

THE JEFFERSONIAN

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

VOL. 19. STROUDSBURG, MONROE COUNTY, PA. MAY 10, 1860. NO. 18

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.

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, Justices, 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 Dey street, New York.
June 16, 1859.—1y.*

NATIONAL POLITICS.

A SPEECH

Delivered at the Cooper Institute, N. Y.

BY

ABRAHAM LINCOLN, of Illinois.

The Hon. Abraham Lincoln of Illinois, the great antagonist of Senator Douglas, gave in the Cooper Institute, a lecture on National Politics. Although there was an admission fee for the benefit of the Plymouth Church course of lectures, the seats of the great hall were nearly all filled, and a large number of people preferred standing to sitting in the rear seats. Upon the platform were ex-Gov. John A. King, David Dudley Field, Wm. C. Bryant, Gen. James W. Nye, Alms-House Governor Isaac J. Oliver and Washington Smith, Delsfield Smith, Dr. S. Lousberry, A. J. Dittenhoeffer, esq., Judge E. D. Calver, Theodore Tilton, Thomas B. Stillman, Samuel Sinclair, J. S. Gibbons, in fine it was crowded with distinguished Republicans. A considerable number of ladies graced the occasion by their presence.

Mr. Lincoln was escorted into the room by David Dudley Field and Wm. C. Bryant, amid loud and prolonged applause. Mr. FIELD said:

Pellucis Republicans: I beg leave to nominate as Chairman of this meeting a Republican whom you all know well—William Cullen Bryant. [Cheers.] Those of you who are in favor of Mr. Bryant will say Aye. [General and thunderous "aye."] Those of you who are not in favor will say No. [Silence.] There is no No. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Bryant on taking the chair, said:

My friends, it is a grateful office that I perform in introducing to you at this time an eminent citizen of the West whom you know, or whom you have known hitherto only by fame, but who has consented to address a New-York assemblage this evening. The Great West, my friends, is a potent auxiliary in the battle we are fighting for Freedom against Slavery; in behalf of civilization against barbarism; for the occupation of some of the fairest regions of our continent, on which the settlers are now building their cities. I say a higher and a wiser agency than that of man in the causes that have filled with a hardy population the vast and fertile region which forms the western part of the Valley of the Mississippi, a race of men who are not ashamed to till their acres with their own hands, and who would be ashamed to subsist by the labor of the slave. [Cheers.] These children of the West, my friends, form a living bulwark against the advances of Slavery, and from them is recruited the vanguard of the armies of Liberty. [Applause.] One of them will appear before you this evening. I present to you a gallant soldier of the political campaign of 1856, who then rendered good service to the Republican cause, and who was since the champion of that cause in the struggle which took place two years later for the supremacy in the Legislature of Illinois, who took the field then against Douglas, and who would have then won victory but for the unjust apportionment law of the State, which allowed a minority of the people to elect the majority of the legislature. I have only, my friends, to pronounce the name of Abraham Lincoln of Illinois (loud cheering)—I have only to pronounce his name, to secure your profoundest attention. [Continued applause, and "Three cheers for Abraham Lincoln!"]

Mr. Lincoln then, after prolonged applause, said:

Mr. President and Fellow-Citizens of New York: The facts with which I shall deal this evening are mainly old and familiar; nor is there anything new in the general use I shall make of them. If there shall be any novelty, it will be in the mode of presenting the facts, and the inferences and observations following that presentation.

In his speech last Autumn, at Columbus, Ohio, as reported in *The New-York Times*, Senator Douglas said:

"Our fathers when they framed the Government under which we live, understood this question just as well, and even better than we do now."

I fully endorse this, and adopt it as a text for this discourse. I so adopt because it furnishes a precise and an agreed starting point for a discussion between Republicans and that wing of the Democracy headed by Senator Douglas. It simply leaves the inquiry: "What was the understanding those fathers had of the question mentioned?"

What is the frame of Government under which we live?

The answer must be: "The Constitution of the United States." That Constitution consists of the original, framed in 1787 (and under which the present Government first went into operation), and twelve subsequently framed amendments, the first ten of which were framed in 1789.

