The Potter Journal.

SINGLE COPIES, } Devoted to the Principles of True Democracy, and the Dissemination of Morality, Literature and News. { FOUR CENTS.

VOLUME XII.--NUMBER 15. COUDERSPORT, POTTER COUNTY, PA., THURSDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1859. TERMS.--$1.25 PER ANNUM.

THE POTTER JOURNAL,

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY MORNING, BY

Thos. S. Chase,

To whom all Letters and Communications should be addressed, to secure attention.

Terms--Invariably in Advance: $1.25 per Annum.

Terms of Advertising.

1 Square [10 lines] 1 insertion,	50
" " " 3 "	$1 50
Each subsequent insertion less than 13,	25
1 Square three months,	2 50
" six "	4 00
" nine "	5 50
" one year,	8 00
Rule and figure work, per sq., 3 ins.	3 00
Every subsequent insertion,	50
1 Column six months,	13 00
" " "	10 00
" " "	7 00
" per year,	30 00
" " "	16 00
Double-column, displayed, per annum	65 00
" " six months,	35 00
" " three "	16 00
" " one month,	6 00
" " per square of 10 lines, each insertion under 4,	1 00
Parts of columns will be inserted at the same rates.	
Administrator's or Executor's Notice,	2 00
Auditor's Notices, each,	1 50
Sheriff's Sales, per tract,	1 50
Marriage Notices; each,	1 00
Divorce Notices, each,	1 50
Administrator's Sales, per square for 4 insertions,	1 50
Business or Professional Cards, each, not exceding 8 lines, per year,	5 00
Special and Editorial Notices, per line,	10

☞All transient advertisements must be paid in advance, and no notice will be taken of advertisements from a distance, unless they are accompanied by the money or satisfactory reference.

Business Cards.

JOHN S. MANN,

ATTORNEY AND COUNSELLOR AT LAW, Coudersport, Pa., will attend the several Courts in Potter and M'Kean Counties. All business entrusted to his care will receive prompt attention. Office on Main st., opposite the Court House. 10:1

F. W. KNOX,

ATTORNEY AT LAW, Coudersport, Pa., will regularly attend the Courts in Potter and the adjoining Counties. 10:1

ARTHUR G. OLMSTED,

ATTORNEY & COUNSELLOR AT LAW, Coudersport, Pa., will attend to all business entrusted to his care, with promptnes and fidelity. Office in Temperance Block, second floor, Main St. 10:1

ISAAC BENSON,

ATTORNEY AT LAW, Coudersport, Pa., will attend to all business entrusted to him, with care and promptness. Office corner of West and Third sts. 10:1

C. L. HOYT,

CIVIL ENGINEER, SURVEYOR and DRAUGHTSMAN, Bingham, Potter Co., Pa., will promptly and efficiently attend to all business entrusted to him. First-class professional references can be given if required. 11:29-1y*

CHARLES REISSMANN,

CABINET MAKER, having erected a new and convenient Shop, on the South-east corner of Third and West streets, will be happy to receive and fill all orders in his calling. Repairing and re-fitting carefully and neatly done on short notice.

Coudersport, Nov. 8, 1859.-11-1y.

O. T. ELLISON,

PRACTICING PHYSICIAN, Coudersport, Pa., respectfully informs the citizens of the village and vicinity that he will promply respond to all calls for professional services. Office on Main st., in building formerly occupied by C. W. Ellis, Esq. 9:22

COLLINS SMITH. E. A. JONES.

SMITH & JONES,

DEALERS IN DRUGS, MEDICINES, PAINTS, Oils, Fancy Articles, Stationery, Dry Goods, Groceries, &c., Main st., Coudersport, Pa. 10:1

D. E. OLMSTED,

DEALER IN DRY GOODS, READY-MADE Clothing, Crockery, Groceries, &c., Main st., Coudersport, Pa. 10:1

M. W. MANN,

DEALER IN BOOKS & STATIONERY, MAGAZINES and Music, N. W. corner of Main and Third sts., Coudersport, Pa. 10:1

MARK GILLON,

DRAPER and TAILOR, late from the City of Liverpool, England. Shop opposite Court House, Coudersport, Potter Co. Pa..

