

THE JEFFERSONIAN

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

VOL 19. STROUDSBURG, MONROE COUNTY, PA. SEPTEMBER 20, 1860. NO. 36

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, Justice, Legal and other Blanks, Pamphlets, &c., printed with neatness and dispatch, on reasonable terms at this office.

Register's Notice.

NOTICE is hereby given to all persons interested in the estates of the respective decedents, that the following accounts have been filed in the Register's office of Monroe county, and will be presented for confirmation to the Orphans' Court of said county, at Stroudsburg, on Monday, the 24th day of September, 1860, at 10 o'clock, a. m.
The Account of Alexander Fowler and William S. Wintemute, Executors of William Fowler, late of the Borough of Stroudsburg, deceased.
The Account of Edward Brown, Administrator of Susan Brown, late of Stroud township, deceased.
The Account of James R. Andre and Charles R. Andre, Administrators of Leonard Andre, late of Stroud township, deceased.
First Account of Andrew Storm and Robert W. Swink, Executors of Peter Frederick, late of Stroud township, deceased.
The Account of Andrew Storm, Administrator of William Hinton, late of Hamilton township, deceased.
The Account of Abraham Fowler, Administrator of William Fowler, deceased.
WM. S. REES, Register.
Register's Office, Stroudsburg, Pa.
August 30, 1860.

JURY LIST, SEPTEMBER TERM, 1860.

GRAND JURORS.
Barrett—Martin B. Reinhart.
Chesnut Hill—Able Storm, Simpson Mosteller.
Coolbaugh—Jesse O. Cliff.
Eldred—Charles Correll, Joseph Hawk John Correll.
Hamilton—Michael Shoemaker, Jacob Slutter, Joseph Fenner.
Pocano—Adam Anglemeyer, Charles Kistler.
Paradise—John J. Price, Levi Frautz Polk—David Kresge.
Ross—Barnet Flyte, Henry Meason.
Smithfield—William Brown, William Peters, James Tarpenning, E. q.
Stroudsburg—A. R. Jackson, William Wallace.
Tobhanna—Andrew Eschenbach, Henry Stoddart.
PETIT JURORS.
Chesnut Hill—John Gregory, Henry H Weiss, Peter Kresge, Joseph Butz.
Eldred—Jonas Zerfass, Addi Daniel, Phillip Drumbeller, E. q. Joseph Fehn.
Hamilton—Able Stappes, Israel Houser, Levi Slutter, John Shoemaker, Joseph Keller, Peter Williams.
Jackson—Jacob Kresge.
M. Smithfield—Abraham V. Coolbaugh, John Dewitt.
Polk—John S. Fisher, E. q. Joseph Gruber, E. q., Frederick Shupp.
Pocano—Samuel Daily.
Paradise—James Henry.
Ross—Peter Arnold.
Stroud—John Shoek, James H. Kerr, Jacob Rhodes, Petit B. Priarose, John Thomas, Moses Phillips, Absalom Featherman, Philip Fisher.
Stroudsburg—Robert R. Depuy, Gershon Hull, Daniel Peters.
Tobhanna—Samuel Hay.
Tunkannook—Peter Merwine, Jr.

DOUGLAS & POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY.

Speech of Carl Schurz, of Wisconsin.—In Hampden Hall, Springfield, Mass., January 4, 1860.
The first little impulses to the general upheaving of the popular spirit—the tea tax, the stamp act—drop into insignificance; they are almost forgotten; the revolutionary spirit has risen far above them. It disdain to justify itself with petty pleadings; it spurs diplomatic equivocation; it places the claim to independence upon the broad basis of eternal rights, as self-evident as the sun, as broad as the world, as common as the air of heaven. The struggle of the colonies against the usurping Government of Great Britain has risen to the proud dimensions of a struggle of man for liberty and equality. Behold, five men are advancing towards the table of the President.— First, Thomas Jefferson, whose philosophical spirit grasps the generality of things and events; then Benjamin Franklin, the great apostle of common sense, the clear wisdom of real life beaming in his serene eye; then the undaunted John Adams, and two others. Now Jefferson reads the Declaration of Independence, and loudly proclaims the fundamental principle upon which it rests: "All men are created free and equal." It is said; history tells you what it meant. The sceptre of royalty is flung back across the ocean; the prerogatives of nobility are trodden into the dust; every man a king, every man a baron; in seven of the original colonies the shackles of the black

