

THE JEFFERSONIAN

Devoted to Politics, Literature, Agriculture, Science, Morality, and General Intelligence.

VOL. 19.

STROUDSBURG, MONROE COUNTY, PA. FEBRUARY 23, 1860.

NO. 7.

Published by Theodore Schoch.

TERMS.—Two dollars per annum in advance—Two dollars and a quarter, half yearly—and if not paid before the end of the year, Two dollars and a half. No papers discontinued until all arrearages are paid, except at the option of the Editor.
17 Advertisements of one square (ten lines) or less, one or three insertions, \$1.00. Each additional insertion, 25 cents. Longer ones in proportion.

JOB PRINTING.

Having a general assortment of large, plain and ornamental type, we are prepared to execute every description of

FANCY PRINTING.

Cards, Circulars, Bill Heads, Notes, Blank Receipts, Justice, Legal and other Blanks, Pamphlets, &c., printed with neatness and dispatch, on reasonable terms at this office.

J. Q. DUCKWORTH. JOHN HAYN

To Country Dealers.

DUCKWORTH & HAYN,

WHOLESALE DEALERS IN

Groceries, Provisions, Liquors, &c.

No. 80 Day street, New York.

June 16, 1859.—1y.

The Lawyer's Valentine.

BY JOHN G. SAGE.

I'm notified—fair neighbor mine—

By one of our Profession,

That this—the Term of Valentine—

Is Cupid's Special Session.

Permit me, therefore, to report

Myself, on this occasion,

Quite ready to proceed to Court,

And file my Declaration.

I've an attachment for you, too;

A legal and a strong one;

O, yield unto the Process, do;

Nor let it be a long one!

No scowling bailiff lurks behind;

He'd be a precious nobby,

Who, failing to Arrest the mind,

Should go and Take the Body.

For though a form like yours might throw

A scupper in distraction;

I couldn't serve a Capias—no—

I'd scorn so base an Action!

O, do not tell me of your youth,

And turn away demurely;

For, though you're very young, in truth,

You're not an infant, surely!

The Case is everything to me;

My heart is love's own tissue;

Don't plead a Dilatory Plea;

Let's have the General Issue!

Or, since you've really no Defense,

Why not, this present Session,

Omitting all absurd pretence,

Give Judgement by Confession!

So shall you be my lawful wife;

And I—your faithful lover—

Be Tenant of your heart for Life;

With no Remains over!

THE WIFE.

On earth to man there is but one

His heart can love—his soul can own;

Though myriads fit before his view,

There is but one to whom he's true—

That one can sway him to and fro;

Can make him drain the cup of woe;

Can make him joy, or blast his life;

And that one name is simply wife.

But in that name a world is sphered,

A world by all beloved, revered,

Who have the sense to know its worth

And spurn the gaudy joys of earth;

For that full heart in her dear breast—

If rightly prized—eternal rest

Is not with blissful sweets more rife,

Than that poor heart—a loving wife.

SPEECH OF CASSIUS M. CLAY.

Delivered on the Capital Steps at Frank-

fort, January 10, 1860.

Democracy as it Was.

Gentlemen, let me read a few Demo-

cratic platforms, to show how this thing

went along. I will read you the Demo-

cratic platform of 1852, two years before

the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska bill,

so far as it touches upon the subject of

Slavery:

"That Congress has no power under

the Constitution to interfere with or con-

trol the domestic institutions of the sev-

eral States, and that such States are the

sole and proper judges of everything ap-

pertaining to their own affairs, not pro-

hibited by the Constitution; that all ef-

forts of the abolitionists or others, made

to induce Congress to interfere with ques-

tions of Slavery, or to take incipient

steps in relation thereto, are calculated

to lead to the most alarming and danger-

ous consequences."

What say you to that, Democrat?—

Although you declared in black and white

that it was dangerous to interfere with

the subject of Slavery, what have you

done! Did you not say it was dangerous

to interfere! Answer me that, and let

me go on! You are silent. You are

condemned out of your own mouths. I

proceed:

"And that all such efforts have an in-

evitable tendency to diminish the happi-

ness of the people, and endanger the sta-

bility and permanency of the Union."