N. B. -Particular attention paid to CUTTING. 10:35-1y.

J. J. OLMSTED. : : : : : : : : : : S. D. KELLY.

OLMSTED & KELLY,

DEALER IN STOVES, TIN & SHEET IRON WARE, Main st., nearly opposite the Court House, Coudersport, Pa. Tin and Sheet Iron Ware made to order, in good style, on short notice. 10:1

COUDERSPORT HOTEL,

D. F. GLASSMIRE, Proprietor, Corner of Main and Second Streets, Coudersport, Potter Co., Pa. 9:44

ALLEGANY HOUSE,

SAMUEL M. MILLS, Proprietor, Colesburg Potter Co., Pa., seven miles north of Coudersport on the Wellsville Road. 9:44

LYMAN HOUSE,

C. C. LYMAN, Proprietor, Ulysses, Potter Co., Pa. This House is situated on the East corner of Main street, opposite A. Corey & Son's store, and is well adapted to meet the wants of patrons and friends. 12:11-1y.

Poet's Corner.

From the Atlantic Monthly, for November.

HYMN OF TRUST.

BY OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES.

O Love Divine, that stooped to share
Our sharpest pang, our bitterest tear,
On Thee we cast each earth-born care,
We smile at pain while Thou art near!

Though long the weary way we tread,
And sorrow crown each lingering year,
No path we shun, no darkness dread,
Our hearts still whispering, Thou art near!

When drooping pleasure turns to grief,
And trembling faith is changed to fear,
The murmuring wind, the quivering leaf
Shall softly tell us, Thou art near!

On Thee we fling our burden ing woe,
O Love Divine, for ever dear,
Content to suffer, while we know,
Living and dying, Thou art near

Political.

Governor Chase's Speech at Cincinnati.

THE DOUGLAS DOCTRINE ANALYZED.

We find the following thorough and conclusive review of Douglas's Sovereignty professions in a speech delivered by Governor Chase at Cincinnati, on the 20th of November ultimo, after the recent Ohio election. It is worthy of careful perusal—particularly by Douglas democrats:

The words popular sovereignty are good words; the idea they embody is a good idea. The bold assertion that the so-called democratic party are the champions, and that the Republican party are the enemies of popular sovereignty is the cunningest device which could possibly be contrived to cover up the propagandism of slavery and the usurpations of the slave power. It is the old plan of "stealing the livery of heaven to serve the devil in."

We love popular sovereignty, for it is the bulwark of human rights. We revere the power of the people, because we see in it every man's safest defence against wrong.

Our opponents were sagacious enough, therefore, when they iterated and reiterated their cry of popular sovereignty, and, by bold and clamorous assertions, sought to create the belief that the Republicans, in seeking to arrest the spread of slavery, were assailing the right of the people to govern themselves. It was the only course, indeed, which offered the slightest possibility of success; for the defenders of slavery, as the best relation between capital and labor, are yet in the free states, even among those who call themselves democrats. It is not to be denied that many were misled by that cry and by those assertions. We can never be obliged to maintain our Republican position under greater disadvantages than those produced by the misconceptions thus created.

There was, however, one great advantage in all this. It compelled a general and thorough discussion of the position taken by Mr. Douglas and his friends. It led to universal inquiry, What is this popular sovereignty which is so vehemently asserted? Is it a reality or a sham? Is it the old doctrine handed down to us by our fathers in the immortal Declaration, or is it some modern counterfeit, got up to serve base party necessities?

We looked for the description of the specific given by the patentee himself. We inquired—How does "my doctrine of popular sovereignty," described in "my Kansas-Nebraska bill," agree with or differ from the doctrine of the fathers of the Republic embodied by Thomas Jefferson in the nation's creed of human rights?

We read Mr. Douglas's Wooster speech, and we found him positively asserting "that he never uttered any such nonsense as that a territory was a sovereign power." How, then, we asked, can there be popular sovereignty in a territory. When there is no "sovereign power" can there be any sovereignty of the people? Why talk, then, of popular sovereignty in a territory? Clearly it seems for no honest purpose.