man struck off; almost everywhere the way prepared for gradual emancipation. "No recognition of the right of property in man!" says Madison. "Let slavery be abolished by law!" says Washington. Not only the supremacy of Old England is to be shaken off, but a new organization of society is to be built up, on the basis of liberty and equality. That is the Declaration of Independence! That is the American Revolution. All men free and equal! Not even the broad desert of the Atlantic ocean stops the triumphant shout. Behold, the nations of the Old World are rushing to arms.—Bastilles are blown into the dust as by the trumpets of Jericho, and, like a pillar of fire by night and a pillar of cloud by day, the great watchword of the American Revolution shows forever the way to struggling humanity. [Long continued applause.] All men are created free and equal! Whence the supernatural power in these seven words?
Turn your eyes away from the sublime spectacle of 1776, from that glorious galaxy of men whose hearts were large enough for all mankind, and let me recall you to the sober year of 1857. There is Springfield, the capital of Illinois, one of those States which owe their greatness to an ordinance originally framed by the same man whose hand wrote the Declaration of Independence. In the Hall of the Assembly, there stands Mr. Douglas, who initiates an eager crowd into the mystery of "popular sovereignty." He will tell you what it meant, when the men of 1776 said that "all men are created free and equal." He says:
"No man can vindicate the character, the motives, and the conduct of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, except upon the hypothesis that they referred to the white race alone, and not to the African, when they declared all men to have been created free and equal—that they were speaking of British subjects on this continent being equal to British subjects born and residing in Great Britain—that they were entitled to the same inalienable rights, and among them were enumerated life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The Declaration of Independence was adopted merely for the purpose of justifying the colonists in the eyes of the civilized world in withdrawing their allegiance from the British Crown, and dissolving their connection with the mother country."
What! Is that all? Is that little heap of quicksand the whole substructure on which a new organization of society was to be built—the whole foundation upon which the proud and ponderous edifices of the United States rest? They did, then, not mean all men, when they said all men.— They intended, perhaps, even to disfranchise those free blacks who in five of the original thirteen colonies enjoyed the right of voting. They meant but the white race. Oh, no, by no means, the whole white race; not the Germans, not the French, not the Scandinavians; they meant but British subjects. "British subjects on this continent being equal to British subjects born and residing on the other side of the great water!" [Laughter and applause.]
There is your Declaration of Independence, a diplomatic dodge, adopted merely for the purpose of excusing the rebellious colonies in the eyes of civilized mankind. There is your Declaration of Independence, no longer the sacred code of the rights of man, but an hypocritical piece of special pleading, drawn up by a batch of artful pettifoggers, who, when speaking of the rights of man, meant but the privileges of a set of aristocratic slaveholders, but styled it "the rights of man," in order to throw dust into the eyes of the world, and to inveigle noble-hearted souls into leading them aid and assistance. [Applause.] These are your boasted Revolutionary sires, no longer heroes and sages, but accomplished humbuggers and hypocrites, who passed counterfeit sentiments as genuine, and obtained arms and money and assistance and sympathy on false pretences! There is your great American Revolution, no longer the great champion of universal principles, but a mean Yankee trick—[bursts of applause and laughter]—a wooden utopia—[renewed cheers]—the most impudent proposition ever practised upon the whole world! [Applause.]
This is the way Mr. Douglas wants you to read and understand the proudest pages of American history! That is the kind of history with which he finds it necessary to prop his mongrel doctrine of popular sovereignty! That is what he calls vindicating the character and the motives and the conduct of the signers of the Declaration of Independence. Thus he did not blush to slander Jefferson, who, when speaking of his country, meant the world, and, when speaking of his fellow-citizens, meant mankind; and Franklin, in whose clear head theory and practice were the same, and who, having declared "all men to be created free and equal," became the first President of the first great Abolition Society; and John Adams, the representative of that State which abolished slavery within its limits with one great stroke of legislation, and Washington, who declared it to be "his fondest wish to see slavery abolished by law," and affirmed to the Declaration of Independence the broad signature of his heroic sword; and Madison, who deemed it "absurd to admit the idea of property in man;" and of the framers of the Constitution, who took care not to disgrace that instrument with the word "slavery," and, before adopting it finally, blotted

