The Potter Journal.

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

VOLUME XII, NUMBER 24. COUDERSPORT, POTTER COUNTY, PA., THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1860. TERMS, $1.25 PER ANNUM.

Terms of Advertising.

Square [10 lines] 1 insertion,	$ 50
" " 2 "	$1 50
Each subsequent insertion less than 13,	25
Square three months,	2 50
" six "	4 00
" nine "	5 50
" one year,	6 00
Table and figure work, per sq. 1 time	1 00
Every subsequent insertion,	50
Column six months,	10 00
" " "	10 00
" " "	7 00
" per year,	30 00
" " "	18 00
Double-column, displayed, per annum,	65 00
" " six months,	35 00
" " three "	16 00
" " one month,	6 00
" " per square	
Less 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 exceeding 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 in 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 door, 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. 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,
S. J. 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.

D. L. & M. H. DANIELS,
DEALERS IN DRY GOODS, GROCERIES, Ready-Made Clothing, Crockery, Hardware, Books, Stationery, Hats, Caps, Boots, Shoes, Paints, Oils, &c., &c., Ulysses, Potter Co., Pa. ☞ Cash paid for Furs, Hides and Pelts. All kinds of Grain taken in exchange for trade.–12:20.

Poet's Corner.

For the Potter Journal.

TO THE MEMORY OF JOHN BROWN.

Farewell, farewell to thee, friend of the lowly—
Thus breathe the oppressed 'neath Virginia's sky—
Already thy foes, e'en, admire thee most truly,
While bondmen will cherish thy name till they die.

For long in America's green, pleasant valleys
Will fathers and children remember the doom
Of him who lies sleeping, among the wild mountains,
With the wail of the north-winds to chant o'er his tomb.

And oft when "Independence morning" is dawning,
Awakes, by its loud cannon, the young and the old—
Ev'ry true-hearted patriot, 'mid the gen'ral rejoicing,
Will blush for his country when thy history's told.

The young northern maid, as with pleasure she dresses
Her brown, sunny locks for some national day,
Will think on thy fate, till, neglecting her tresses,
She mournfully turns from her mirror away.

Nor will Freedom—beloved of her Hero—forget thee,
Though tyrants watch over her tears as they start;
Close, close by the side of her temple she'll set thee,
Embalmed in the innermost shrine of her heart.

Farewell! be it ours to endear thy memory
In the hearts of our people, who love Freedom's laws;
Every groan of the slave, and each cry for delivery,
Will arouse them to action reviving thy cause.

LERA.

Choice Reading.

Cursed with Blessings.

"Cursed with blessings." I closed the page, and leaned back in reflection.

"Here is another paradox," said I. "Cursed with blessings! It is simply a contradiction in terms. What does the writer mean?"

I turned to the page again, and read on. "There is such a thing as being cursed with blessings, so that the earthly good a man seeks, shall become the greatest evil that can be visited upon him."

Some gleams of light passed into my mind. Thought and memory went to work; and soon around the proposition gathered a host of illustrating incidents. I remembered the case of a man who, in early and middle life, always, in family prayer, brought in the petition—"Increase our basket and store." And the worldly good things he so much desired, came; came in rich abundance. He added house to house, until his rents flowed back upon him, a princely income. But, his selfish heart made all his earthly blessings a curse. Like the miser, his life was in his possessions; and when anything threatened these, trouble of spirit arose. The dread of loss by fire, haunted him like a murderer's conscience. He insured; but felt only half protected by insurance, for there were dishonest companies, flaws in contracts, quibbles in the law. He had suffered one loss in this way. It was not serious, but enough to break his faith in Insurance as a reliable protection against fire. And so, every stroke of the alarm bell, by night or by day, gave a shock to his nerves, and sent a pang of fear to his heart. Sweet, refreshing sleep, became a stranger to his pillow. The ghost of apprehension was forever by his side, a fearful vision.

Then came a morbid dread of poverty; and, after a time, his day-dreams and fitful night-visions began to be of pauperism and the almshouse. At sixty he was insane, from this cause, and died, in the hallucination of abject want, leaving a hundred thousand dollars of property, which passed to heirs, who made the blessing a curse also, as he had done, but in another way. In five years from his death, his two sons realized their father's fears, and now fill pauper's graves.

"Cursed with blessings! Even so!" I said, as memory closed the page on which this history was recorded. "Like the manna which the children of Israel gathered in the wilderness, life's blessings must be used to day—if hoarded selfishly, they will not keep."