Who were our fathers that framed the Constitution? I suppose the "thirty-nine" who signed the original instrument may be fairly called our fathers who framed that part of the present Government. It is almost exactly true to say they framed it, and it is altogether true to say they fairly represented the opinion and sentiment of the whole nation at that time.—The names, being familiar to nearly all, and accessible to quite all, need not now be repeated.

I take these "thirty-nine," for the present, as being "our fathers who framed the Government under which we live."

What is the question which, according to the text those fathers understood just as well, and even better than we do now?

It is this: Does the proper division of local from Federal authority, or anything in the Constitution, forbid our Federal Government to control as to Slavery in our Federal Territories?

Upon this, Douglas holds the affirmative, and Republicans the negative. This affirmative and denial form an issue; and this issue—this question—is precisely what the text declares our fathers understood better than we.

Let us now inquire whether the "thirty-nine" or any of them, ever acted upon this question; and if they did, how they acted upon it—how they expressed that better understanding.

In 1784—three years before the Constitution—the United States then owning the North-Western Territory, and no other—the Congress of the Confederation had before them the question of prohibiting Slavery in that Territory; and four of the "thirty-nine" who afterward framed the Constitution were in that Congress, and voted on that question. Of these, Roger Sherman, Thomas Mifflin, and Hugh Williamson voted for the prohibition—thus showing that, in the understanding, no line dividing local from Federal authority, nor anything else, properly forbade the Federal Government to control as to Slavery in Federal territory. The other of the four—James McHenry—voted against the prohibition, showing that, for some cause, he thought it improper to vote for it.

In 1787, still before the Constitution, but while the Convention was in session framing it, and while the North-Western Territory still was the only territory owned by the United States—the same question of prohibiting Slavery in the Territory again came before the Congress of the Confederation; and three more of the "thirty-nine" who afterward signed the Constitution, were in that Congress and voted on the question. They were W. Blount, William Few, and Abraham Baldwin; and they all voted for the prohibition—thus showing that, in their understanding, no line dividing local from Federal authority, nor anything else, properly forbade the Federal Government to control as to Slavery in Federal territory. This time the prohibition became a law, being a part of what is now well known as the Ordinance of 87.

The question of Federal control of Slavery in the Territories, seems not to have been directly before the Convention which framed the original Constitution; and hence it is not recorded that the "thirty-nine" or any of them, while engaged on that instrument, expressed any opinion on that precise question.

In 1789, by the first Congress which sat under the Constitution, an act was passed to enforce the Ordinance of '87, including the prohibition of Slavery in North-Western Territory. The bill for this act was reported by one of the "thirty-nine," Thomas Fitzsimmons, then a Member of the House of Representatives from Pennsylvania. It went through all its stages without a word of opposition, and finally passed both branches without Yea and Nays, which is equivalent to a unanimous passage. In this Congress there were sixteen of the "thirty-nine" fathers who framed the original Constitution. They were:

- | | |
|------------------|--------------------|
| John Langdon, | Thos. Fitzsimmons, |
| Nicholas Gilman, | William Few, |
| Wm. S. Johnson, | Abraham Baldwin, |
| Roger Sherman, | Rufus King, |
| Robert Morris, | William Patterson, |
| George Clymer, | Richard Bassett, |
| George Read, | Pierce Butler, |
| Daniel Carroll, | James Madison. |

This shows that, in their understanding, no line dividing local from Federal authority, nor anything in the Constitution, properly forbade Congress to prohibit Slavery in the Federal Territory; else both their fidelity to correct principle, and their oath to support the Constitution, would have constrained them to oppose the prohibition.

Again, George Washington, another of the "thirty-nine," was then President of the United States, and as such, approved and signed the bill, thus complaining its validity as a law, and thus showing that, in his understanding, no line dividing local from Federal authority, nor anything in the Constitution, forbade the Federal Government to control as to Slavery in Federal Territory.