We sought to know what rights Mr. Douglas did claim for the people of a territory. We found his own statement in a Senate report, made by himself as chairman of the committee on territories, and quoted by him in that same Wooster speech. "The sovereignty of a territory," he says in that report, "remains in abeyance, suspended in the United States, in trust for the people, until they shall be admitted into the Union as a state. In the meantime they are permitted to exercise and enjoy all the rights and privileges of self-government; to be exercised in subordination to the constitution and in obedience to the organic law."

Here we have it. This is the Douglas doctrine of popular sovereignty—the "rights of self-government in subordination to the constitution and in obedience to the organic law." The people of a territory have no sovereignty. *It is suspended*—it is not very clear where—but certainly suspended. It cannot be vested in the people until they come into the Union as a state. "In the meantime"—and a very *mean* time it is—"they are admitted"—how gracious that is—"to exercise and enjoy the rights of self-government in subordination to the constitution and in obedience to the organic law." I pass over, to-night, the limitation of "subordination to the constitution"—though the whole wickedness of the Dred Scott decision is covered up in it—and ask your attention to that other limitation, "obedience to the organic law."

The people of a territory must obey "the organic law." They have only such rights of self-government as they may exercise in obedience to that.

The popular sovereignty taught by Jefferson consisted in the derivation of the powers of government from the governed. There can be no genuine popular sovereignty, according to his teaching, where the people do not institute their own government—frame their own "organic law."

Now, how is it with Douglas's "my doctrine"? Why, "my doctrine" refers the power of organizing the government of the territories to Congress. Mr. Douglas himself framed the organic act—the fundamental law—the constitution of Kansas and Nebraska. Congress, by enactment, gave it being and vitality. Neither the people of Kansas nor the people of Nebraska were consulted at all about their institutions. The consent of the governed had nothing to do with the powers of the government. Those powers are derived in Kansas and Nebraska and every other territory, from the act of Congress which Mr. Douglas calls the organic law. When he says, therefore, that the rights of self-government are to be exercised in obedience to the organic law, he says, in reality, they are to be exercised in obedience to Congress.

What kind of popular sovereignty have we here? Does not this sham cut rather a sorry figure by the side of the grand old verity of Thomas Jefferson?

But now let us look into "my Kansas-Nebraska bill" and see what powers of self-government the people may exercise "in obedience to the organic act." Every really self-governing people must exercise, through agents appointed by itself, in such form as itself may prescribe, legislative, judicial and executive powers. In other words, it must make, construe and execute its own laws.

Now we have already seen that with the making of its fundamental law the people of Kansas or Nebraska had nothing whatever to do. Mr. Douglas and Congress made it. But, passing over this, how much legislative, judicial and executive power does the organic act allow to the people? It vests "the legislative power in the Governor and a legislative assembly"; fixes the number of members of each branch of the legislature; provides for their pay; determines how many days they may sit; and then subjects all their acts to the veto of the Governor. Not much popular sovereignty here! Not much "power of self-government in obedience to the organic act," where no bill can become a law without the approval of the Governor, unless passed by a vote of two-thirds of the members of each House! But this is not the worst of it. The Governor, thus made a constituent element of the legislative power, and clothed with the prerogative of the veto, is not elected by the people of the territory, but appointed by the federal government, through the President.

Thus we see that this organic act allows the people next to the legislative power. What executive power does it give them? None whatever. That power is vested in a Governor, or, in his absence, in a Secretary, and both are appointed by the President. Where then, finally, does the organic act vest the supreme judiciary power? In a Supreme Court. Do you say then, "Well, the people certainly elect their own judges." If you do, you are mistaken; for the judges are all appointed by the President. What powers of self government, then, I repeat, have the people of a territory "in obedience to the organic law"; ? No executive power, no judicial power, and practically, no legislative power, except in subjugation to the federal Executive. In other words, here is a people, organized as a political community by act of Congress, without power to make, construe or execute their own laws. Can we fail to admire, in the organic law by which they are thus subjugated, "my doctrine of popular sovereignty."