You condemn yourselves again.

"And ought not to be countenanced by

any friend of our political institutions."

Resolved, That the foregoing proposi-

tions covers and was intended to embrace

THE WHOLE SUBJECT OF Slavery agitation

in Congress."

Mark that the words, "the whole sub-

ject," are in small capitals in their report-

ed resolutions.

"And, therefore, the Democratic party of the Union, standing upon their National platform, will abide by and adhere to a faithful execution of the acts known as the Compromise measures, settled by the Congress—the act for reclaiming fugitives from service or labor included—which act, being designed to carry out the express provision of the Constitution, cannot be repealed or so changed as to destroy or impair its efficiency."

"Resolved, That the Democratic party will resist all attempts at renewing in Congress or out of it, the agitation of the Slavery question, under whatever shape or color the attempt may be made."

These were the declarations and avowals of the Democratic party in 1852.—Now, what do they do in 1854! Why, they go under the leadership of Stephen A. Douglas, when he had made a report, saying that that law of 1820 was sacredly conceived in the Compromise of 1850, and repeal the Missouri Compromise—Now, I believe, they stand condemned by their own language and by their own acts, and I have here accomplished what I proposed to do.

The Democracy Self-Condemed.

What was the result of all this? The result was that in obedience to the declaration that the people were to be fairly left to choose for themselves between Liberty and Slavery, they adopted another platform. Let me come to that. I will tell you what they did in 1856, in that year the Cincinnati platform was adopted.

In consequence of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, the Northern people interceded to get their own territory, upon the avowal made in the Kansas-Nebraska bill, that the people were to be left free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States." But notwithstanding that avowal it made, they immediately as the report of the United States Congress showed you, before a single Free-Soiler or Republican had set his foot into the new territory, commenced on the border of Missouri the organization of the "Blue Lodges," to invade Kansas, with the avowed design—peaceably if they could, and forcibly if they must—to have that land for a Slave State, and "damn the Abolitionists, they would shoot them down as squirrels," as I heard a leading Democrat express himself in Lexington, while that conflict was going on. They passed these resolutions in 1856, and I want you to pay a strict attention to these, in comparison with the other avowals:

"Resolved, That we reiterate with renewed energy of purpose, the well-considered declaration of former Conventions upon this sectional issue of Domestic Slavery and concerning the reserved rights of the States"—

That alludes to the former Democratic platform of 1852, four years before. It goes on:

"1. That Congress has no power under the Constitution to interfere with or control the domestic institutions of the several States, and that all such States are the sole and proper judges of everything appertaining to their own affairs, not prohibited by the Constitution; that all efforts of the Abolitionists or others, made to induce Congress to interfere with questions of Slavery, or to take incipient steps in relation thereto—the very thing they have been doing to-day, besides which we have heard them denouncing every man that does not come up to their standard, and calling every man that stands on the 'Squatter Sovereignty' platform outside of the Democratic party—are calculated to lead to the most alarming and dangerous consequences; and that all such efforts have an inevitable tendency to diminish the happiness of the people and endanger the stability and permanency of the Union, and ought not to be countenanced by any friend of our political institutions.

"2. That the foregoing proposition covers, and was intended to embrace, the whole subject of Slavery agitation in Congress; and, therefore, the Democratic party of the Union, standing on this national platform will abide by and adhere to a faithful execution of the acts known as the Compromise Measures, settled by the Congress of 1850; 'the act for reclaiming fugitives from service or labor' included, which act being designed to carry out an express provision of the Constitution, cannot with fidelity thereto be repealed, or so changed as to destroy or impair its efficiency.

"3. That the Democratic party will resist all attempts at renewing, in Congress or out of it, the agitation of the Slavery question, under whatever shape or color the attempt may be made."