No great while after the adoption of

the original Constitution, North Carolina ceded to the Federal Government the country now constituting the State of Tennessee; and a few years later Georgia ceded that which now constitutes the States of Mississippi and Alabama. In both deeds of cession it was made a condition by the ceding States that the Federal Government should not prohibit Slavery in the ceded country. Under these circumstances, Congress, on taking charge of these countries, did not absolutely prohibit Slavery within them. But they did interfere with it—take control of it—even there to a certain extent. In 1798, Congress organized the Territory of Mississippi. In the act of organization they prohibited the bringing of slaves into the Territory, from any place without the United States, by fine, and giving freedom to slaves so brought. This act passed both branches of Congress without Yea and Nays. In that Congress were three of the "thirty-nine" who framed the original Constitution. They were John Langdon, George Read, and Abraham Baldwin. They all, probably, voted for it. Certainly they would have placed their opposition to it upon record, if, in their understanding, any line dividing local from Federal authority, or anything in the Constitution, properly forbade the Federal Government to control as to Slavery in Federal Territory.

In 1803, the Federal Government purchased the Louisiana country. Our former territorial acquisitions came from certain of our own States; but this Louisiana country was acquired from a foreign nation. In 1804, Congress gave a Territorial organization to that part of it which now constitutes the State of Louisiana.—New Orleans, lying within that part, was an old and comparatively large city.—There were other considerable towns and settlements, and Slavery was extensively and thoroughly intermingled with the people. Congress did not, in the Territorial act, prohibit Slavery; but they did interfere with it—take control of it—in a more marked and extensive way than they did in the case of Mississippi. The substance of the provision therein made, in relation to slaves, was:

First: That no slave should be imported into the Territory from foreign parts.

Second: That no slave should be carried into it who had been imported into the United States since the first day of May, 1798.

Third: That no slave should be carried into it, except by the owner, and for his own use as a settler; the penalty in all the cases being a fine upon the violator of the law, and freedom to the slave.

This act also was passed without Yea and Nays. In the Congress which passed it, there were two of the "thirty-nine."—They were Abraham Baldwin and Jonathan Dayton. As stated in the case of Mississippi, it is probably they both voted for it. They would not have allowed it to pass without recording their opposition to it, if, in their understanding, it violated either the line properly dividing local from Federal authority or any provision of the Constitution.

In 1819-20, came, and passed the Missouri question. Many votes were taken, by Yeas and Nays, in both branches of Congress, upon the various phases of the general question. Two of the "thirty-nine"—Rufus King and Charles Pickney—were members of that Congress. Mr. King steadily voted for Slavery prohibition and against all compromises, while Mr. Pickney as steadily voted against all compromises. By this Mr. King that in his understanding, no line dividing local from Federal authority, nor anything in the Constitution, was violated by Congress prohibiting Slavery in Federal Territory; while Mr. Pickney, by his votes, showed that in his understanding there was some sufficient reason for opposing such prohibition in that case.

The cases I have mentioned are the only acts of the "thirty-nine," or of any of them, upon the direct issue, which I have been able to discover.

To enumerate the persons who thus acted, as being four in 1784, three in 1787, seventeen in 1789, three in 1798, two in 1804, and two in 1819-20—there would be thirty-one of them. But this would be counting John Langdon Roger Sherman, William Few, Rufus King, and George Read, each twice, and Abraham Baldwin four times. The true number of those of the "thirty-nine" whom I have shown to have acted upon the question, which, by the text, they understood better than we, is twenty-three, leaving sixteen not shown to have acted upon it any way.

Here, then, we have twenty-three of our "thirty-nine" fathers who framed the Government under which we live, who have, upon their official responsibility and their corporal oaths, acted upon the very question which the text affirms they "understood just as well, and even better than we do now;" and twenty-one of them—a clear majority of the whole "thirty-nine"—so acting upon it as to make them guilty of gross political impropriety, and willful perjury, if in their understanding, any proper division between local and Federal authority, or anything in the Constitution they had made themselves, and sworn to support, forbade the Federal Government to control as to Slavery in the Federal Territories. Thus the twenty-one acted; and, as actions speak louder than words, so actions under such responsibility speak still louder.