Now, these violations of every just principle of true self-government were not inadvertant or accidental. When this Kansas-Nebraska bill of Mr. Douglas was under discussion, I, as your senator, objected to the veto power proposed to be given the Governor, but without avail. I proposed amendments giving to the people the power to elect their own Governor, their own secretary and their own judges, and these amendments were voted down by Mr. Douglas and his confederates in repealing the prohibition against the extension of slavery. It was a premeditated thing—this stripping of the people of every attribute and function of sovereignty, and this subjugation of them to the will and control of the President. Nor is the purpose hard to guess. The President was the servant of the slave power, and his will and control was the will and control of the oligarchy.

Just one thing further in this connection. Does this organic act enable the people to exclude slavery? Mr. Douglas tells us that he regards slaves as property, recognized as such by the federal constitution; that slaves taken into the territories remain property; and that neither a territorial nor state legislature has a right to deprive an owner of his property without his consent, except for public use, upon due compensation. Still, he says, a territorial legislature, by unfriendly legislation or non-action, may control slavery so as to make slave-holding impracticable, or, what is the same thing, inconvenient and unprofitable. But this is not what we want. Such legislative action, if we admit that slaves taken into a territory remain property, and that this property in man is recognized by the constitution, can hardly be vindicated as honest or constitutional. What we want for the people of a territory—what they want for themselves—is a substantive, sufficient and efficient power, plainly recognized in the organic act, to exclude slavery—to prevent its introduction—to keep it out. Have they got this power under Mr. Douglas's organic act? He will not say so. He may say that the people may exclude slavery by making it convenient and unprofitable to hold slaves, and may thus force slavery out after it has come in. But he will not say that they can exclude slavery by keeping it out—by preventing its introduction. He cannot say so and be consistent with himself.

Now all this throws light upon a somewhat remarkable passage in the history of the Kansas-Nebraska bill. You will remember that I proposed to amend it by declaring distinctly and in so many words, that "under the Constitution the people may, through their legal representatives, if they see fit, exclude slavery." You will remember that this amendment was voted down by Mr. Douglas and his fellow-repealers. I charged then, and I have frequently charged since, that it was never intended that the people should be allowed, under the bill—the organic act—to exclude slavery. You now see how well founded that charge was. The Dred Scott decision—the universal construction of the oligarchy—Mr. Douglas's own statements, all demonstrate that it was right.

Here, then, we have popular sovereignty according to "*my* doctrine," as set forth in "*my* Kansas-Nebraska bill"; a people with a subjugated legislature; with a Governor appointed by the President, in whose election they have no voice; with judges also appointed by the President; without power to protect themselves against the introduction of the great moral, social and political evil of slavery. What cruel mockery it is! What a monstrous absurdity is the attempt to vindicate such legislation in the name of popular sovereignty! How palpable it is that the cry of popular sovereignty is a cheat and a fraud, and all belief in the sham a miserable delusion!

We have to thank Mr. Douglas for the discussion (for his coming provoked it) which has exposed this pretension and deprived it of all power to do further mischief. The verdict of Ohio this fall is against this wretched counterfeit of a great and vital truth. It will no longer pass current among her people. All attempts to give it circulation will only discredit those who make them. For this I repeat, we may thank Mr. Douglas. I cheerfully admit that he has more than paid the debt he owed me.