Another illustration memory gave. I knew a man who set his heart upon wealth, as a means of comfort in old age. "I am willing to work now," he used to say, "while I am young and vigorous; though business is distasteful to me. I love ease and freedom, and for the sake of gaining them, I toil on in early manhood."

And while he toiled on he was comparatively happy. I can remember him as one of the most cheerful men in my circle of acquaintance. But competence rewarded his labor ere yet his sun of life had swept beyond the zenith, and his "basket and store" were full. His toil crowned him with blessings. And so he retired from the busy world to enjoy these good things which had come to him in return for useful industry. Alas for my friend! He had no taste for books, no love of art, no fondness for country life, or pleasant gardening. His mind had been educated only in one direction. He was a man of business, and that alone. And so, he had nothing to do but to sit down and enjoy himself. How impossible that was, he discovered in less than a month. During the first and second seasons he tried Cape May, Saratoga, Newport, and a trip down the Lakes and at the St. Lawrence. But he did not really enjoy himself. How could he? There is no enjoyment for a man living without a purpose. Mere killing time is only a slow, soul-killing operation, and is always accompanied by pain.

Ten years ago it was when my friend retired from business, to enjoy his fortune. His cup of blessing was full, and he has been holding it to his lips ever since, trying to find sweetness in the draught; but, judging from the expression of his face, the tone of his voice, and the character of his remarks, I think the wine in his cup must be dashed with unusual bitterness. His blessing has become a curse.

Another received a moderate fortune from a distant relative. He happened to be heir-at-law, and the relative dying without a will, he came most unexpectedly into possession of about thirty-five thousand dollars in cash. He was a clerk, with a salary of one thousand dollars a year, living frugally with his wife and two children in a small, rented house. Few men enjoyed life with a keener zest than this young man. But the fortune proved his ruin. The clerkship was at once given up for a business venture; the hired house for a handsome purchased dwelling; omnibus rides for drives in an elegant carriage; social tea companies for elegant parties. His course was brilliant but brief. The blessing was made a curse. Soured, dissatisfied, maddened by a sudden fall from the height up to which he had soared, away down into the valley of abject poverty, he lost self-respect and self-control. Drink made the ruin complete. His pale widow sits toiling now, early and late, striving to keep the wolf of hunger from her door.

Shall we go on, varying these illustrations of the text? They may be taken from every condition in life, and from all of its wide relations. There is not a reader who cannot supply his quota, and set them even in stronger light than we have done. And there is not a reader who may not, with the writer, find in his own past history almost unnumbered instances, in which he has turned his good things into evil; his blessing into cursing. We all do it, when we let affection rest in mere natural and sensual things, instead of making these things ministers of the soul's higher life. Worldly possessions are blessings, if acquired as a means to useful ends; but they curse us, when we make them our chiefest good.—*Steps toward Heaven.*

Love a Wife and Care for a Wife.

I wish every husband would copy into his memorandum book this sentence, from a recently published work: "Women must be constituted very differently from men. A word said, a line written, and we are happy; omitted, our hearts ache, as if for a great misfortune. Men cannot feel it, or guess at it; if they did, the most careless of them would be slow to wound us so."

The grave hides many a heart which has been stung to death, because one who might, after all have loved it after a certain careless fashion, was deaf, dumb, and blind to the truth in the sentence we have just quoted, or, if not, was at least restive and impatient with regard to it. Many men, marrying late in in life, being accustomed only to take care of themselves, and that in the most erratic, rambling, exciting fashion, eating, drinking, sleeping, and waking whenever their fancy, or good cheer and amusement, questionable or unquestionable, prompted, come at last, when they get tired of this, with their selfish habits fixed as fate, to matrimony. For awhile it is novelty. Shortly, it is strange and irksome, this always being obliged to consider the comfort and happiness of another. To have something always hanging on the arm, which used to swing free, or, at most, but twirl a cane. Then they think their duty done if they provide food and clothing, and refrain (possibly) from harsh words. Ah, is it? Listen to that sigh as you close the door. Watch the gradual fading of the eye, the paling of the cheek, not from age—she should be yet young—but that gnawing pain at the heart, born of the settled conviction that the great hungry craving of her soul, as far as you are concerned, must go forever unsatisfied. God help such wives, and keep them from attempting to slack their soul's thirst at poisoned fountains.

