



The Independent Republican

CIRCULATION, 2136

C. F. READ & H. H. PRAZIER, EDITORS

F. E. LOOMIS, CORRESPONDING EDITOR

MONTROSE, SUSQ. CO., PA.

Thursday, January 27, 1859.

Notice.—Mr. E. W. FAZIER is our traveling agent, authorized to receive subscriptions, advertisements, &c., and to collect moneys for the Independent Republican.

As the Independent Republican has now a much larger circulation than both the other papers published in Susquehanna county, other papers will receive the greater benefit to be derived from advertising in this paper.

We are indebted to our Representative, S. B. Chase, for a copy of the Pennsylvania Legislative Manual, and for other favors.

A pair of horses belonging to Mr. Orison Foster, of Brigewater, took fright and ran away in Montrose, during the fire last Thursday night. One of them was so much injured that he has since died.

The attention of our readers is called to the new advertisement of the Susquehanna County Normal School, which appears in our columns this week. The school continues to prosper under the energetic and skillful management of Professor Stoddard, by whom it was originated.

We find little of interest in the proceedings of the Pennsylvania Legislature during the past week, and do not think best to fill our columns with unimportant details. We shall endeavor to keep our readers informed of all important movements both in State and National affairs.

The donations made to Elder Boomer last week, amounted to \$210, which we believe is the largest donation ever given to any clergyman in Montrose.

We observe that our friend, Theodore Smith, has sold the Scranton Republican to F. A. McCarty, Esq. The new editor is said to be talented and accomplished; and Mr. Smith states in his valedictory that the paper is to be a good deal enlarged and improved. It can hardly be gotten up more neatly than it has been, or made more interesting and valuable without an increase of size.

We wish the new editor a prosperous career, and friend Smith ditto—where'er his lot be cast.

The Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs have voted to report Mr. Sidel's "thirty millions for Cuba" bill.

The cry of "fire" is becoming alarmingly frequent in Montrose. On Thursday evening last, at about half past ten, a small barn belonging to Mr. Leonard Seale, and near the house occupied by Mrs. Fausole and the barn of Mr. Case, in which the last two fires recorded by us occurred, was discovered to be burning, and it was consumed with remarkable rapidity. The fire soon reached across the alley to Lyons and Chandler's store—in which was Blommer H. H. and in which the Register printing office was housed, in 1854—which also commenced burning rapidly. It was impossible to save the barn, which was mostly destroyed in a few minutes; and the efforts of the firemen and citizens were directed to arresting the progress of the fire in the store. As a fresh breeze was blowing, and everything seemed to burn almost like tinder, it was a desperate struggle. For more than an hour it seemed doubtful whether the fire would conquer or be conquered; but at length, the pipemen of the two engine companies and others having (in the midst of smoke and fire) entered the building through upper windows, and holes having been cut through the plastering to enable them to reach the heart of the fire, it was extinguished. Much more damage was done by this fire than by any previous ones in Montrose this winter. Lyons and Chandler's building, which is very long, was nearly one third destroyed. Mr. Chandler, who occupied the front of the building as a store, (with Mr. S. Langdon, clothing merchant) had his goods considerably damaged. The damage to the building and to Mr. Chandler's goods has been estimated at \$1500—covered by insurance. Mr. De Witt, of the firm of Lathrop, and Dr. Witt had a quantity of furniture and household goods stored in the building, which were insured to the amount of \$500, but he estimates his loss at about double that. Cobb and Rogers, grocers, had in the basement one hundred barrels of flour and a quantity of salt and oats. The flour was injured by being wet; but the damage is covered by insurance. There were two schools in the building, one taught by Miss Austin, and the other by Miss Dimock. The books in Miss Austin's room were mostly saved, the others destroyed. Mr. Case's cow, which was in his barn when it burned, and escaped with only a bad fright, was also in this barn, and was considerably singed before she was got out.

It is rather remarkable that so many fires occur in the same part of the town. Many believe that the last two are the work of incendiaries. But for the fire engines, either of them would undoubtedly have destroyed the whole row of buildings on the east side of Public Avenue, from Post's store to Tarnell's hotel. The fire engines have paid for themselves many times over, and our citizens generally should exert themselves to keep up the companies and to keep the engines in good working order. As there is a great lack of water in many parts of the town, it to be hoped that before another summer season will be built wherever needed.