out from the extradition clause the word "servitude," avowedly because it signified the condition of a slave, and substituted the word "service," avowedly because it signified the condition of a freeman. Thus Mr. Douglas dares to speak of all those true men, who, after having proclaimed their principles in the Declaration, endeavored to introduce them into practical life in almost every State, in the way of gradual emancipation! That they have failed in this, is it a fault of theirs? It shows not that they were less great and sincere, but that subsequent generations were hardly worthy of so noble an ancestry! [Applause.]
There is Mr. Douglas's version of your history. He despairs of converting you without slandering your fathers. His present doctrines cannot thrive, unless planted in a calumny on the past. He vindicate the signers of the Declaration of Independence! Indeed, they need it sadly. I see the illustrious committee of five rise from their graves, at their head Thomas Jefferson, his lips curled with the smile of contempt, and I hear him say to Mr. Douglas: "Sir, you may abuse us as much as you please, but with the goodness to spare us with your vindictive attacks of our character and motives."— [Great laughter and applause.]
It is a common thing that men of a coarse cast of mind so lose themselves in the mean pursuit of selfish ends, as to become insensible to the grand and sublime. Measuring every character and every event in history by the low standard of their own individualities, applying to everything the narrow rule of their own motives, incapable of grasping broad and generous ideas, they will belittle every great thing they cannot deny, and drag down every struggle of principles to the sordid arena of aspiring selfishness, or of small competing interests. Eighteen hundred years ago, there were men who saw nothing in insipient Christianity but a mere wrangle between Jewish theologians, got up by a carpenter's boy, and carried on by a few crazy fishermen. Three hundred years ago, there were men who saw in the great reformatory movement of the sixteenth century, not the emancipation of the individual conscience, but a mere fuss kicked up by a German monk who wanted to get married. Two hundred years ago, there were men who saw in Hampden's refusal to pay the ship money, not a bold vindication of constitutional liberty, but the crazy antics of a man who was mean enough to quarrel about a few shillings. And now, there are men who see in the Declaration of Independence and the American Revolution, not the reorganization of human society upon the basis of liberty and equality, but a dodge of some English colonists, who were unwilling to pay their taxes. [Continued applause.]
But the dignity of great characters and the glory of great events find their vindication in the consciences of the people.— [Cheers.] It is in vain for demagogues to raise their short arms against the truth of history. The Declaration of Independence stands there. No candid man ever read it without seeing and feeling that every word of it was dictated by deep and earnest thought, and that every sentence of it bears the stamp of philosophical generality. It is the summing up of the results of the philosophical development of the age; it is the practical embodiment of the progressive ideas, which, very far from being confined to the narrow limits of the English colonies, pervaded the very atmosphere of all civilized countries. That code of human rights has grown on the very soil of civilization, not in the miry soil of a South Carolina cotton-field. He must have a dull mind or a disordered brain, who misunderstands its principles; but he must have the heart of a villain, who knowingly misrepresents them. [Loud cheers.]
Mr. Douglas's ambition might have been satisfied with this ignominious exploit. But the necessities of the popular-sovereignty doctrine do not stop there.— After having tried to explain away the fundamental principles underlying this Republic, which are hostile to slavery and its extension, Mr. Douglas finds it exceedingly inconvenient to encounter facts which prove, beyond doubt, that these principles, from a mere theoretical existence, rose to practical realization.— Popular sovereignty, which is at war with the doctrines of the Declaration of Independence, demands the slaughter of the ordinance of 1787, and Mr. Douglas is up to the task. He does not stop at trifles.
And here we must return to the Harper-Magazine manifesto. He leads us through a century of colonial history, in order to show that the people of the colonies claimed the right to legislate on the subject of slavery. And remarkably enough, all the instances quoted show a uniform tendency adverse to the peculiar institution. Mr. Douglas then proceeds to discover the germs of his popular-sovereignty doctrine in the first Congressional legislation concerning the Territories. I will not undertake to criticize that singular historical essay, although some of its statements are such as to make the freshmen of our colleges smile.
The "statesman" Douglas does not seem to be aware that the ability to read history ought to precede the attempt to write it. [Laughter and cheers.] He leads us back to the Congress of 1784.— Mr. Jefferson and his colleagues have just executed the deed of cession of the

