

THE JEFFERSONIAN

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

VOL 19.

STROUDSBURG, MONROE COUNTY, PA. MAY 17, 1860.

NO. 19.

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.
EPAvertisements 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. DECKWORTH. JOHN HAYN
To Country Dealers.
DUCKWORTH & HAYN,
WHOLESALE DEALERS IN
Groceries, Provisions, Liquors, &c.
No. 80 Dry street, New York.
June 16, 1859.—ly.*

Ministering Spirits.
It is a beautiful belief,
That ever round our head,
Are hovering on noiseless wing,
The spirits of the dead.

It is a beautiful belief,
When ended our career,
That it will be our ministry
To watch o'er others here;
To lend a moral to the flower,
Breathe wisdom to the wind,
To hold commune at night's late hour,
With the imprisoned mind;
To bid the mourner cease to mourn,
The trembling be forgiven;
To bear away from ills of clay,
The infant to its heaven.

Alice Carey has written four as beautiful lines as can be found in the English language:—
Among the pitfalls in our way,
The best of us walk blindly!
So man, be wary, watch and pray,
And judge your brother kindly.

The Court Duns.
The court room often furnishes a large amount of variety and incident for a hearty laugh, but the gravity of the bench and the respect for the law rather suppress our mirth. At our Washington County Circuit court, held at Salem, in January, 1858, Mr. Justice Potter presided. Judge P. resides at Schenectady, and is sometimes a wag, but by way of relief from the cares of the bench.

While presiding, and engaged in taking the testimony of a witness then on the stand, he was suddenly interrupted by a son of the Emerald Isle, who, with hat in hand, approached Judge P., and asked id a loud voice:
"Will the court pay me what he owes me?"
"Judge P. raised his head, and stared at Pat in astonishment at so unexpected a pun in public, but observing by Pat's air that he was honest in his demand, and thinking that, perhaps, he was one of the help at the hotel where he was stopping, and had done him some trifling service, the Judge said,
"I don't owe you anything: what do I owe you?"
"And haven't I bin attendin' yer court these three days?"
"I did not send for you; what have you been attending for?" inquired Judge P.
"And didn't yer District Attorney send for me to swear before the Grand Jury?"
The truth flashed across Judge P.'s mind; Pat was a witness on behalf of the people, and wanted pay for his attendance. Judge P. directed the proper officer to swear him, and pay him if he needed relief; and then joined in a quiet laugh with bar and jury at so unexpected a dun.

The publishers of the *New York Christian Advocate and Journal* have received a communication from a Virginia postmaster, that he has decided not to permit that paper to be circulated through his office.

A young man has up-sprung in New York, who has been gifted with unprecedented powers of calculation. He carries about with him, for their exhibition, a wooden slate and a piece of chalk. On this slate, in one instance, which were replete with the heavier numerals. Mr. Hutchinson (this is the phenomenon's name) was not permitted to see the figures until they were all marked down.—He then seized the chalk and with a convulsive jerk put down at the bottom the correct sum total, with a rapidity that scarcely allowed him time to glance at the figures. The youth does, with the same lightning rapidity, sums in cube and square root. He says he makes his calculations by a definite system. He is engaged by Barnum, and will give lessons at the museum.

Near Warren, Connecticut, is posted on a meadow fence the following:
Notice—Know hows is loud in these medders, eny man ore woman letters there knows run the road wot gits inter my medders aforesed shal have his tale cut off by me, Obadiah Rogers.

NATIONAL POLITICS.

A SPEECH

Delivered at the Cooper Institute, N. Y.

BY

ABRAHAM LINCOLN, of Illinois.

The sum of the whole is, that of our "thirty-nine" fathers who framed the original Constitution, twenty-one—a clear majority of the whole—certainly understood that no proper division of local from Federal authority, nor any part of the Constitution, forbade the Federal Government to control Slavery in the Federal Territories; while all the rest probably had the same understanding. Such, unquestionably, was the understanding of our fathers who framed the original Constitution; and the text affirms that they understood the question better than we.