Think you, her husband, how little a kind word, a smile, a caress to you, how much to her. If you call these things "childish, and beneath your notice, "then you should never, have married. There are men who should remain forever single. You are one. You have no right to require of a woman her health, strength, time and devotion, to mock her with this shadowy unsatisfying return. A new bonnet, a dress, a shawl, a watch, anything, everything, but what a true woman's heart must crave, sympathy, appreciation, love. She may be rich in everything else, but if she is poor in these, and is a good woman, she had better die.

There are hard, unloving, cold monstrosities of woman (rare exceptions) who neither require love nor know how to give it. We are not speaking of these. That big-hearted, loving, noble men have occasionally been thrown away upon such, does not disprove what we have been saying. But even a man thus situated has greatly the advantage of a woman in a similar position, because, over the needle, a woman may think herself into an insane asylum, while the active out-door turmoil of business life is at least a sometime reprieve to him.

Do you ask me, "Are there no happy wives?" God be praised, yes, and glorious, loveable husbands, too, who know how to treat a woman, and would have her neither fool nor drudge. Almost every wife would be a good and happy wife were she only loved enough. Let husbands, present and prospective, think of this.—*London Journal.*

Political.

THE trial of Andrew Stevens, at Charlestown, Va., for murder, treason, &c, as an accomplice of John Brown, was concluded on Saturday week. After an absence of fifteen minutes, the jury returned a verdict of guilty on all the counts of the indictment. Stevens, it is said, received the verdict with great composure, a smile appearing on his face as it was announced.

GOVERNOR CHASE tells the story that when Lieut. Gov. Newman of Tennessee, was in Cincinnati with the Kentucky and Tennessee Legislatures, he was accompanied by his "body servant," a sprightly, saddle-colored "boy" of about thirty, who was conscious of his dignity. His master, who was in the habit of jesting with him familiarly, accosted him in the hall of the Neil House, just before the departure of the guests, with a "Why, Jack, havn't any of the Abolitionists carried you off yet?" "Yah! yah! Mass' Newman, (quoth Jack) when I seed you gwine down de street arm in arm wid Gubner Dennison and Gubner Chase, I tot *you* were gone, sure—yah! yah!"

SOME naturalized citizens of Irish birth, residing in the Town of Menesha, Wis., having been accused of selling out to the Republicans, Michael Hogan, one of their number, comes out in a letter to the *Conservator*, with a statement of his reasons for leaving the Democrats. He declares he attached himself to that party, believing, in common with many of his countrymen that they were the friends of the laboring man, particularly to those of foreign birth. He has been with them long enough to know that these professions are false, and made to delude the ignorant. The millions of landless poor from Europe had a right to expect that the Homestead bill would receive a hearty support at the hands of a party that owed its ascendency to their votes; but they had been doomed to disappointment. Labor should everywhere be honorable; but an effort is now making to degrade it. Democratic Senators declare that "labor is the legitimate sphere of slaves; that labor should be owned and not hired, thus striking a blow at the very liberties of nine-tenths of the Democratic voters of the North and no voice of condemnation is raised to protect us."

Slavery in the Territories versus Popular Sovereignty.

An extract from a recent speech delivered in Springfield, Mass., by CARL SCHURZ, *of Wisconsin, a German patriot.*

Of all men, Mr. Douglas ought to be the first to know what the true intent and meaning of the Nebraska bill and the principle of popular sovereignty is. He is said to be a statesman, and it must be presumed that his measure rests upon a positive idea; for all true statesmanship is founded upon positive ideas.

In order to find out Mr. Douglas's own definition of his own "great principle," we are obliged to pick up the most lucid of his statements as we find them scattered about in numerous speeches and manifestoes. After multifarious cruisings upon the sea of platforms and arguments, Mr. Douglas has at last landed at the following point: "A slave," says he, in his famous Harper-Magazine article, "a slave, within the meaning of the Constitution, is a person held to service or labor in one State, '*under the laws thereof*'—not under the Constitution of the United States, or under the laws thereof, nor by virtue of any Federal authority whatever, but *under the laws of the particular State where such service or labor may be due.*" This is clear; and, with his eyes firmly fixed upon the people of the North, he goes on: "If, as Mr. Buchanan asserts, slavery exists in the Territories by virtue of the Constitution of the United States, then it becomes the imperative duty of Congress, *to the performance of which every member is bound by his conscience and his oath, and from which no consideration of policy or expediency can release him,* to provide by law such adequate and complete protection, as is essential to the enjoyment of an important right secured by the Constitution—in one word, to enact a general slave code for the Territories." But Mr. Douglas is not satisfied with this. In order to strengthen his assumption, and to annihilate Mr. Buchanan's construction of the Nebraska bill still more, he proceeds: "The Constitution being uniform everywhere within the dominions of the United States, being the supreme law of the land, anything in the Constitution or laws of any of the States to the contrary notwithstanding, why does not slavery exist in Pennsylvania, just as well as in Kansas or in South Carolina, by virtue of the same Constitution, since Pennsylvania is subordinate to the Constitution in the same manner and to the same extent as South Carolina and Kansas?"