Court Proceedings.

Commonwealth vs. Charles Lowrie. Indictment, Conspiracy, Bentley and Little for Commonwealth, Jessup and Turrell for Defence.

MONTROSE, JANUARY 18TH, 1859.

Commonwealth vs. Charles Lowrie. Indictment, Conspiracy, Bentley and Little for Commonwealth, Jessup and Turrell for Defence.

Corbit Pickering, sworn.—Mr. Lowrie came and saw me sometime in July last, in a hay-field, in Lewis township, and said he had a warrant for me for stealing a horse, and wanted me to go with him into Luzerne Co. As I did not know much about the law in such matters, I went with him to Henry Manzo's. After we had started, Mr. Lowrie said he thought I had better settle the matter, and I finally gave him nine dollars to settle.

Cross-examined.—Mr. Lowrie said the warrant was for stealing a horse, and thought I had better settle, while yet in the hay-field. James Brown did not come into the field with Mr. Lowrie, when he came with the warrant. Mr. Brown claimed the horse as his. In reply I told him he had cheated me out of the horse.

Almon Pickering, sworn.—I was in the hay-field with father when Mr. Lowrie came with the warrant. After he requested my father to go with him, he (father) made preparations to go, and while doing so, Mr. Lowrie proposed to settle, and it was finally adjusted for nine dollars. He said the warrant was for stealing a horse, and wanted father to go with him into Luzerne county, and I believe, Scott township.

Nathaniel Pickering, sworn.—Mr. Lowrie took me with the warrant, with my father, some time in July last. He wanted me to go with him to Scott township, Luzerne Co. After I eat my dinner, I went as far as Mr. Manzo's with him, (Lowrie) and he told me we had better settle, and father finally settled the difficulty for nine dollars.

Cross-examined.—I think it was the 10th of July that the horse was brought from Scott township, and a few days before we were taken with the warrant for stealing the horse.

Elias Pickering, sworn.—I was in the woods peeling bark, Mr. Lowrie came with Henry Manzo, and said he had a warrant for me for stealing a horse. After we had left the woods, Mr. Lowrie and Henry Manzo proposed settlement. I heard only about settlement by anyone else excepting Lowrie, Manzo, and father.

Cross-examined.—I brought the horse from Luzerne county, the Sunday before, I think. Brown had nothing to say about the settlement that I heard.

[Here the warrant was read by the Counsel for the Commonwealth, from which it appeared that the warrant did not originally contain the first name of any particular Pickering.]

H. W. White, sworn.—I was in E. Farnam's office last July, when Mr. Lowrie came there with the warrant. I think it did not state what Pickering was meant, but left the first name a blank.

David Youngs, sworn.—I saw the warrant at Mr. Callender's, in Scott. There was a particular Pickering mentioned in the warrant, but the first name was left a blank. [Here the Commonwealth rested, and the Defence proceeded with their testimony.]

Nelson Callender, sworn.—I am a Justice of the Peace of Scott township. At the time the warrant was made out for the Pickering, Mr. Brown did not know their first names, but he could insert their names after he learned what they were, after he arrived in Susquehanna county. Mr. Lowrie was not used to doing business, and did not want to serve the warrant.

Henry Manzo, sworn.—I was being come some time last July, when Mr. Lowrie came into the field and wished me to go with him to Mr. Pickering's, as he had a warrant for the Pickering's, and was not acquainted with them. At first I refused to go, as I was in a great hurry about my work, but finally, after earnest solicitations, I went with him. After the arrest was made, Mr. Pickering effected a settlement by paying Mr. Brown five dollars, and the cost of the Constable, Mr. Lowrie.

Cross-examined.—When Mr. Lowrie first came into the field, he inquired after Corbit Pickering, and afterwards for Elias Pickering.

John Conrad, sworn.—I asked Mr. Pickering at one time if he knew where Brown was, and he said he did not, neither did he saw, as he was a poor cotter at the best.

Michael Belder, sworn.—I heard Elias Pickering say that if it had not been for Henry Manzo the settlement never would have been made.

Minwell Manzo, sworn.—I heard Mr. Pickering tell Mr. Lowrie that he did not know anything more than his duty. And I also heard him say that he did not blame Mr. Manzo, in the matter referred to.