But, so far, I have been considering the understanding of the question manifested by the framers of the original Constitution. In, and by, the original instrument, a mode was provided for amending it; and, as I have already stated, the present frame of Government under which we live consists of that original and twelve amendatory articles framed and adopted since. Those who now insist that Federal control of Slavery in Federal Territories violates the Constitution, point us to the provisions which they suppose it thus violates; and, as I understand, they all fix upon provisions in these amendatory articles, and not in the original instrument. The Supreme Court, in the Dred Scott case, plant themselves upon the fifth amendment, which provides that "no person shall be deprived of property without due process of law;" while Senator Douglas and his peculiar adherents plant themselves upon the tenth amendment, providing that "the powers not granted by the Constitution, are reserved to the States respectively, and to the people."

Now, it so happens that these amendments were framed by the first Congress which sat under the Constitution—the identical Congress which passed the act already mentioned, enforcing the prohibition of Slavery in the North-Western Territory. Not only was it the same Congress, but they were the identical, same individual men who, at the same session, and at the same time within the session, had under consideration, and in progress toward maturity, these Constitutional amendments and this act prohibiting Slavery in all the territory the nation then owned. The Constitutional amendments were introduced before and passed after the act enforcing the Ordinance of '87; so that during the whole pendency of the act to enforce the Ordinance, the Constitutional amendments were also pending.

That Congress, consisting in all of seventy six members, including sixteen of the framers of the original Constitution, as before stated, were pre-eminently our fathers who framed that part of the Government under which we live which is now claimed as forbidding the Federal Government to control Slavery in the Federal Territories.

It is not a little presumptuous in any one at this day to affirm that the two things which that congress deliberately framed and carried to maturity at the same time, are absolutely inconsistent with each other? And does not such affirmation become impudently absurd when coupled with the other affirmation, from the same mouth, that those who did the two things alleged to be inconsistent understood whether they really were inconsistent better than we—better than he who affirms that they are inconsistent?

It is surely safe to assume that the "thirty-nine" framers of the original Constitution, and the seventy-six members of the Congress which framed the amendments thereto, taken together, do certainly include those who may be fairly called "our fathers who framed the Government under which we live." And so assuming I defy any man to show that any one of them ever in his whole life declared that, in his understanding, any proper division of local from Federal authority, or any part of the Constitution, forbade the Federal Government to control as to Slavery in the Federal Territories. To those who now so declare, I give not only "our fathers who framed the Government under which we live," but with them all other living men within the century in which it was framed, among whom to search, and they shall not be able to find the evidence of a single man agreeing with them.

Now, and here, let me guard a little against being misunderstood. I do not mean to say we are bound to follow implicitly in whatever our fathers did. To do so, would be to discard all the lights of current experience—to reject all progress—all improvement. What I do say is, that if we would supplant the opinions and policy of our fathers in any case, we should do so upon evidence so conclusive, and argument so clear, that even their great authority, fairly considered and weighed, cannot stand; and most surely not in a case whereof we ourselves declare they understood the question better than we.

Let a proper division of local from Federal authority, or any part of the Constitution, forbids the Federal Government to control as to Slavery in the Federal Territories, he is right to say so, and to enforce his position by all truthful evidence and fair argument which he can.—But he has no right to mislead others who have less access to history and less leisure to study it, into the false belief that "our fathers, who framed the Government under which we live," were of the same opinion—thus substituting falsehood and deception for truthful evidence and fair argument. If any man at this day sincerely believes "our fathers, who framed the Government under which we live," used and applied principles, in other cases, which ought to have let them understand that a proper division of local from Federal authority, or some part of the Constitution, forbids the Federal Government to control as to Slavery in the Federal Territories, he is right to say so.—But he should, at the same time brave the responsibility of declaring that, in his opinion, he understands their principles better than they did themselves; and especially should he not shrink that responsibility by asserting that they "understood the question just as well, and even better than we do now."