Northwestern Territory, and the same Mr. Jefferson, as chairman of a committee, then submits "a plan for the temporary government of the Territories ceded by the individual States to the United States." Mr. Douglas proceeds to describe how the Territorial Governments were to be organized, what rights and powers were put into the hands of the people, and how they were to be exercised; and, after having demonstrated that the term "new States" meant the same thing which is now designated by "Territories," he comes to the conclusion that the spirit pervading that plan was in exact consonance with his doctrine of "popular sovereignty." Mr. Douglas ostentatiously calls this "the Jeffersonian plan." "It was," says he, "the first plan of government for the Territories ever adopted in the United States. It was drawn by the author of the Declaration of Independence, and revised and adopted by those who shaped the issues which produced the Revolution, and formed the foundations upon which our whole system of American government rests." But Mr. Douglas skips rather nimbly over the significant fact, that the same "author of the Declaration of Independence" put into that plan a proviso, excluding slavery from the Territories. Was that a mere accident? Mr. Jefferson showed thereby, conclusively, that, in his opinion, the exclusion of slavery by Congressional legislation was by no means inconsistent with the spirit of "popular sovereignty" which Mr. Douglas discovers in the plan of 1784; but this does not disturb Mr. Douglas. "The fifth article," says he, "relating to the prohibition of slavery, having been rejected by Congress, never became a part of the Jeffersonian plan of government for the Territories, as adopted April 23d, 1784." Although with a large numerical majority in its favor, (sixteen to seven), this article did indeed fail to obtain a constitutional majority, the vote of New Jersey not being counted, in consequence of there being but one delegate from that State present; yet it had been drawn up by Mr. Jefferson, introduced by Mr. Jefferson, and sustained by Mr. Jefferson's vote. Nevertheless, Mr. Douglas persists in calling a plan, from which the peculiar Jeffersonian feature had been struck out, the "Jeffersonian plan." This is the play of Hamlet with the character of Hamlet omitted.— [Laughter.]
"This charter of compact," proceeds Mr. Douglas, "with its fundamental conditions which were unalterable without the joint consent of the people interested in them, as well as of the U. States, then stood upon the statute book un repealed and irrevocable, when, on the 14th day of May, 1787, the Federal Convention met at Philadelphia." Does Mr. Douglas not know that on the 16th of March, 1785, a proposition was introduced in Congress by Rufus King, to exclude slavery from the States described in the resolve of April 23d, 1784, and to make this provision part of the compact established by that resolve? Does he not know that this provision, restoring the Jeffersonian feature to the "Jeffersonian plan," was committed, by the vote of eight States against four? Does he not know that the plan of 1784 never went into practical operation, but was expressly set aside by Congress in 1787? Does he not know that the ordinance of 1787 was the first legislative act ever practically organizing a Territory of the United States, and that one of its most prominent features was the proviso excluding slavery from all the Territories then in possession of the United States?
Mr. Douglas's historical recollections of the ordinance of 1787 seem to be very indistinct. Indeed, he deems it only worthy of an occasional, passing, almost contemptuous notice. He speaks of it as "the ordinance of the 14th of July, 1787," which was passed by the remnant of Congress of the Confederation, sitting in New York, while its most eminent members were at Philadelphia, as delegates to the Federal Convention." For three quarters of a century, people were in the habit of thinking that the ordinance of 1787 was an act of the highest order of importance, but we now learn that it was rather indifferent affair, passed on an indifferent occasion, by an exceedingly indifferent set of fellows, while the plan of 1784, a mere abstract programme, completely overruled by subsequent legislation, is represented as the true glory of the age. How is this? The reason is obvious.— Mr. Douglas belongs to that class of historians who dwell upon those facts which suit their convenience, and unconsciously drop the rest. I once heard of a Jesuit college where they used a text book of history, in which the French Revolution was never mentioned, while the Emperor Napoleon figured there only as a modest Marquis Bonaparte, who held a commission under Louis XVII, and fought great battles for the glory of the Catholic Church. [Laughter and Applause.] So it is with Mr. Douglas and the history of this country. He ignores the universal principles of the Declaration of Independence, and represents the great founders of the Republic as merely paving the way for his "great principles," while a few village politicians get up an obscure ordinance, adverse to the general tendency of things. But as those Jesuits never could prevent their students from peeping out of their college windows into the wide world, where they perceived a very different state of things, so Mr. Douglas