[Here the Commonwealth proceeded with their rebutting testimony.]

David Youngs, recalled.—I heard Mr. Callender say that the warrant was only intended for the arrest of one Pickering.

Nathaniel Pickering, recalled.—I heard Mr. Callender say that the warrant was intended for two or three of them.

After the above evidence was submitted to the Jury, the case was argued by Judge Jessup on the part of the defence, and by R. B. Little for the Commonwealth; and after a brief charge of the Judge to the Jury, they retired to their room, and returned at a verdict of "Not Guilty, and the County to pay the costs."

Commonwealth vs. Harvey Lynch. Indictment, Indecent Exposure of his Person, Jessup and Turrell for Commonwealth, Little and McCollum for Defence. Verdict, "Guilty."

Commonwealth vs. E. R. Tingley. Indictment, Assault and Battery. Newton and McCollum for Commonwealth, Chamberlain for Defence.

P. R. Tower, sworn.—On the 24th of last August, as I was going across Mr. Tingley's lot, he met me and ordered me off from his lot. I had two loes in one hand, and a pick on my shoulder, and was going to work on the road, when Mr. Tingley pitched on to me; he threw me down and hurt me quite bad. I asked Mr. Moore—who was with me, which committed the assault? and he said Tingley did.

G. W. Moore, sworn.—As I was going across Mr. Tingley's lot with Mr. Tower, on the 24th of last August, Mr. Tingley met us and ordered Mr. Tower off. Mr. Tower had two loes at the time in one hand, and a pick in the other across his shoulder. Mr. Tingley pitched on to Mr. Tower and knocked him down; when he got up his face was exceedingly bloody, and I should think he was hurt quite bad.

H. A. Coulter, sworn.—On Tuesday morning, the 24th of August last, as I was crossing Mr. Tingley's lot, Mr. Tingley met Mr. Tower and ordered him off. Mr. Tower had two loes in his hand, and a pick on his shoulder. Mr. Tingley pitched on to him, and threw him down, and hurt him quite bad; his face was quite bloody. I was about

From the Philadelphia Sunday Transcript.

Douglas and his Position.

Since his triumph in Illinois, Stephen A. Douglas has been traversing the land, going through a series of orations. His and his friends seem determined to keep him prominently before the eyes of the people. They have changed their order and array of battle. A few months ago it was simply Douglas, Walker, Forney, &c., fighting for a great principle, and defending themselves from a popular proscription. But the great principle has been vindicated; Kansas is surrendered to freedom; and the proscription Administration has been so overwhelmed with defeat that it is beneath contempt. The Anti-Leocomptonites are fully victorious. The object, therefore, of their present movements, or rather the movements of their leaders, is not to save a principle and a territory already saved, or to defend themselves from a whip and a helpless Administration. Their object, on the other hand, has become purely personal. They have been transformed from Anti-Leocomptonites into Douglasites. Flushed with an unprecedented triumph over a national Administration, they have been seduced into the enterprise of making Douglas the next President, and of securing to themselves the control of the Federal Government.

Will they succeed? The position of Douglas is very peculiar, and yet to the eagle observer it is very plain. It is in broad contrast with his former career. No man in this Union has hitherto been more consistently devoted to the ideas and demands of the slaveholding interest in the South. He never filtered or haggled; he swallowed with equal avidity even the most nauseous doses which were forced down the throats of many obedient Democrats by the ultra fire-eaters. These salamander-gentry made an idol of Douglas. He was the embodiment of the filibuster policy, of all that extreme element in the South which would force the march of our boundaries in that direction so as to make more slaves. States. He was equally ready to swallow the Missouri Compromise, in which he stifled the Fathers of the Republic, the traditions of the Democratic party, and his own antecedents, in order to open all the territories of the Union to the spread of negro slavery.

He went, if possible, still further; for, in 1855 and 1856, when the ruthlessly oppressed and harassed people of the South, with almost party distinction, turned their backs to the General Government and to the people of the United States for relief and justice, for the privilege of exercising sovereignty over their own domestic affairs, no man so belied and slandered them, and mocked at their complaints and miseries as Stephen A. Douglas.