But enough. Let all who believe that "our fathers, who framed the Government under which we live, understood this question just as well, and even better than we do now," speak as they spoke, and act as they acted upon it.—This is all the Republicans ask—all Republicans desire—in relation to Slavery. As those fathers marked it, so let it be again marked, as an evil not to be extended, but to be tolerated and protected only because of and so far as its actual presence among us makes that toleration and protection a necessity. Let all the guaranties those fathers gave it be, not grudgingly, but fully and fairly, maintained. For this Republicans contend, and with this, so far as I know or believe, they will be content.

And now, if they would listen—as I suppose they will not—I would address a few words to the Southern people. I would say to them: You consider yourselves a reasonable and a just people; and I consider that in the general qualities of reason and justice you are not inferior to any other people. Still when you speak of us Republicans, you do so only to denounce us as reptiles, or at best as no better than outlaws. You will grant a hearing to pirates or murderers, but nothing like it to "Black Republicans." In all your contentions with one another, each of you deems an unconditional condemnation of "Black Republicanism" as the first thing to be attended to. Indeed such condemnation of us seems to be an indispensable pre-requisite—license, so to speak—among you to be admitted or permitted to speak at all.

Now, can you, or not, be prevailed upon to pause and to consider whether this is quite just to us, or even to yourselves? Bring forward your charges and specifications, and then be patient long enough to hear us deny or justify.

You say we are sectional. We deny it. That makes an issue; and the burden of proof is upon you. You produce your proof; and what is it? Why, that our party has existence in your section—gets no votes in your section. The fact is substantially true; but does it prove the issue? If it does, then in case we should, without change of principle, begin to get votes in your section, we should thereby cease to be sectional. You cannot escape this conclusion; and yet, are you willing to abide by it? If you are, you will probably soon find that we have ceased to be sectional, for we shall get votes in your section this very year. You will then begin to discover, as the truth plainly is, that your proof does not touch the issue. The fact that we get no votes in your section is a fact of your making, and not of ours. And if there be fault in that fact, that fault is primarily yours, and remains so until you show that we repel you by some wrong principle or practice. If we do repel you by any wrong principle or practice, the fault is ours; but this brings you to where you ought to have started—to a discussion of the right or wrong of our principle. If our principle, put in practice, would wrong your section for the benefit of ours, or for any other object, then our principle, and we with it, are sectional, and are justly opposed and denounced as such. Meet us, then, on the question of whether our principle, put in practice, would wrong your section; and so meet it as if it were possible that something may be said on our side. Do you accept the challenge? No! Then you really believe that the principle which our fathers who framed the Government under which we live thought so clearly right as to adopt it, and endorse it again, and again, upon their official oaths, is, in fact, so clearly wrong as to demand your condemnation without a moment's consideration.

Some of you delight to flout in our faces the warning against sectional parties given by Washington in his Farewell Address. Less than eight years before Washington gave that warning, he had, as President of the United States, approved and signed an act of Congress, enforcing the prohibition of Slavery in the North-Western Territory, which set embodied the policy of the Government upon that subject, up to and at the very moment he penned that warning; and about one year after he penned it he wrote La Fayette that he considered that prohibitions wise measure, expressing in the same connection his hope that we some time have a confederacy of free States.

Bearing this in mind, and seeing that sectionalism has since arisen upon this subject, is that warning a warning against us, or in our hands against you? Could Washington himself speak, would he cast the blame of that sectionalism upon us, who sustain his policy, or upon you who repudiate it? We respect that warning of Washington, and we commend it to you, together with his example pointing to the right application of it.