Oh yes! will resist. That is the Democratic doctrine in 1856 in Cincinnati—did you allude to it to-day? Yes, you voted the doctrine down, and yet here it is, "that the Democratic party will resist all attempts at renewing, in Congress or out of it, the agitation of the Slavery question, under whatever shape or color the attempt may be made." What do you say to that! There is the Cincinnati platform which you eschewed to-day.—You denounced as treasonable any attempt to renew that agitation, under any shape whatever; let me, however, turn to another clause:

"4. That by the uniform application of this Democratic principle to the organization of Territories, and to the admission of new States, with or without Domestic

Slavery, as they may elect; the equal rights of all the States will be preserved intact; the original compact of the Constitution maintained inviolate; and the perpetuity and expansion of the Union insured to its utmost capacity of embracing, in peace and harmony, every future American State that may be constituted or annexed, with a republican form of government."

But you omit:

"5. Resolved, That claim of fellowship with, and desiring the co-operation of all who regard the preservation of the Union under the constitution as the paramount issue, and repudiating all sectional parties and platforms concerning Domestic Slavery, which seek to embroil the States and to incite to treason and armed resistance to law in the Territories, and whose avowed purposes, if consummated, must end in civil war and dissolution—the American Democracy recognize and adopt the principles contained in the organic laws establishing Kansas and Nebraska Territories, as embodying the only sound and safe solution of the 'Slavery question,' upon which the great national idea of the people of this whole country can repose in its determined conservatism of the Union—Non-intervention by Congress in State and Territory, or in the District of Columbia."

Oh! Mr. Graves, where are your resolutions? There, gentlemen, is your declaration, and to it you would not even allude to-day, and under the affectation of renewing the old Democratic platform of 1856, you entirely overlooked and ignored that clause which bound you not directly or indirectly to interfere with Slavery in State or Territory. What have you declared to-day? That Mr. Douglas, if not willing to go along with you outside the Democratic party; that he is guilty of treason. That may be all right; they say that a fool never changes his opinion, and that a wise man does, but you ought to tell it out when you make such a charge as that.

The Unmade Issue.

Well now, gentlemen, I am going to give you a clause, that if they had adopted to-day, it would have put the thing so plain, that if you gave us Douglas we would catch you; if you gave us Toombs, we would catch you, and if you offered Breckinridge, we would catch you. You did not intend the Democratic party to know there was such a clause. As a man up our way, a preacher, a man of great good sense, but little or no education, would say, when reading the Bible, "Well brethren, that is one—if you please, this is—a bad place, and we will skip it." The Democratic party to-day found it was a hard place, and skipped it [applause], so that it is no wonder they did not want me to go into the same hall, and that the lights were out, and it was all dark. Here is what they did. The Republican nor Abolition party, nor the old Whig party, nor the American party, nor the Democratic party, have ever made an issue upon the resolution passed to-day, and which was in the platform of 1856, it is simply as to the power of the people when they become a State. It is a self-evident truth, and they intend you to go home with it, with the thought that you bagged the game, and you will find that the lion has gone, and you have put but the ass's skin into your pouch.

"Resolved, That we recognize the right of the people of the Territories, including Kansas and Nebraska, acting through the legally and fairly expressed will of a majority of actual residents, and whenever the number of their inhabitants justifies it, to form a Constitution, with or without domestic Slavery, and be admitted into Union upon terms of perfect equality with the other States."

Lord how frank this is! "with or without domestic Slavery, and be admitted into the Union upon terms of perfect equality with the other States." Who ever denied that? I challenge Mr. Silvertooth, I challenge Oscar Turner, or even Mr. Speaker Merriwether, to point me out a single resolution from the foundation of our Government to this day, in any portion of the United States, where such has been denied! If there is such, my reading has been of no account.

The Kansas-Nebraska Bill.

Take the case now. I have read the platforms and shown that they are inconsistent. But let me tell you what was the clause in the Kansas-Nebraska bill which they affirmed again and again. It states that the Democratic party determined "neither to legislate Slavery into those Territories"—oh, no! of course not—"nor to exclude it therefrom." What are you to do then? I but to leave the people perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States." Now, what do you think of that! Did not intend to legislate Slavery into Kansas, nor to exclude it; but did intend to leave the people perfectly free to form and regulate their own way? Is that your doctrine to-day?—Editor of *The Yeoman*, are you going to publish it that way to-day, that the object of the Nebraska bill was intended to leave the people perfectly free to regulate their own domestic institutions in their way? You say to-day in the resolutions you have adopted, that the people shall not do any such thing, and if Douglas goes for any such doctrine, we will see him damned if he remains in the Democratic party; and Mr. Silvertooth declares he is already out of the pale of the Democratic church.—

[A voice—"the whole Democratic party is not responsible for him."] Of course not! God forbid they should be. [Laughter and applause.] The great mass of the Republican party is of the Democratic party, but they are of the good old American gold with the stamp of '76, not the bogus Democratic stamp of 1854 and 1856. They are with us now, and will be with us hereafter, and therefore I stand here and the lights are put out. The darkness will not keep you, however, from knowing that they are incompetent to administer the government that the whole party is responsible for.