Two of the twenty-three voted against

Congressional prohibition of Slavery in the Federal Territories, in the instances in which they acted upon the question.—But for what reasons they so voted is not known. They may have done so because they thought a proper division of local from Federal authority, or some provision or principle of the Constitution, stood in the way; or they may, without any such question, have voted against the prohibition, on what appeared to them to be sufficient grounds of expediency. No one who has sworn to support the Constitution, can conscientiously vote for what he understands to be an unconstitutional measure, however expedient he may think it; but one may and ought to vote against a measure which he deems constitutional, if, at the same time he deems it inexpedient. It, therefore, would be unsafe to set down even the two who voted against the prohibition, as having done so because, in their understanding, any proper division of local from Federal authority, or anything in the Constitution, forbade the Federal Government to control as to Slavery in Federal Territory.

The remaining sixteen of the "thirty-nine," so far as I have discovered, have left no record of their understanding upon the direct question of Federal control of Slavery in the Federal Territories.—But there is much reason to believe that their understanding upon that question would not have appeared different from that of their twenty-three compeers, had it been manifested at all.

For the purpose of adhering rigidly to the text, I have purposely omitted whatever understanding may have been manifested, by any person, however distinguished, other than the thirty-nine fathers who framed the original Constitution; and, for the same reason, I have also omitted whatever understanding may have been manifested by any of the "thirty-nine" even, on any other phase of the general question of Slavery. If we should look into their acts and declarations on those other phases, as the foreign slave trade, and the morality and policy of Slavery generally, it would appear to us that on the morality and policy of Slavery generally, would appear to us that on the direct question of Federal control of Slavery in Federal Territories, the sixteen, if they had acted at all, would probably have acted just as the twenty-three did. Among that sixteen were several of the most noted Anti-Slavery men of those times—as Dr. Franklin, Alexander Hamilton, Gouverneur Morris—while there was not one now known to have been otherwise, unless it may be John Rutledge of South Carolina.

(To be Continued.)

Don't Like Widowers.

In endeavoring to take the census for the government the marshals occasionally meet with such difficulties as will nigh to deprive them of their own senses. The following colloquy is said to have taken place somewhere, between a Marshal and an Irish woman:

"How many male members have you in the family?"

"Never a one."

"When were you married?"

"The day Pat Doyle left Tipperary for Ameriky. Ah, well I mind it. A sunshiner day never gilded the sky of ould Ireland."

"What was the condition of your husband before marriage?"

"Divil a man more miserable. He said if I did not give him a promise within two weeks he'd blow his brains out with a crowbar."

"Was he at the time of your marriage a widower or a bachelor?"

"A whiel! A widower, did you say? Ah, now go away with your nonsense.—It's the likes of me that would take up with a second-hand husband! Do I look like the wife of a widower! A poor devil all legs and consumption, like a sick turkey. A widower! May I never be blessed if I'd not rather live an ould maid, and bring up a family on butter-milk and praties!"

India Rubber Tools.

A new composition has recently been produced, the basis of which is India rubber combined with emery, from which are manufactured files, emery wheels, grindstones, hones, razor-strops, scythes, knives, sharpeners, and a variety of other articles of like nature. The files wrought from this new composition can be moulded into any desired size and form, and adapted to every variety of mechanical business in which the common rasp and file are employed. They can be made as rigid as the steel file, or as flexible and elastic as the original gum which forms the basis of the invention. Emery wheels and grindstones are wrought from this composition of every needed shape and size, from the coarsest grade of emery to the finest buffwheel. In point of economy, this new composition is claimed to be superior to any of the implements which it is destined to supersede, since the articles made from it are serviceable until the material of which they are composed is entirely worn away.

Mr. James Nelson, who stole the wife and clothing of Mr. Vail of Milford, and conveyed them to New York, has got "sick of his bargain," and wrote back to the husband, stating that he could have his wife by coming after her. This may be considered cooler than most of the weather has been for the last few weeks.