But you say you are conservative—eminently conservative—while we are revolutionary, destructive, or something of the sort. What is conservatism? Is it not adherence to the old and tried, against the new and untried? We stick to, contend for, the identical old policy on the point in controversy which was adopted by our fathers who framed the Government under which we live; while you with one accord reject, and scout, and spit upon that old policy, and insist upon substituting something new. True, you disagree among yourselves as to what that substitute shall be. You have considerable variety of new propositions and plans, but you are unanimous in rejecting and denouncing the old policy of the fathers. Some of you are for reviving the foreign slave-trade; some for a Congressional Slave-Code for the Territories; some for Congress forbidding the Territories to prohibit Slavery within their limits; some for maintaining Slavery in the Territories through the Judiciary; some for the "great principle" that "if one man would enslave another, no third man should object," fantastically called "Popular Sovereignty"; but never a man among you in favor of Federal prohibition of Slavery in Federal Territories, according to the practice of our fathers who framed the Government under which we live. Not one of all your various plans can show a precedent or an advocate in the century within which our Government originated.—Consider, then, whether your claim of conservatism for yourselves, and your charge of destructiveness against us, are based on the most clear and stable foundations.

Again, you say we have made the Slavery question more prominent than it formerly was. We deny it. We admit that it is more prominent but we deny that we made it so. It was not we, but you, who discarded the old policy of the fathers. We resisted, and still resist, your innovation; and thence comes the greater prominence of the question. Would you have that question reduced to its former proportions? Go back to that old policy. What has been will be again, under the same conditions. If you would have the peace of the old times, re-adopt the precepts and policy of the old times.

You charge that we stir up insurrections among your slaves. We deny it; and what is your proof? Harper's Ferry! John Brown!! John Brown was no Republican; and you have failed to implicate a single Republican in his Harper's Ferry enterprise. If any member of our party is guilty in that matter, you know it or do you not know it. If you do know it, you are inexcusable to not designate the man and prove the fact. If you do not know it, you are inexcusable to assert it, and especially to persist in the assertion after you have tried and failed to make the proof. You need not be told that persisting in a charge which one does not know to be true, is simply malicious slander.

Some of you admit that no Republican designedly aided or encouraged the Harper's Ferry affair; but still insist that our doctrines and declarations necessarily lead to such results. We do not believe it.—We know we hold to no doctrines, and make no declarations, which were not held to and made by our fathers who framed the Government under which we live. You never dealt fairly by us in relation to this affair. When it occurred, some important State elections were near at hand, and you were in evident glee with the belief that, by charging the blame upon us, you would get an advantage of us in those elections. The elections came, and your expectations were not quite fulfilled. Every Republican man knew that, as to himself at least, your charge was a slander, and he was not much inclined by it to cast his vote in your favor. Republican doctrines and declarations are accompanied with a continual protest against any interference whatever with your slaves, or with you about your slaves. Surely, this does not encourage them to revolt. True, we do in common with our fathers who framed the Government under which we live, declare our belief that Slavery is wrong; but the slaves do not hear us declare even this. For anything we say or do, the slaves would scarcely know there is a Republican party. I believe they would not, in fact, generally know it but for your misrepresentations of us, in their hearing.—In your political contentions among yourselves, each faction charges the other with sympathy with Black Republicanism; and then, to give point to the charge, defines Black Republicanism to simply be insurrection, blood and thunder among the slaves.

(To be Continued.)

A wife's farewell to her husband every morning—"Buy and buy."

Eloquent Passage from the Speech of Mr. Lovejoy.

Mr. Lovejoy.