The Snake and its Skin.

Let us trace the consequences like the snake; yearly they shed their skin, but they never go back into the old one; beautiful it is at first, but it immediately returns to dust and ashes. Let us look at the consequences. Here was the formation of the "Blue Lodges" in Missouri, according to the Congressional Report (remember I don't intend to give any statement upon my own say; I appeal to history to substantiate all I say). You march under your Missouri hordes so formed into the Territory of Kansas, and although it is well known, and as history has proven, that the Republican party was in a clear majority, by force of arms, you took down the Judges of Election that were appointed legally. They were taken by force, the Missouri forces going out with banners flying and with colors displayed, and the question was asked "are you a Judge according to the Constitution and the laws?" Not "are you a Judge of Election carrying the declaration of the Cincinnati platforms of 1852 and 1856, that the people should determine upon their domestic institutions in their own way?" But, "are you sound on the goose?" That was what they asked them; in other words, "are you for Slavery?" Not "are you for the Constitution and the laws, and for the support of Republican institutions and principles as our fathers handed them down to us?" No! but "are you right on the goose?" and if a man did not answer that way that pleased them, they caught him by the collar and ejected him, and many who opposed the Constitutional right of election were wounded and killed. Where then stood the Democratic press of the United States? Aiding and abetting all this treason. The free-soil citizen from the State of Kentucky, as well as he from the Free States, who had seen by actual experiment the glorious benefits of free institutions, and others who had seen the woe of Slavery, and who found that the pledges of the Democratic party had been kept to the word and violated in fact, late in the day sent to their homes both in Kentucky, the Slave and the Free States and took up arms, and upon every field, and by the whole power that God and nature had bestowed upon them, they resisted this attempt to enslave them.—What then did the President of these United States? All the time he by the forces of the United States disarmed the Republican party, and left them at the mercy of those invaders of their rights.

John Brown and his Raid.

Then sprang up this John Brown. I say he is the legitimate son of the acts and avowals of the Democratic party that they intended to take possession of Kansas by force of arms, "peaceably if they could, but forcibly if they must;" and it was only when those descendants of revolutionary fathers took up arms in their own defense—and I thank God there were Kentuckians as well as Yankees fighting there in the battle for freedom—that they drove back the invaders, and now a great and overwhelming majority of the people of Kansas say that it shall be free, notwithstanding James Buchanan lifts up his impious hands, and perhaps praying that it may be so, says that "Kansas is as much a Slave Territory as South Carolina." Is that democracy? In the name of that God to whom he so impiously appeals, is it so—is it a Slave State? Not at all. History tells us that just there began John Brown. How it is I will state, as it comes to me authenticated.—To the best of my knowledge and belief, before he shed the blood of a single man one of his sons was chopped to pieces in cold blood, and another son was dragged in chains by a vehicle until, from the heat, the exposure, the ignominy, and the torture of the moving chains his brain was crazed, and he went mad; and his sister, looking upon all these sad calamities and scenes of horror, was also crazed. Then this man took up the knife, and made a war of extermination upon the slaveholders and the invaders of the soil. There is the secret of the whole matter, so help me God, as I believe I am Cassius Clay, as I stand here to-night. I say the beginning of this raid on Virginia. John Brown felt that there was no protection for him in the Democratic party; that the laws of Missouri and Kansas gave no protection to him, and that he had once more to appeal to the God of Hosts for defense, and he carried that war on in Kansas, and in Missouri, and Virginia. The whole story is told; it was nothing but the raid of a man injured by aggressions made upon him, and these proved to have been begun and completed by the Democratic party themselves. Therefore I hurl back the imputation, and history will stand by the record, and will record the unwholesome truth. That is all of it. It was no servile insurrection at all. I see before me this night a man who committed John

Brown in Virginia, and I hear from other sources, as Senator Mason, that there was not a slave rose in insurrection. It was a raid—the fruit of Democratic action and injustice; and if it is the thing it is said to be, that will yet threaten the peculiar institution of the South along the whole border, they, the Democrats, are responsible for it by reason of their avowals and their acts; but the Republicans are not. I repudiate the charge, and appeal to the country for a verdict.