cannot prevent us from traveling out of the yellow covers of Harper's Magazine, into the open records of history, where we find Mr. Jefferson's anti-slavery clause, although accidentally lost in 1784, strenuously insisted upon by the leading spirits of the Republic, incorporated in the great act of 1787, solemnly reaffirmed by the first Congress under the Constitution, and firmly maintained even against the petition of the people of one of the Territories. [Cheers.] This is the true "Jeffersonian plan," the plan which Jefferson framed, voted for, and which was carried out in his spirit; not that mangled report of 1784, which Mr. Douglas wants us to take as the foundation of all Territorial government, because an historical accident happens to coincide with his schemes.
That true Jeffersonian plan rested, indeed, on the principle of popular sovereignty; but it will be conceded that Mr. Jefferson's great principle was as widely different from that of Mr. Douglas as the ordinance of 1787 is different from the Nebraska bill. While Mr. Jefferson's notion of popular sovereignty sprang from the idea that man has certain inalienable rights which the majority shall not encroach upon, Mr. Douglas's doctrine rests upon the idea that the highest development of liberty consists in the right of one class of men to hold another class of men as slaves, if they see fit to do so. [Applause.] While Mr. Jefferson excluded slavery from the Territories, in order to make room for true popular sovereignty, Mr. Douglas invents his false popular sovereignty, in order to make room for slavery. The ordinance of 1787, the true "Jeffersonian plan," was indeed no mere accident, no mere occasional act of legislation. It sprang from the idea, as Madison expressed it, "that republican institutions would become a fallacy, where slavery existed;" and in order to guarantee republican institutions to the Territories, they excluded slavery.
The ordinance of 1787 was the logical offspring of the principles upon which your independence and your Constitution are founded; it is the practical application of the Declaration of Independence to the government of the Territories. Its very existence sets completely at naught Mr. Douglas's doctrine and historical construction, and the dwarf-hand of the demagogue tries in vain to tear this bright page out of your annals. [Cheers.] The ordinance of 1787 stands written on the very gate posts of the Northwestern States; written on every grain field that waves in the breeze, on every factory that dots the course of their rushing waters, on every cottage that harbors thrifty freemen; written in every heart that rejoices over the blessings of liberty. [Long continued Applause.] There it stands in characters of light. Only a blind man cannot see it; only a fool can misunderstand it; only a knave can willfully misinterpret it. [Repeated cheers.]
Such is Mr. Douglas's principle of popular sovereignty in its logical and historical aspect; apparently adopting the doctrine that slavery is the creature of local law only, and fighting against a Congressional slave code, but, on the other hand, admitting the very principle on which protection to slave property becomes a logical necessity; and again assuming the ground that slave property may be introduced where there is no local law, but expiating away the logical consequences of that doctrine by the transparent sophistry of unfriendly legislation; dragging the proudest exploits of American statesmanship into the dust; emasculating the Declaration of Independence, because incompatible with its principles; setting aside the ordinance of 1787, because that stern fact is a conclusive historical argument against it; a jesuitical piece of equivocation and double dealing, unable to stand before the criticism of a logical mind, because it is a mixture of glaring contradictions; unable to stop the wear of principles and interests, because it is at war with itself. [Applause.] It is true, its principal champion worked hard to cover with bullying boisterousness the moral cowardice from which it sprang; but in vain. He mistakes the motive power which shapes the actions of free nations. Having no moral convictions of his own to stand upon, he could never address himself to the moral sense of the people.— [Sensation.] Having no moral convictions of his own! This is a grave charge, but I know what I say. I repeat true convictions wherever I find them. Among the fire-eaters of the South, there are men who speak of the moral basis of slavery, and believe in it; who speak of the blessings of servitude, and believe in it; who assert that slavery is right, and believe it. Atrocious as their errors may be, and deeply as I deplore them, yet I respect their convictions as soon as I find them out. But look into the record of the champion of "popular sovereignty," seen it, from syllable to syllable; and then tell me, you Douglasites of the South, do you find one word there indicating a moral conviction that slavery is right? And you Douglasites of the North, who are in the habit of telling us that you are the true anti-slavery men, and that popular sovereignty will surely work the overthrow of slavery, did your master ever utter a similar sentiment? Do you find in his record one word of sympathy with the down-trodden and degraded? One spark of the humane philosophy of our age? One syllable in vindication of the outraged dignity of human nature! One