One of the earliest settlements of Virginia was made by a fugitive slave. John Smith was captured in war and sold to a high-toned, chivalrous Turk, and put to the task of threshing. The master rode up to the barn door, one day, and said, "Jack, you rascal, why don't you thresh faster?" Jack—horresco referens!—flew at his master, killed him with his flail, (oh, for a Harper's Ferry Committee!) sprang into the vacant saddle, and escaped, and came and settled Jamestown. Oh, for a South-side preacher to admonish John to stay and serve his master, whose property he was, like a good "Christian dog!" A moment, Sir. Let us look at this question aside from its moral aspects. And I want to know what right slavery, or a slaveholder, has to go with slaves into the common Territories of the United States. You talk about the equality of the States, and I grant it. The citizens of a slave State have all the rights in the Territories that a citizen of a free State has. You have the right, I concede, to go into the common Territories and live there with any kind of property we can take, but you have not the right to take slaves. This is the distinction I make. At a liberal estimate there are not more than two millions of people in the United States interested in slave labor. There are only four hundred thousand slaveholders.—There are thirty millions of people in this country. There are twenty-eight millions interested in the system of free labor, and two millions in that of slave labor. The free system accommodates some eight millions in the slave States better than the slave system. Here is the point. If slavery goes into the Territories, free labor cannot go there. The presence of slavery without any local law for the purpose, is the exclusion of free labor.—If you take slavery there, I cannot go there with the N. Y. Tribune, the Evening Post, the Independent, or any similar paper, religious or secular. I cannot go with the minister I desire to hear preach the gospel. Free schools cannot go there. You say, indeed, we can go. Yes; so all may go to a public house. It is common to all who choose to make it their temporary abode. All are invited to the table d'hôte. The landlord opens the door of the dining hall, and says, "Walk in, gentlemen!" but if a man sitting there is leprous, dripping with a contagious disease, no one will go in. It is really as much an exclusion as if the doors were closed and barred against his entrance. So, if slavery goes, freedom cannot go. I favor the equality of the States. I favor the right of every citizen of a slave State to go into the Territories; but I deny that he has the right to practice slaveholding there, for it is not an institution—it was never instituted—never established by law—but a practice like polygamy. I say that they have not a right to go there and practice this high crime, so injurious to man, and so offensive to God. And this is the question: whether these twenty-eight million people shall be accommodated, or two millions people shall be accommodated? For, I repeat, the presence of slavery is the utter exclusion of free labor and the institutions of freedom. I deny no one their rights. The slave States are equal to the free States. It is a poor, pitiful and paltry patriotism that cannot take in the entire extent of its country; but I do deny that slavery has the same right as freedom in this country. Freedom is the Isaac; slavery is the heir of promise. Slavery is the Hagar and Ishmael, and they must go into the wilderness, and freedom shall have the entire inheritance. God and the fathers gave it to freedom and free institutions. It belongs to freedom—not to me; not to the citizens of the free States, but to freedom, to the utter exclusion of slaveholding. Now, gentlemen, I know you are in a mood to take a little advice. (Laughter.) I tell you I love you all—(Renewed laughter.)

Mr. McQUEEN.—I utterly repudiate your love.

Mr. LOVEJOY.—Sinners did that of Christ but he loved them still. (Laughter.)

Mr. McQUEEN.—I do not think he loves you much.

Mr. LOVEJOY.—I am afraid that I am not much like him. He went, however, and preached to the spirits in the prison, and I think I never approximated so nearly to him as in this regard, while making proclamation of the holy evangel of God to sinners in this House. I tell you of the slave States that you must emancipate your slaves. It belongs to you and not to us. You must transform them from slaves into serfs, and give them homes, and protect and guard the sanctity of the family. We shall not push you. If you say that you want a quarter of a century, you can have it; if you want half a century, you can have it. But I insist that this system must ultimately be extinguished. There is no question about it. You who advocate the perpetuity of slavery are like a set of mad-men, who should place themselves on the top of an iceberg which had disengaged itself from the frozen regions of the North, and begun to float downward and downward, through the warm climates. The sun shines and melts it; the soft winds blow on and melt it; the rains descend and melt it; the water ripples round it and melts it; and then these wild visionaries,