His report in favor of the Leocompton Legislature and its laws—both worse than the Leocompton Convention itself—the blackest blot upon his record. But this Stephen A. Douglas, his advocate for extreme slavery extension, this reviler of all his countrymen who cherished any sympathies for freedom or the North, at last paused in his downward career. Like a high mettle steed, he reared and threw his rider, and stopped still with the reins in his teeth. He was not so unamiable in this claim—neither was he for the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. Let them talk in the style following, from the Georgia Citizen, and they will find numbers of northern dough-faces who will appreciate their arguments. In speaking of the recent landing of negroes from Africa in that State it says:

"This is only the 'beginning of the end,' and we have not a word to say in condemnation of an act that will practically nullify an unconstitutional law against the south and her institutions. On the contrary, we believe that the people of Georgia have the inalienable right to import laborers from Africa, or anywhere else, and that all free southerners will be willing to have them smuggled into the country, if the odious restrictions on the part of the federal government against free trade in this species of property are not removed."

Never did Senator Douglas appear so so much advantage as in the Senate last winter. He rose to a dignity of tone and diction of which none had deemed him capable, and which comes to a man naturally when he feels that he is right. He was, by long odds, the most popular man in the United States.

His position was perfectly national, and yet it gratified the public conscience and moral sentiment of the whole people. He was not a man who would stoop to sustain himself, and to ask for a re-election to the Senate. He made an arduous, gallant, brilliant, and successful fight. He was opposed by an antagonist of vast power, by a foe worthy of his steel, and he goes back to Washington like a conqueror, carrying his trophies with him.

But in the Illinois campaign, the character of his mind, and his temper, and the temper led him to take a position in which defeat hereafter is inevitable. Mr. Douglas is a man of powerful and active brain. His mind is quick, acute, shrewd and strong. It is of coarse-grained and rugged strength. It combines the spring of the tiger with the logic of the bulldog. He is not massive and gross like Webster, nor copious and learned like Benton and Choate, nor broad and philosophic like Seward. The intellect of Douglas is very practical. It always aims at immediate ends. He always writes and speaks for present effect. He always argues not for truth but for victory. If he could always keep cool and self-possessed he would form an invincible Ajax in every contest. But the great misfortune of Mr. Douglas is that his passions are excessively strong, and he lacks moral sense and feeling. He is very impetuous and fiery, and in every contest his blood gets so hot that he loses all dignity, all candor, and all principle; and he becomes unfair, false, and vindictive. In common with Daniel Webster he lacks a high moral endowment. He has no intense and overmastering sympathy with democracy against aristocracy, against slavery, with truth against falsehood; with the right against the wrong. He despises philanthropy, and regards compassion a weakness. He worships the Roman gods, SENECA and VICTORY, and finds no attraction at the shrine of SURVIVAL and PRIDE.

It is no wonder, therefore, that in the very first movements of his reaction from his no-bler stand of last winter, Mr. Douglas should betray his inherent moral weakness. So he did in Illinois. His antagonist, Lincoln, in the opening speech of the campaign, attempted to show: a historical truth and philosophic idea, that in course of time and events, all the States of the Union would become free or slave States. Lincoln's idea was, not that any party should insist on this as a party principle, or that any State should be coerced into any change of institutions, but that only that human bondage would, unless it was maintained by a constant spread, die out of itself in the States of this Union.

This innocent and benign idea—which was an axiom in the early days of the Republic—was distorted by Douglas, in his reply to Lincoln, into the odious dogma that Lincoln's party intended to coerce the slave States into the abolition of slavery. Douglas, of course, knew better. He knew that Lincoln meant only to utter a philosophical fact; not to promulge a new party principle. Yet he chose to take issue with Lincoln on a willful misrepresentation. The consequence was that Lincoln got him into chancery, and whipped him in debate. Douglas got mad, became vulgar, resorted to his old stand against abolition, &c., alienated the Republicans, and barely escaped defeat.

