitions in his own words, I see you puzzled all the more, and you ask me again: 'What is it?' I will tell you what judgment will be passed upon it by future historians, who may find it worth while to describe this important attempt to dally and tittle with the logic of things.

Mr. Douglas is a statesman, (as they are all, all statesmen,) and pretends that the Constitution does not establish slavery in the territories, 'beyond the power of the people to control it by law.' What does that mean? It means that a people of a territory shall have the power, not to exclude slavery by law, for Mr. Douglas never uses that expression, but to embarrass the slaveholder in the enjoyment of his right by 'unfriendly legislation.'

Mr. Douglas has been so positive, he cannot deny us the privilege of making a few logical deductions from his own premises. We expect him to proceed in the following manner: 'Since a slave is held under the laws of a State, and not under the Constitution or laws of the United States, slavery exists only by virtue of local law'

Mr. Douglas has been so positive, he cannot deny us the privilege of making a few logical deductions from his own premises. We expect him to proceed in the following manner: 'Since a slave is held under the laws of a State, and not under the Constitution or laws of the United States, slavery exists only by virtue of local law'

Mr. Douglas has been so positive, he cannot deny us the privilege of making a few logical deductions from his own premises. We expect him to proceed in the following manner: 'Since a slave is held under the laws of a State, and not under the Constitution or laws of the United States, slavery exists only by virtue of local law'

Mr. Douglas's situation is certainly a very perplexing one. On one side he is estranged by the administration of democracy for his illogical and unconstitutional doctrine, that the legislature of a territory has control over slavery; and on the other hand, one of his nearest friends, Mr. Morris of Illinois, in his recent speech on the President's Message, denounces the doctrine that slave property may be carried into the territories, just like other property, as atrocious 'abomination.'

Mr. Douglas's situation is certainly a very perplexing one. On one side he is estranged by the administration of democracy for his illogical and unconstitutional doctrine, that the legislature of a territory has control over slavery; and on the other hand, one of his nearest friends, Mr. Morris of Illinois, in his recent speech on the President's Message, denounces the doctrine that slave property may be carried into the territories, just like other property, as atrocious 'abomination.'

Mr. Douglas's situation is certainly a very perplexing one. On one side he is estranged by the administration of democracy for his illogical and unconstitutional doctrine, that the legislature of a territory has control over slavery; and on the other hand, one of his nearest friends, Mr. Morris of Illinois, in his recent speech on the President's Message, denounces the doctrine that slave property may be carried into the territories, just like other property, as atrocious 'abomination.'

Mr. Douglas's situation is certainly a very perplexing one. On one side he is estranged by the administration of democracy for his illogical and unconstitutional doctrine, that the legislature of a territory has control over slavery; and on the other hand, one of his nearest friends, Mr. Morris of Illinois, in his recent speech on the President's Message, denounces the doctrine that slave property may be carried into the territories, just like other property, as atrocious 'abomination.'

Mr. Douglas's situation is certainly a very perplexing one. On one side he is estranged by the administration of democracy for his illogical and unconstitutional doctrine, that the legislature of a territory has control over slavery; and on the other hand, one of his nearest friends, Mr. Morris of Illinois, in his recent speech on the President's Message, denounces the doctrine that slave property may be carried into the territories, just like other property, as atrocious 'abomination.'

Mr. Douglas's situation is certainly a very perplexing one. On one side he is estranged by the administration of democracy for his illogical and unconstitutional doctrine, that the legislature of a territory has control over slavery; and on the other hand, one of his nearest friends, Mr. Morris of Illinois, in his recent speech on the President's Message, denounces the doctrine that slave property may be carried into the territories, just like other property, as atrocious 'abomination.'

Mr. Douglas's situation is certainly a very perplexing one. On one side he is estranged by the administration of democracy for his illogical and unconstitutional doctrine, that the legislature of a territory has control over slavery; and on the other hand, one of his nearest friends, Mr. Morris of Illinois, in his recent speech on the President's Message, denounces the doctrine that slave property may be carried into the territories, just like other property, as atrocious 'abomination.'