Life on the Moon.

The discoveries of science are becoming more astonishing every day; and in no department are these more interesting than the recent researches of astronomers in lunar geography.

Until quite recently, the surface of the moon has been supposed to be a vast lifeless desert. Astronomers have abused the moon in every possible way. They have said there was no heat in moonshine. They have denied the moon an atmosphere, and consequently water and organic life. They have made us believe that a residence in the moon would be exceedingly undesirable. The old faith in the Goddess of the Night was quite overturned in scientific circles, and the fascinations of moonlight were departing day by day.

But all this is changed, and the present acquaintance of long-eyed science with our satellite is very succinctly set forth in a summary carefully prepared for the New York Tribune, from which we learn that Knox and Melloni have shown, by very exact observations, that there is heat in the moon's rays. Zantedeschi has discovered that this heat produces a sensible effect upon the mimosa. An English philosopher has found that the earth is colder during the first quarter of the moon than it is in the second.

Upon the growth of plants the moon exercises a remarkable influence. The chemical action of light is necessary to their principal work, the absorption of carbon from the carbonic acid gas of the atmosphere. This work all plants carry on during the day and in the night they sleep—except when the moon shines.—She wakes them and sets them at work. So the farmers who plant only just before the full moon are right, and the seafishers who call them superstitious are themselves the foolish ones. For, is sown before or near new moon, the young plants get a love ground just at the fall, when the tender things need sleep. But if sown just before the full, they come up about new moon, pass their babyhood under the soothing influences of dark nights, and when the full moon comes are sturdy urchins, able to work night and day.

The moon-worshippers are right, also, in regard to the influence of the moon upon the weather. Herschel, Arago and Whewell recognised that the moon had some slight power in dispersing clouds.—The Sailors go further, and say the moon eats up the clouds. At the last meeting of the British Association, it was shown that the weather through a long series of years depended a little—a very little—upon the phases of the moon, and Quetelet, the Director of the Brussels Observatory, has shown that between the first and last quarters of the moon, more, and not less rain falls than during the remainder of the time. However, fine weather and greater rainfall may go together.

Finally, Webb, after a careful comparison of the present appearance of the moon with the very precise maps made by Madler some twenty years ago has shown that there have been considerable changes. Some of the small craters, in particular, have a notably different form from what they had when Madler observed them. These changes show the existence of water and an atmosphere. Father Scochi, Director of the Roman Observatory, after much observation has come to the conclusion that the peaks of the highest mountains on the moon are covered with snow. And, to make us still more at home on the moon, De la Rive, the owner of the observatory at Crawford, near London, gives it as his opinion that what were at first marked down as seas, and afterwards supposed to be barren plains, are in fact extensive forests. In support of this comes up a great astronomical authority—Schwabe, the discoverer of the periodic times of the sun's spots. Besides these great smooth plains, which were called seas, there are a number of furrows and wrinkles, nearly a hundred, the nature of which is entirely unknown. Their length varies from three to thirty-five miles, and their greatest breadth is about five thousand feet; most of them are considerably narrower. Their sides are parallel and smooth; some are run in straight lines, and some are gently curved. Ordinarily they are separate, but sometimes they seem to be cut off by them. They are found all over the surface of the moon, except on the highest mountain chains.

Of these furrows Schwabe has made careful study at various times. He found them to consist of very fine parallel dark lines, separated by clear spaces. A few months later, the lines of streaks had disappeared, but after a little while they returned, again to disappear. In this periodic change he thinks, that he finds proof that these lines are rows of trees, and the clear streaks between them are the bare ground seen when the trees are leafless; when the trees are in full leaf, the ground is so covered as to produce a uniform shade, and the lines disappear.

Nothing is more natural than to suppose that the dark spots on the moon are forests; but how shall we account for the growth of these trees in right lines? This hypothesis we must for the present consider to be only a hypothesis. With the aid of photography, which will secure for us accurate pictures of the moon from time to time, we may hope that the question will be solved, and that we may really find out what is going on upon the surface of our satellite.—N. Y. Tribune.