The Vice-President's Allegations.

Gentlemen, having said so much preliminary and in explanation, I come to the declaration of the Vice President of the United States, as formally put forth by him, sent me under his own hand, but which speech I am told is very distinctly different from that he made in this State-house.

You will pardon me for the length of this argument, if it may be so called, embarrassed as I am by the difficulty of my position here. It is rather more desultory than I had intended it should be, but the importance of the questions to be discussed will, I think, plead my justification.

The Vice President of the United States makes against the Republican party ten formal allegations. He says:

"I charge that the present and ulterior purposes of the Republican party are:

"To introduce the doctrine of negro equality into American politics, and to make it the ground of positive legislation, hostile to the Southern States;

"To exclude the slave property of the South from all territory in the Union, or which may hereafter be acquired;

"To prevent the admission, in any latitude, of another slaveholding State;

"To repeal the Fugitive Slave Law, and practically refuse to obey the Constitution on that subject;

"To refuse to prevent or punish, by State action, the spoilation of Slave property, but on the contrary, to make it a criminal offense in their citizens to obey the laws of the Union, in so far as they protect property in African slaves;

"To abolish Slavery in the District of Columbia;

"To abolish it in the Forts, Arsenals, Dock-Yards, and other places in the South where Congress has exclusive jurisdiction;

"To abolish the international and coast-wise trade;

"To limit, harass, and frown upon the institution in every mode of political action, and by every form of public opinion;

"And finally, by the Executive, by Congress, by the postal service, and in all other accessible modes, to agitate without ceasing, until the Southern States without sympathy or brotherhood in the Union—worn down by the unequal struggle—shall be compelled to surrender ignominiously and emancipate their slaves."

Now, gentlemen, these are allegations formally put forth. It is not for me to question the motives of the man who makes them, but I take the allegations as I find them, and I shall attempt to answer them in detail. First of all, I appeal to the country and history. Standing here upon our recorded action, and the integrity of our previous character, I plead not guilty of the charges; not guilty on every count except one, and to that I plead guilty.

Negro Equality set at Rest.

First, we are not guilty of the purpose "to introduce the doctrine of negro equality into American politics, and to make it the ground of positive legislation, hostile to the Southern States." Mark, the crime is here, that we have been guilty of "introducing." Now, it is well known so far as common rumor goes—we cannot always judge of the motives of men—that the Dred Scott case was gotten up by agreement, in advance of legislation, but subsequent to the declaration of the power of the Democratic party, to take possession of Kansas. We did not want any such subject introduced into politics.—Why? Because there was already odium enough attached to us as being the defenders of the rights of the negro against the white man. We were called already "negro-lovers," and it was not to our interest to get up an issue of this kind if we desired so to do. But an agreed case was made, as is reported in Howard's reports. The case came up to the Supreme Court of the United States from the U.S. District Court of Missouri, and although I am a follower of the plough, and although he has studied law all his life, I declare that Beriah Magoffin does not know anything about the case; there is not a common young lawyer that is not better posted up in this matter. Governor Magoffin does not profess to know anything about it—that honorable and high toned gentleman has never made it his study—any man can see that who reads his inaugural address. John C. Breckinridge does not understand it, or he is a great hypocrite. He is ignorant of the question at issue, or he is a hypocrite, and intended determinedly to deceive the people of the United States, but of course in consequence of the respect I have for him, I believe that he is utterly ignorant of the questions at issue in the case. I think I can present them so that a man of the commonest understanding can comprehend the case.