The weakness of his present position is, that he stands upon a platform which is neither fish, flesh, or fowl. He refuses to dispute with the infamous and inhuman Dred Scott decision, under an affectation of deference to the authority of the Supreme Court, and yet he very illogically contends that, in full accordance with that decision, the people of the territories have a right to refuse or protect slavery. Now every tyrant knows that it is the duty of Congress and the territories to take special care to protect slave property. A patent inconsistency like this of Douglas will damn any platform. There is a split in its original construction. Again he tries to conciliate the free soil sentiment by denouncing southern ultraism and the revival of the slave trade, yet at the same time, he offends the same mighty element by turning to the South and indulging in the precious gammon that the Declaration of Independence, when it announced its great truths, meant only white men, and by talking about the spread of our territory. Can such Janus-faced dodging succeed? For to be observed, Leocompton is no longer a question. It is dead and buried. The real question is, shall slavery spread or stay where it is? Whoever dodges this question is sure to be crushed by the two sides of it. Douglas is trying to dodge it, and to dodge the great American question which is also of the vastest importance, and to dodge the protective issue. What with all his dodging, he will find himself on the shelf before long.

He is trying to maintain his status as a Democrat. He can't do it in his present position, for he has lost the confidence of the extreme slaveholding element of people without doing what the Van Buren and the "burn burners" did—crab back into a subordinate and suspected position. He denounces the Republicans and their leaders, and so they oppose him as much as ever. He is without any great party to back him. The democracy will not break up their organization or modify their position to please him; the opposition will not haul down their flag to boost his.

All this is proven by his recent progress through the country. A year ago, here in Philadelphia, the people turned out to hail him. All classes and parties cheered him at the Girard House. Americans and Republicans vied with Democrats in hurrahs for Douglas. A few days ago he was received with no welcoming crowd of people without party distinction. The good natured City Council and Mayor gave him Independence Hall, simply because no one is afraid of him, and all liked to take a fling at Buchanan. But the procession which escorted him was a small, meagre affair. His ovation here was nothing but a funny little attempt got up by Forney, and his squad of Douglasites. The great body of Democracy and of the Opposition held aloof.

REVIVAL OF THE AFRICAN SLAVE TRADE.—A new demand of the South upon their yielding brethren of the North is now being made—the removal of the interdiction of the African Slave trade. As it is always successful in its demands, we suppose it will succeed in this. The South is not so unamiable in this claim—neither was he for the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. Let them talk in the style following, from the Georgia Citizen, and they will find numbers of northern dough-faces who will appreciate their arguments. In speaking of the recent landing of negroes from Africa in that State it says:

"This is only the 'beginning of the end,' and we have not a word to say in condemnation of an act that will practically nullify an unconstitutional law against the south and her institutions. On the contrary, we believe that the people of Georgia have the inalienable right to import laborers from Africa, or anywhere else, and that all free southerners will be willing to have them smuggled into the country, if the odious restrictions on the part of the federal government against free trade in this species of property are not removed."

Never did Senator Douglas appear so so much advantage as in the Senate last winter. He rose to a dignity of tone and diction of which none had deemed him capable, and which comes to a man naturally when he feels that he is right. He was, by long odds, the most popular man in the United States.

His position was perfectly national, and yet it gratified the public conscience and moral sentiment of the whole people. He was not a man who would stoop to sustain himself, and to ask for a re-election to the Senate. He made an arduous, gallant, brilliant, and successful fight. He was opposed by an antagonist of vast power, by a foe worthy of his steel, and he goes back to Washington like a conqueror, carrying his trophies with him.

But in the Illinois campaign, the character of his mind, and his temper, and the temper led him to take a position in which defeat hereafter is inevitable. Mr. Douglas is a man of powerful and active brain. His mind is quick, acute, shrewd and strong. It is of coarse-grained and rugged strength. It combines the spring of the tiger with the logic of the bulldog. He is not massive and gross like Webster, nor copious and learned like Benton and Choate, nor broad and philosophic like Seward. The intellect of Douglas is very practical. It always aims at immediate ends. He always writes and speaks for present effect. He always argues not for truth but for victory. If he could always keep cool and self-possessed he would form an invincible Ajax in every contest. But the great misfortune of Mr. Douglas is that his passions are excessively strong, and he lacks moral sense and feeling. He is very impetuous and fiery, and in every contest his blood gets so hot that he loses all dignity, all candor, and all principle; and he becomes unfair, false, and vindictive. In common with Daniel Webster he lacks a high moral endowment. He has no intense and overmastering sympathy with democracy against aristocracy, against slavery, with truth against falsehood; with the right against the wrong. He despises philanthropy, and regards compassion a weakness. He worships the Roman gods, SENECA and VICTORY, and finds no attraction at the shrine of SURVIVAL and PRIDE.