who fancied they could sail an iceberg through the tropics, start up and blaspheme sunshine, and rain, and zephyr; and mousing the heavens, tell Jehovah that unless he stops the shining of the sun, and the blowing of the winds, and the falling of the rain, they will crumble his universe "from turret to foundation stone." (Great laughter.) Do you not think God would feel bad; and would not the arch-angles tremble at the chivvry? (Renewed laughter.) You may call this extravagant; but you can no more perpetuate slavery, and will no more dissolve this Union, in order to perpetuate it, than you can stop the shining of the sun, or the ripple of the sea, the descent of the rain, or the blowing of the wind, &c., no more than you can subdue the ocean when it lashes itself into fury and dashes its erected mountain billows against the rocks. It is as preposterous to think of taking slavery down through the civilization of the age as it is to think of floating an iceberg through the tropics. It is not in the order of things. I am willing to concede that you can do anything that any equal number of men can achieve. I did mean to taunt you about Harper's Ferry, but I believe I will not. I am willing to concede that you are as brave as other men; although I do not think you show it by this abusive language; because brave men are always calm and self-possessed. God feels no anger, for he knows no fear. I say, you can do anything that other men can do. You can preserve and perpetuate this system, if any equal number of men could do it; but the stars in their courses are fighting against you; God, in his providence, is fighting against you.—The universe was established upon the great principle of justice and truth. It may be jostled out of its place for a little while, but it will, sooner or later, fall back to its grooves. You must sacrifice slavery for the good of your country. Do this, and you will have the sympathy, the prayers, and the co-operation of the entire nation. Refuse or neglect this, refuse to proclaim liberty through all the land, to all the inhabitants thereof, and the Exodus of the slave will be through the Red Sea. It is a well-known physiological as well as psychological fact, that ancestral characteristics re-appear after a long interval of years, and even of generations, as streams disappear and gush out at a distant point. It is also well known that the Saxon blood is being infiltrated into the blood of the enslaved. By and by, some Marion will be found calling his guerrilla troops from the swamps and everglades of South Carolina; and a Patrick Henry will re-appear in the Old Dominion, shouting, as of old, "Give us liberty, or give us death!" Then will transpire those scenes which troubled the prophetic vision of Jefferson, and made him tremble for his country, when he remembered that God was just, and that his justice would not sleep forever, and that every divine attribute would be arrayed upon the side of the struggling bondmen. And he justified the uprising, by saying the little finger of American slavery was thicker than the lions of British despotism. Sir, Virginia cannot afford, the country cannot afford, to continue a practice fraught with so much of peril. It is better to remove the magazine, than to be kept evermore in dread of a lighted match. The future glory and usefulness of this nation cannot be sacrificed to this system of crime. The nations of the earth are taught by our example. The American Republic must repose Queen among the nations of the earth. Slavery must die. Oathsgo est delenda. The philosophy, therefore, and the lesson which the slave States ought to have learned from John Brown, and from all these events, are not these expressions of rage and vengeance. Instead of being stimulated to revenge, Virginia ought to have learned the lesson of penitence. Instead of arraying herself in sheep's gray, she ought to have put on sackcloth and ashes. Instead of imbibing the distillation of corn, mixed with the products of the poultry-yard, she ought to have drunk the waters of bitterness, in view of her sin of slaveholding.

Mr. MARTIN, (Va.)—And if you come among us, we will do with you as we did with John Brown—hang you up as high as Haman. I say that as a Virginian.

Mr. LOVEJOY.—I have no doubt of it. (Here the hammer fell.)

The Lafayette Journal says the Sheriff of that county recently took a young fellow to the Lunatic Asylum from that place, who is remarkably handsome, and whose insanity is believed to have been produced by a morbid development of his self-conceit. Vanity is not satisfied with making people crazy—it has more victims in the grave than the cholera.

Shocking Accident.

Augusta, Ga., Monday, May 7, 1860.
It is reported and believed that twenty nine girls and boys, who were on a picnic and fishing party, were drowned in Boykin's mill-pond, near Camden, S. C. on Saturday. The boat sunk in the middle of the pond. The water has been drawn off, and nineteen bodies have been found. No names have yet been learned.

Charles Lever, in one of his stories, tells of a dashing individual who boiled his hams in sherry wine, whereat an honest Irishman exclaimed, "Bedad, I wish I was a pig myself."