Another lesson has been deeply impressed on the minds of the people of Ohio by the discussion of this fall. It is this: That the democracy of 1859 is neither in faith nor practice the democracy of 1849. The party name is preserved, but neither the men nor the principles of the party remain the same. The so-called democratic party of to-day renounces its old doctrines of equal rights and exact justice to all, guarded and secured by equal laws and just administration, and substitutes for them the dogmas of the propagandists and perpetualists of slavery, wretchedly disguised under the hollow pretences of popular sovereignty.—This change of principles announces a change in men. Of those who most boldly and zealously maintained the democratic faith in 1849, vast numbers have been compelled, by simple fidelity to that faith, to join the Republican ranks. And who have taken their place in the misnamed democracy of to-day? Look around and see. You know the men. They are pro-slavery whigs, who either from mistaken views of obligation, or from mistrust of the people and dislike of the doctrine of equal rights, were pro-slavery in their feelings; Americans of like mind and sentiment; and some free soilers, I am sorry to add, who have forsaken the doctrine and party of freedom for the creed and party of slavery. These are the men who fill up, in part, the ranks of democracy, broken and thinned because of its own apostacy from its own faith. I say, in part, for we all know that the democratic party, which, while professing hostility to slavery extension and a zeal for enfranchisment limited only by respect for the rights of soverign states, commanded large majorities, has, ever since its apostacy from its principles was made manifest, been reduced to a minority in Ohio. The men who have joined the party compensate neither by number nor by vigor for the men who have been constrained to leave it rather than abandon their principles. It is now clearly seen that when the democratic party enjoyed the confidence of the people, it proclaimed the doctrines which the Republican party now proclaims.

Let us organize then, for the great struggle. The hearts, the judgements, the conciences of the people are with us. Go into your streets, observe your noble architecture, contemplate your prosperous industry, consider the schools where your children received the blessings of education, and the churches where you worship the common Father of us all! behold these monuments of free labor, and refuse if you can, to join in defence of the great principle which works out these splendid results—the principle of the inalienable rights of every man to liberty—the freest exercise of all the powers and faculties which God has given him for his own good and the good of his fellow-men.

Let us not be told that in thus maintaining the rights and interests of free labor we act an unfriendly part to our fellow-citizens of the slave states. It is not so. We propose no interference with them or with their slavery. So far as we are concerned, they and their states shall have every right which the constitution gives them. I have always said so. I never refused to measures for the promotion of the interests of citizens of slave states as cordial support as I have given to like measures for the benefit of the citizens of my own. We wage no war with any section of our common country. We insist only that the few shall not be permitted to control the many—that the government of the people shall be in the hands of the people, and not in the hands of a privileged class—that the slaveholders of the slave states shall not force their slavery either into the free states or the free territories of the republic. Have not the masses of free white men in the states as deep an interest in these objects as we have? Is there anything in these purposes of ours hostile even to any constitutional rights of the slave-holders themselves?

Let us unite, then, for these purposes of freedom. Let us unite, too, for reform—to arrest the fearful tendencies of the federal government to corruption and prodigality—to secure to labor its just rewards—to protect and cherish our industry—to elevate the tone and scope of our foreign intercourse—to cultivate a higher and nobler sentiment of nationality—to make our country the glory of all lands and the example of all nations. These are objects worthy the labor of patriots. Let them be ours.

More About the Organization of Potter County.

From the Tioga Agitator.

EDITOR OF THE AGITATOR—*Dear Sir:* In that part of your paper of last week devoted to the "Adjoining Counties" I notice an article from the Potter *Journal* touching upon the early history of that county. I have a few facts in regard to the efforts of the late JOHN KEATING, Esq., of Philadelphia, to induce settlements in Potter County, related to me by himself some years ago, which may not be uninteresting to your readers.

Besides the gifts of 150 acres of land to an Academy and $500 to help build the same; and the gift of two-thirds of 99 acres of land whereon to build a county town, (as recited in the preamble of the act of March 4th, 1807, which establish Potter as a seperate county,) Mr. Keating contributed largely from his means to advance the interests of the settlers in the then wilderness.

When the territory now known as Potter County was about being purchased, most of that part of the State was then known as Lycoming County. It was all a wilderness without roads or settlers and only traversed by Indians, who had often been very troublesome to surveyors. On the east the nearest settlements were on the north-east branch of the Susquehanna; to the north there were settlers in Steuben and Allegany counties; to the west settlers had already begun in Warren county on the Allehegny river, and on the south no settlers were nearer to Potter county than those on the north-west branch of the Susquehanna. Mr. Keeting and the other purchasers could look only to the latter as being neighbors to the settlers of Potter county, the other settlers being cut off by natural difficulties very hard at that time to overcome. Besides this the settlements on the south were not so spare as any of the others named, and hence the first move was to have a road opened to Jersey Shore, of which I will tell you more presently.