word which might indicate a moral conviction that slavery is wrong? Not one! But one thing he does tell you: "I do not care whether slavery be voted up or down!" There is then a human heart that does not care! Sir, look over this broad land, where the struggle has raged for years and years; and across the two oceans, around the globe, to the point where the far West meets the far East, over the teeming countries where the cradle of mankind stood; and over the workshops of civilization in Europe, and over those mysterious regions, under the tropical sun, which have not emerged yet from the night of barbarism to the daylight of civilized life—and then tell me, how many hearts do you find that do not tremble with mortal anguish or exultant joy as the scales of human freedom or human bondage go up or down? Look over the history of the world, from the time when infant mankind felt in its heart the first throbbings of aspiring dignity, down to our days, when the rights of man have at last found a bold and powerful champion in a great and mighty Republic; where is the page that is not spotted with blood and tears, shed in that all-absorbing struggle; where a chapter which does not tell the tale of jubilent triumph or heart-breaking distress, as the scales of freedom or slavery went up or down!— [Loud applause.] But to-day, in the midst of the nineteenth century, in a Republic whose programme was laid down in the Declaration of Independence, there comes a man to you, and tells you, with cynical coolness, that he does not care! And because he does not care, he claims the confidence of his countrymen and the highest honors of the Republic! Because he does not care, he pretends to be the representative statesman of this age!
Sir, I always thought he can be no true statesman whose ideas and conceptions are not founded upon profound moral convictions of right and wrong. [Applause.] What, then, shall we say of him who boastingly parades his indifference as a virtue? May we not drop the discussion about his statesmanship, and ask, What is he worth as a man? [Repeated cheers.] Yes; he mistakes the motive power which shapes the events of history. I find that in the life of free nations, mere legal disquisitions never turned the tide of events, and mere constitutional constructions never determined the tendency of an age. The logic of things goes its steady way, immovable to eloquence and deaf to argument. It shapes and changes laws and Constitutions according to its immutable rules, and those adverse to it will prove no effectual obstruction to its onward march. In times of great conflicts, the promptings and dictates of the human conscience are more potent than all the inventive ingenuity of the human brain. The conscience of a free people, when once fairly ruling the action of the masses, will never fail to make new laws, when those existing are contrary to its tendency, or it will put its own construction upon those that are there. Your disquisitions and platitudes may be used as weapons and stratagems in a fencing match of controversial parties; but, powerless as they are before the conscience of man, posterity will remember them only as mere secondary incidents of a battle of great principles, in which the strongest motive powers of human nature were the true combatants.
There is the slavery question; not a mere occasional quarrel between two sections of country divided by a geographical line; not a mere contest between two economical interests for the preponderance; not a mere wrangle between two political parties for power and spoils; but the great struggle between the human conscience and a burning wrong, between advancing civilization and retreating barbarism, between two antagonistic systems of social organization. [Cheers.] In vain will our impotent mock giants endeavor to make the test question of our age turn on a ridiculous logical quibble, or a paltry legal technicality, (applause); in vain will they invent small dodges, and call them "great principles;" in vain will they attempt to drag down the all-absorbing contest to the level of a mere pot house quarrel between two rival candidates for a Presidential nomination. [Applause.] The wheel of progressing events will crush them to atoms, as it has crushed so many abnormities, (cheers), and a future generation will perhaps read on Mr. Douglas's tombstone the inscription: "Here lies the queer sort of statesman, who, when the great battle of slavery was fought, pretended to say that he did not care whether slavery was voted up or voted down." [Cheers.]
But as long as their mortal vitality of this nation is not entirely exhausted, Mr. Douglas, and men like him will in vain endeavor to reduce the people to that disgusting state of moral indifference which he himself is not ashamed to boast of. I solemnly protest that the American people are not to be measured by Mr. Douglas's low moral standard. However degraded some of our politicians may be, the progress of the struggle will show that the popular conscience is still alive, and that the people DO CARE! [Long continued applause.]

There is not a county in Indiana but has a Wide-Awake Club in it. The enthusiasm among the Republicans exceeds that of 1840 among the Whigs.— There are not less than 20,000 Wide-Awakes now in the State, and their numbers are still rapidly increasing.