It is no wonder, therefore, that in the very first movements of his reaction from his no-bler stand of last winter, Mr. Douglas should betray his inherent moral weakness. So he did in Illinois. His antagonist, Lincoln, in the opening speech of the campaign, attempted to show: a historical truth and philosophic idea, that in course of time and events, all the States of the Union would become free or slave States. Lincoln's idea was, not that any party should insist on this as a party principle, or that any State should be coerced into any change of institutions, but that only that human bondage would, unless it was maintained by a constant spread, die out of itself in the States of this Union.

This innocent and benign idea—which was an axiom in the early days of the Republic—was distorted by Douglas, in his reply to Lincoln, into the odious dogma that Lincoln's party intended to coerce the slave States into the abolition of slavery. Douglas, of course, knew better. He knew that Lincoln meant only to utter a philosophical fact; not to promulge a new party principle. Yet he chose to take issue with Lincoln on a willful misrepresentation. The consequence was that Lincoln got him into chancery, and whipped him in debate. Douglas got mad, became vulgar, resorted to his old stand against abolition, &c., alienated the Republicans, and barely escaped defeat.

The weakness of his present position is, that he stands upon a platform which is neither fish, flesh, or fowl. He refuses to dispute with the infamous and inhuman Dred Scott decision, under an affectation of deference to the authority of the Supreme Court, and yet he very illogically contends that, in full accordance with that decision, the people of the territories have a right to refuse or protect slavery. Now every tyrant knows that it is the duty of Congress and the territories to take special care to protect slave property. A patent inconsistency like this of Douglas will damn any platform. There is a split in its original construction. Again he tries to conciliate the free soil sentiment by denouncing southern ultraism and the revival of the slave trade, yet at the same time, he offends the same mighty element by turning to the South and indulging in the precious gammon that the Declaration of Independence, when it announced its great truths, meant only white men, and by talking about the spread of our territory. Can such Janus-faced dodging succeed? For to be observed, Leocompton is no longer a question. It is dead and buried. The real question is, shall slavery spread or stay where it is? Whoever dodges this question is sure to be crushed by the two sides of it. Douglas is trying to dodge it, and to dodge the great American question which is also of the vastest importance, and to dodge the protective issue. What with all his dodging, he will find himself on the shelf before long.

He is trying to maintain his status as a Democrat. He can't do it in his present position, for he has lost the confidence of the extreme slaveholding element of people without doing what the Van Buren and the "burn burners" did—crab back into a subordinate and suspected position. He denounces the Republicans and their leaders, and so they oppose him as much as ever. He is without any great party to back him. The democracy will not break up their organization or modify their position to please him; the opposition will not haul down their flag to boost his.

All this is proven by his recent progress through the country. A year ago, here in Philadelphia, the people turned out to hail him. All classes and parties cheered him at the Girard House. Americans and Republicans vied with Democrats in hurrahs for Douglas. A few days ago he was received with no welcoming crowd of people without party distinction. The good natured City Council and Mayor gave him Independence Hall, simply because no one is afraid of him, and all liked to take a fling at Buchanan. But the procession which escorted him was a small, meagre affair. His ovation here was nothing but a funny little attempt got up by Forney, and his squad of Douglasites. The great body of Democracy and of the Opposition held aloof.

REVIVAL OF THE AFRICAN SLAVE TRADE.—A new demand of the South upon their yielding brethren of the North is now being made—the removal of the interdiction of the African Slave trade. As it is always successful in its demands, we suppose it will succeed in this. The South is not so unamiable in this claim—neither was he for the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. Let them talk in the style following, from the Georgia Citizen, and they will find numbers of northern dough-faces who will appreciate their arguments. In speaking of the recent landing of negroes from Africa in that State it says:

"This is only the 'beginning of the end,' and we have not a word to say in condemnation of an act that will practically nullify an unconstitutional law against the south and her institutions. On the contrary, we believe that the people of Georgia have the inalienable right to import laborers from Africa, or anywhere else, and that all free southerners will be willing to have them smuggled into the country, if the odious restrictions on the part of the federal government against free trade in this species of property are not removed."

Never did Senator Douglas appear so so much advantage as in the Senate last winter. He rose to a dignity of tone and diction of which none had deemed him capable, and which comes to a man naturally when he feels that he is right. He was, by long odds, the most popular man in the United States.