As soon as John Keating & Co. purchased these lands from Mr. Wm. Bingham, they commenced by having their purchase well explored. This task was confided to Mr. Francis King (grandfather of Wm. K. King, Esq., now of Smethport Pa.,) who gave the greatest satisfaction to his employers as an excellent surveyor; intelligent in his explorations and in all his observations respecting the soil, climate, and future prosperity of the county. He encountered every difficulty, every danger and privation with the greatest perseverence and fortitude. Having fixed upon that section of the Keating lands now known as Ceres, as being the nearest to the quarter from which, sooner or later, settlers and provisions must come, Mr. King started some time during the year 1809, I think, to meet Mr. Keating who had been waiting at Dyke's Creek (now known as Wellsville or Genesee, N. Y.) about eleven days, by reason of a delay in opening a road from the latter place to Ceres. After seeing what could be done preparatory to the formation of a settlement at Ceres, Mr. Keating and Mr. King started together for the south, and it took them five days to reach the waters of the Susquehanna. When about three miles below the mouth of the Sinnemahoning they found two families very poorly off as to everything. These were the first whites they had seen on their journey. There was not a settler on any of the branches of the Sinnemahoning. They followed the river down to Northumberland, and there made arrangements with John Cowden, Esq., which enabled them to procure all that was necessary to commence at Ceres. They had to take families and provisions up to the mouth of the Sinnemahoning; thence up the Driftwood; thence across the portage to the Allegheny at Canoe-Place (now Port Allegany;) thence down the Allegheny to the mouth of the Oswayo; thence up the Oswayo to Ceres, a distance of at least two hundred miles. Of course the expenses of such a trip were not very light. Similar wants required a continuation of such expenses for three or four years, not by the route of the Sinnemahoning alone, but by the Allegheny from Pittsburg. If Mr. Bingham, from whom John Keating & Co. purchased their lands, had not been carried off by a sudden and premature death, he would have contributed agreeably to his positive intentions, by his means, to the improvement of his estate, especially in that county. The minority of his son caused a delay of twenty years. Embarrassment in the affairs of other large proprietors; the indifference of others; the unsettled disputes of the Pennsylvania and Connecticut claimants; the purchase of Indian lands; the opening of the Erie Canal, and many other circumstances have proved great drawbacks to the settlement of Potter and the neighboring counties.

But Mr. Keating did not stop with simply making explorations and surveys. He induced men of character to become settlers by generous donations of land; and that the education of their children might not be neglected he employed an Englishman named John Watson as a school teacher for five years on a salary of $100 a year. He furnished the first families with a medicine chest, and gave premiums on potatoes, corn, &c., which amounted to $250. With the aid of the then Trustees of the county, Mr. Keating got a road opened from Ceres to Big Meadows (near the Manchester Mills in this county) a distance of fifty-five miles. He gave $200 to this object, and Mr. Wm. Bingham gave $250. Mr. K. employed a man named Carson, of Jersey Shore, to clear ten acres on a lot belonging to himself in Potter county (now Sweden township I believe) and built a house thereon for the entertainment of travelers. He gave to the late Mr. Wm. Ayres a lease of the same for seven years, free, and his choice of a lot of 100 acres anywhere in the county as a consideration for his staying there. Not one of the old settlers in Potter or this County who has stopped at the Cold Spring Farm can forget the comforts and kindness enjoyed at the hospitable fire-side of Mr. Ayres.

Shortly afterward Mr. Keating agreed with Major Isaac Lyman, a most active, intelligent and persevering man, to give to forty settlers at his choice, fifty acres each, *gratis*, and to give to himself one hundred acres gratis and ten dollars for each settler he would bring in with him. Major Lyman was the father of Judge Lyman, now mail agent on the Tioga Road.

I will conclude this already long communication by a word about the Jersey Shore turnpike. It was explored and laid out by Francis King, whose kindness to the early settlers did much to smooth away the rough side of pioneer life. The State by an act of Assembly, made a grant of $20,000. Mr. Steward-son, Mr. Bingham, Mr. Keating and Mr.