Mr. Douglas's situation is certainly a very perplexing one. On one side he is estranged by the administration of democracy for his illogical and unconstitutional doctrine, that the legislature of a territory has control over slavery; and on the other hand, one of his nearest friends, Mr. Morris of Illinois, in his recent speech on the President's Message, denounces the doctrine that slave property may be carried into the territories, just like other property, as atrocious 'abomination.'

Mr. Douglas's situation is certainly a very perplexing one. On one side he is estranged by the administration of democracy for his illogical and unconstitutional doctrine, that the legislature of a territory has control over slavery; and on the other hand, one of his nearest friends, Mr. Morris of Illinois, in his recent speech on the President's Message, denounces the doctrine that slave property may be carried into the territories, just like other property, as atrocious 'abomination.'

Mr. Douglas's situation is certainly a very perplexing one. On one side he is estranged by the administration of democracy for his illogical and unconstitutional doctrine, that the legislature of a territory has control over slavery; and on the other hand, one of his nearest friends, Mr. Morris of Illinois, in his recent speech on the President's Message, denounces the doctrine that slave property may be carried into the territories, just like other property, as atrocious 'abomination.'

Mr. Douglas's situation is certainly a very perplexing one. On one side he is estranged by the administration of democracy for his illogical and unconstitutional doctrine, that the legislature of a territory has control over slavery; and on the other hand, one of his nearest friends, Mr. Morris of Illinois, in his recent speech on the President's Message, denounces the doctrine that slave property may be carried into the territories, just like other property, as atrocious 'abomination.'

Mr. Douglas's situation is certainly a very perplexing one. On one side he is estranged by the administration of democracy for his illogical and unconstitutional doctrine, that the legislature of a territory has control over slavery; and on the other hand, one of his nearest friends, Mr. Morris of Illinois, in his recent speech on the President's Message, denounces the doctrine that slave property may be carried into the territories, just like other property, as atrocious 'abomination.'

Mr. Douglas's situation is certainly a very perplexing one. On one side he is estranged by the administration of democracy for his illogical and unconstitutional doctrine, that the legislature of a territory has control over slavery; and on the other hand, one of his nearest friends, Mr. Morris of Illinois, in his recent speech on the President's Message, denounces the doctrine that slave property may be carried into the territories, just like other property, as atrocious 'abomination.'

Mr. Douglas's situation is certainly a very perplexing one. On one side he is estranged by the administration of democracy for his illogical and unconstitutional doctrine, that the legislature of a territory has control over slavery; and on the other hand, one of his nearest friends, Mr. Morris of Illinois, in his recent speech on the President's Message, denounces the doctrine that slave property may be carried into the territories, just like other property, as atrocious 'abomination.'

New Fall and Winter Goods. F. ELLIS, of the late firm of McCoy R. & Ellis, has just returned from the city with a choice assortment of Dry Goods and Groceries...

ROBERT W. PATTON, SOUTH SIDE OF MARKET STREET, LEWISTOWN, PA. Just received and opened at his establishment a new supply of Clocks, Watches, Jewelry, SILVER PLATED WARE, Fancy Articles, &c., which he will dispose of at reasonable prices.

EDWARD FRYSSINGER, WHOLESALE DEALER & MANUFACTURER OF CIGARS, TOBACCO, SNUFF, &c., &c., LEWISTOWN, PA. Orders promptly attended to.

JNO. R. WEEKES, Justice of the Peace, Scribner & Surveyor, OFFICE West Market street, Lewistown, next door to Irwin's grocery.

DR. S. S. CUMMINGS, begs leave to announce that he has removed his office to Mrs. Mary Marks' Variety Store, on East Market street, two doors below the Union House. The Post Office has also been removed to the new place.

Wanted! Wanted! 10,000 PERSONS of both sexes to make money by buying cheap Buckets, Tubs, Buckets, Churns, Brooms, Brushes, &c., &c. at ZERBE'S.