His position was perfectly national, and yet it gratified the public conscience and moral sentiment of the whole people. He was not a man who would stoop to sustain himself, and to ask for a re-election to the Senate. He made an arduous, gallant, brilliant, and successful fight. He was opposed by an antagonist of vast power, by a foe worthy of his steel, and he goes back to Washington like a conqueror, carrying his trophies with him.

But in the Illinois campaign, the character of his mind, and his temper, and the temper led him to take a position in which defeat hereafter is inevitable. Mr. Douglas is a man of powerful and active brain. His mind is quick, acute, shrewd and strong. It is of coarse-grained and rugged strength. It combines the spring of the tiger with the logic of the bulldog. He is not massive and gross like Webster, nor copious and learned like Benton and Choate, nor broad and philosophic like Seward. The intellect of Douglas is very practical. It always aims at immediate ends. He always writes and speaks for present effect. He always argues not for truth but for victory. If he could always keep cool and self-possessed he would form an invincible Ajax in every contest. But the great misfortune of Mr. Douglas is that his passions are excessively strong, and he lacks moral sense and feeling. He is very impetuous and fiery, and in every contest his blood gets so hot that he loses all dignity, all candor, and all principle; and he becomes unfair, false, and vindictive. In common with Daniel Webster he lacks a high moral endowment. He has no intense and overmastering sympathy with democracy against aristocracy, against slavery, with truth against falsehood; with the right against the wrong. He despises philanthropy, and regards compassion a weakness. He worships the Roman gods, SENECA and VICTORY, and finds no attraction at the shrine of SURVIVAL and PRIDE.

It is no wonder, therefore, that in the very first movements of his reaction from his no-bler stand of last winter, Mr. Douglas should betray his inherent moral weakness. So he did in Illinois. His antagonist, Lincoln, in the opening speech of the campaign, attempted to show: a historical truth and philosophic idea, that in course of time and events, all the States of the Union would become free or slave States. Lincoln's idea was, not that any party should insist on this as a party principle, or that any State should be coerced into any change of institutions, but that only that human bondage would, unless it was maintained by a constant spread, die out of itself in the States of this Union.

This innocent and benign idea—which was an axiom in the early days of the Republic—was distorted by Douglas, in his reply to Lincoln, into the odious dogma that Lincoln's party intended to coerce the slave States into the abolition of slavery. Douglas, of course, knew better. He knew that Lincoln meant only to utter a philosophical fact; not to promulge a new party principle. Yet he chose to take issue with Lincoln on a willful misrepresentation. The consequence was that Lincoln got him into chancery, and whipped him in debate. Douglas got mad, became vulgar, resorted to his old stand against abolition, &c., alienated the Republicans, and barely escaped defeat.

The weakness of his present position is, that he stands upon a platform which is neither fish, flesh, or fowl. He refuses to dispute with the infamous and inhuman Dred Scott decision, under an affectation of deference to the authority of the Supreme Court, and yet he very illogically contends that, in full accordance with that decision, the people of the territories have a right to refuse or protect slavery. Now every tyrant knows that it is the duty of Congress and the territories to take special care to protect slave property. A patent inconsistency like this of Douglas will damn any platform. There is a split in its original construction. Again he tries to conciliate the free soil sentiment by denouncing southern ultraism and the revival of the slave trade, yet at the same time, he offends the same mighty element by turning to the South and indulging in the precious gammon that the Declaration of Independence, when it announced its great truths, meant only white men, and by talking about the spread of our territory. Can such Janus-faced dodging succeed? For to be observed, Leocompton is no longer a question. It is dead and buried. The real question is, shall slavery spread or stay where it is? Whoever dodges this question is sure to be crushed by the two sides of it. Douglas is trying to dodge it, and to dodge the great American question which is also of the vastest importance, and to dodge the protective issue. What with all his dodging, he will find himself on the shelf before long.

He is trying to maintain his status as a Democrat. He can't do it in his present position, for he has lost the confidence of the extreme slaveholding element of people without doing what the Van Buren and the "burn burners" did—crab back into a subordinate and suspected position. He denounces the Republicans and their leaders, and so they oppose him as much as ever. He is without any great party to back him. The democracy will not break up their organization or modify their position to please him; the opposition will not haul down their flag to boost his.