I will state the substance of the thing. It was a suit brought by a man of color, called Dred Scott, first, I believe, in the State Courts of Missouri, where it was decided that Scott was free, then going

up, I think to the Supreme Court of Missouri, where the decision was reversed and sent back. It was taken to the Circuit Court; the pleadings were made to this extent, that a plea of abatement was made—Dred Scott bringing an action declaring that, *vi et armis*, one Sanford had assaulted him, as also Harriet Scott his wife, and children. To this, Sanford, who is also upon the record, and admitted to be, I know not if in reality, a citizen of New-York, pleaded, in abatement, that Dred Scott and his wife and children were his slaves, and that being slaves, or rather, to use the language as used in the pleadings, that he was the descendant of African slaves, a man of color, a negro, and therefore he could not be a citizen of the United States; and Sanford called upon the Court to throw the case out of Court, that they had no jurisdiction, and that he (Sanford) should hold, as master, Dred Scott.

So far as the Dred Scott decision became a law of the United States, it is simply thus that after the case was twice argued in the Supreme Court of the United States, a majority, standing seven to two, of the Justices, decided that a man of African blood, descended from parents once slaves, could not be citizens of the United States, and therefore the Court having no jurisdiction, it was returned, with instructions to sustain the Circuit Court. That is what they decided. Now I desire to state, that in my humble judgment, Dred Scott was not the slave of Sanford, and being a free man and a man of color, according to the Constitution of the United States when it was made, he had a right to sue, and had a right to be relieved from this existence of *vi et armis*, and that was the opinion of Justices McLean and Curtis, and every lawyer that has read the decision of the Court in Howard's Reports, that I have spoken to upon the subject, has invariably said to me that the opinion of Justice Curtis is the most conclusive piece of judicial logic ever presented in all the books of judicial decisions. I have it at home, and I declare that in my judgment there is no proposition in Euclid more clearly demonstrated than that. Not that Dred Scott had a right to citizenship, to hold office and vote—rights which many white persons, as for instance women, have not—but that he had a right to the protection afforded by law; that being a free man, by being carried first into a free State and then to the Territory ceded to the United States by France, he had a right to sue and be sued. He never declared that Scott was entitled to all the privileges of a citizen, but the Constitution says: "The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States."

And if Kentucky determines that the black man cannot hold office in the Commonwealth, a black man coming from Massachusetts cannot hold office; he is but entitled to the protection of the laws given for the protection of his own race and condition.

The Dred Scott decision was gotten up entirely by the Democratic party, and it was made in 1856, after the election of President Buchanan, and intended to sustain the Kansas-Nebraska Bill.

In passing, allow me to say that we make no issue with the Supreme Court on that subject. We acknowledge the Supreme Court decision to be the supreme law of the land, and deny the allegation that we intend illegally and factiously to resist the decision of that Court, and force a kind of citizenship upon the country with which we have nothing to do. So far then for the Dred Scott decision.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

A Spiteful Revenge.

A young man residing in town, who has been a regular visitant at the residence of a lady, and whose attendance upon the same was understood as a prelude to an eventual proposal, was sitting by her side at the family tea-table on a late evening, when, during the course of a rather jovial conversation, the mother of the lady turned upon him with the smiling question: "When are you and M— going to get married?" The gentleman responded, with an appearance of great astonishment, that he had never entertained any such intention, and proceeded to joke upon the idea. The young lady immediately arose without a word, and went into a room adjoining, from whence she shortly returned, with a bottle of vitriol in her hand, and, without a syllable or gesture of warning, dashed the terrible fluid into the unsuspecting face of him whom she had supposed her lover, shockingly disfiguring its features, instantly destroying the sight of one eye, and injuring its fellow hopelessly.—*Buffalo Courier.*

A well-known ivory-comb manufacturer, in Connecticut, who, by the way, has almost a monopoly of that branch of trade, on being waited upon to sign the late proslavery manufacturers' convention in that state, said, "No! gentlemen, I won't do it; if the South don't want my combs they may go lousy!" Totally depraved, that manufacturer.

A man was arrested in Virginia a few days since, and being informed that he was suspected of having been engaged in the insurrection at Harper's Ferry, replied "that he didn't know Harper, nor where he kept his d—d old ferry."—He was acquitted.