Big Brindle.

In Nashville, many years ago, there resided a gentleman of great hospitality, large fortune, and, though uneducated, possessed of hard-knot-sense. Col. W. had been elected to the legislature, and had also been judge of the county court.

His elevation, however, had made him somewhat pompous, and he became very fond of using big words. On his farm he had a large mischievous ox, called 'Big Brindle,' which frequently broke down his neighbor's fences, and committed other depredations, much to the Colonel's annoyance.

One morning, after breakfast, in presence of some gentlemen who had staid with him over night and who were on their way to town, he called his overseer and said to him:

"Mr. Allen, I desire you to impound Big Brindle, in order that I may have no more animaladversions on his eternal depredations."

Allen bowed and walked off, sorely puzzled to know what the Col. meant.

So after Col. W. left for town, he went to his wife and asked her what Col. W. meant by telling him to 'impound, the ox.

"Why, said she, 'the Colonel meant to tell you to put him in a pen."

Allen left to perform the feat, for it was no inconsiderable one as the animal was very wild and vicious, and, after a great deal of trouble and vexation, he succeeded.

"Well," said he, wiping the perspiration from his brow and soliloquizing, 'this is impounding, is it? Now I am dead sure the old Colonel will ask me if I impounded Big Brindle, and I'll but I puzzle him as bad as he did me."

The next day the Colonel gave a dinner party, and, as he was not aristocratic, Allen, the overseer, sat down with the company. After the second or third glass was discussed, the Colonel turned to the overseer and said—

"Eh, Mr. Allen, did you impound Big Brindle, sir?"

"Yes, I did, but old Brindle transcended the impound of the impound and scattered-lopplicated all over the equinimity of the forest."

The company burst into an immoderate fit of laughter, while the Colonel's face reddened with discomfiture.

"What do you mean by that sir?" said he.

"Why, I mean, Colonel," said Allen, that old Brindle being prognosticated with the idea of the cholery, ripped and tared, snorted and pawed dirt, jumped the fence, tuck to the woods, and would not be impounded no how!"

This was too much; the company roared again, in which the Colonel was forced to join and, in the midst of the laughter, Allen left the table, saying to himself as he went, 'I reckon the Col. won't ask me to impound any more oxen.'

Life's Happiest Period.

Kingeley gives his evidence on this disputed point. He thus declares: There is no pleasure that I have ever experienced like a child's midsummer holiday.—The time, I mean, when two or three of us used to go away up the brook, and take our dinners with us, and come home at night tired, dirty, happy, scratched beyond recognition, with a great nosegay, three little trout, and one shoe, the other having been used for a boat till it had gone down, with all hands, out of soundings. How poor our Derby days, our Greenwich dinners, our evening parties, where there are plenty of nice girls, are after that! Depend upon it, a man never experiences such pleasure or grief after fourteen as he does before, unless, in some cases, in his first love making, when the sensation is new to him.

We must knock under.

The *Family Pictorial*, a paper managed by ladies, has an item which completely takes the dignity out of the "Lords of Creation." Woman, says the editress, has many advantages over man. One of them is, that his will has no operation till he is dead, whereas, hers generally takes effect in her lifetime.

A Freak of Nature.

A cow belonging to Mr. Benjamin S. Breneman, of Providence township, this county, gave birth to a calf, a few days since, which was still-born, having two distinct heads joined together above the nostrils, with two sets of complete and perfectly formed organs, except the ears. There were two perfect ears, one on either side, and a third not fully developed, about the middle of the head.—Lancaster Union.

"You Don't Don't You!"

"Mister, I say, I don't suppose you don't know nobody what don't want to hire nobody to do nothing, don't you?" The answer was: "Yes, I don't."

A dying West India planter, groaning to his favorite servant, sighed out,—

"Ab, Sambo, I am going on a long, long journey." "Never mind, massa," said the negro, consoling, "it am all de way down hill."

Strawberries made their appearance in New York on Thursday, at three shillings a basket, and in three pint pails at \$2 each. Grapes were offered at \$3 a pound!