All this is proven by his recent progress through the country. A year ago, here in Philadelphia, the people turned out to hail him. All classes and parties cheered him at the Girard House. Americans and Republicans vied with Democrats in hurrahs for Douglas. A few days ago he was received with no welcoming crowd of people without party distinction. The good natured City Council and Mayor gave him Independence Hall, simply because no one is afraid of him, and all liked to take a fling at Buchanan. But the procession which escorted him was a small, meagre affair. His ovation here was nothing but a funny little attempt got up by Forney, and his squad of Douglasites. The great body of Democracy and of the Opposition held aloof.

REVIVAL OF THE AFRICAN SLAVE TRADE.—A new demand of the South upon their yielding brethren of the North is now being made—the removal of the interdiction of the African Slave trade. As it is always successful in its demands, we suppose it will succeed in this. The South is not so unamiable in this claim—neither was he for the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. Let them talk in the style following, from the Georgia Citizen, and they will find numbers of northern dough-faces who will appreciate their arguments. In speaking of the recent landing of negroes from Africa in that State it says:

"This is only the 'beginning of the end,' and we have not a word to say in condemnation of an act that will practically nullify an unconstitutional law against the south and her institutions. On the contrary, we believe that the people of Georgia have the inalienable right to import laborers from Africa, or anywhere else, and that all free southerners will be willing to have them smuggled into the country, if the odious restrictions on the part of the federal government against free trade in this species of property are not removed."

At a rod off at the time of the assault upon Tower.

How the Commonwealth rested, and the Counsel for the Defence withdrew the plea of "Not Guilty," and entered the plea of "Guilty," and offered evidence in mitigation of damages, in reference to words spoken by Tower previous to the assault, about Tingley's wife.

The Court sentenced the defendant to pay a fine of five dollars and costs of prosecution. Commonwealth vs. William Mills. Indictment, Larceny. Franklin Fraser for Commonwealth, Newton and McCollum for the Defence.

John Cronk, sworn.—Wm. Mills came to my house in Jessup township, in October last, I think the Saturday night before election, and stayed all night that night and nearly all day Sunday, and Sunday night. I came here on early Monday morning, and returned home on Tuesday, election day. When I returned, I missed a pair of pants and an overcoat. I had reason to believe that the defendant, Mr. Mills, had stolen them. I have since understood that Mills has been seen wearing the pants and coat.—Mr. Mills has since told me that he bought the pants of Alton Tawley, the Sunday evening previous to the October election.

[The pants, being exhibited in Court, were identified by the witness to be those taken from his house on the Sunday night before the October election.]

The pants and coat were worth about ten or twelve dollars.

D. Dunn, sworn.—I traded pants with Mr. Mills, sometime during the month of October, I think the pants I got of Mills are the same pants identified here by Mr. Cronk.

Asaon Dunn, sworn.—I saw Mr. Mills wearing a pair of pants and an overcoat, about the last of October. I should say they were the same pants that have been produced here in Court.

John Smith, sworn.—Mr. Mills went by light-coach over the month of October, I think the pants I got of Mills are the same pants identified here by Mr. Cronk.

Almon Hatley, sworn.—I never sold a pair of pants to Mr. Mills in my life. I never saw Mr. Mills previous to the Sunday before election, nor never have seen him since until today.

The above evidence being submitted, and after a brief charge of the Judge to the Jury they retired to their room and after an hour's deliberation they returned with a verdict of "Guilty."

Commonwealth vs. William Matthews.—Indictment, Larceny. Franklin Fraser for Commonwealth, F. B. Streeter for the Def. E. Simon, sworn.—I was left in charge of my brother's business in a grocery at Great Bend, on Saturday, Jan. 1st, 1859.

I think the pants I got of Mills are the same pants identified here by Mr. Cronk.

Early on the following morning the door of the grocery was found to be broken open, and one five dollar bill, on the Susquehanna Valley Bank, one dollar bill, and one hundred pennies missed from the money drawer. I was present when Mr. Matthews was examined. The money found upon his person, or at least the bills, were upon the same banks as those which were missed from the drawer.

William W. Wilcox, sworn.—I am the Constable of Great Bend township. I arrested Mr. Matthews, and found one five dollar bill on the Susquehanna Valley Bank, one dollar bill, some seventy odd penn