Just so. Mr. Douglas having been so positive, he cannot deny us the privilege of making a few logical deductions from his own premises. We expect him to proceed in the following manner: "Since a slave is held under the laws of a State, and not under the Constitution or the laws of the United States, *slavery exists only by virtue of local law,*" or, as the Court of Appeals of Kentucky expressed it, "the right to hold a slave exists only by *positive law of a municipal character*, and has no foundation in the law of nature, or the unwritten and common law." If slavery cannot exist except by virtue of local law of a municipal character, it follows, as an irresistible consequence, that a slaveholder cannot hold a slave as property in a Territory where there is no local law of a municipal character establishing that right of property. And, further, the right to hold a slave having no foundation in the law of nature, or the unwritten and common law, we are forced to the conclusion that a slave, brought by his owner upon the soil of a Territory before the Territorial Legislature have enacted laws establishing slavery, becomes of necessity free, for there is no local law of a municipal character under which he might be held as a slave. This principal is recognized by the decisions of several Southern courts. Having gone so far, (and, indeed, I cannot see how a logical mind can escape these conclusions from Mr. Douglas's own premises,) Mr. Douglas would be obliged to define his popular sovereignty to be the right of the people of a Territory, represented in the Territorial Legislature, to admit slavery by positive enactment, if they see fit, *but it being well understood that a slaveholder has not the least shadow of a right to take his slave property into the Territory before such positive legislation has been had.* This definition would have at least the merit of logical consistency."

"But what does Mr. Douglas say?—"Slavery," so he tells us in his Harper-Magazine article, "slavery being the creature of local legislation, and not of the Constitution of the United States, it follows that the Constitution does not establish slavery in the Territories beyond the power of the people to control it by law." What? The Constitution does not establish slavery in the Territories beyond a certain something! What does that mean? If slavery is the creature of local law, how can the Constitution, by its own force, permit slavery to go into a Territory *at all?*

Here is a dark mystery—a pit-fall; and we may well take care not to fall into the trap of some sophistry. Why does he not speak of the admission of slavery by positive enactments? Why not even of the power of the people to exclude it by law? We look in vain for light in Harper's Magazine, (and is it indeed true what Judge Black intimates, that that article is one of the obscurest documents by which ever a politician attempted to befog his followers?) but we may gather Mr. Douglas's real opinion from another manifesto preceding this. In his New Orleans speech, delivered after his recent success in Illinois, he defined his position in substance, as follows: "The Democracy of Illinois hold that a slaveholder has the same right to take his slave property into a Territory as any other man has to take his horse or his merchandise."

What? Slavery is the creature of local law, and yet a slaveholder has the right to take his slave property into a Territory before any local law has given him that right? A slave does not become free, when voluntarily brought by his owner upon the soil of a Territory where no positive local law establishing slavery exists. How is this possible? How can even the elastic mind of a Democratic candidate for the Presidency unite these contradictory assumptions? [Applause.] And yet there it stands, and nothing that Mr. Douglas ever said can be more unequivocal in its meaning. And here again we may claim the privilege of drawing a few logical deductions from Mr. Douglas's own premises. If, as Mr. Douglas distinctly and emphatically tells us, a slaveholder has a right to take his slave, as property, into a Territory, and to hold him there as property, before any legislation on that point is had, from what source does that right arise? Not from the law of nature, for the right to hold a slave is "unfounded in the law of nature, and in the unwritten and common law;" and even Mr. Douglas, little as he may care about nature and her laws, will hardly dare to assert that the system of slave labor is the natural and normal condition of society. It must then spring from positive law. But from what kind of positive law? Not from any positive law of a local and municipal character, for there is none such in the Territory so far. Where is its source, then? There is but one kind of positive law to which the Territories are subject before any local legislation has been had, and *that is the Constitution of the United States.* If, therefore, Mr. Douglas asserts, as he does, that a slaveholder has a right to take his slave as property into a Territory, he must, at the same time, admit that, in the absence of local legislation positively establishing slavery, the Constitution of the United States, the only valid law existing there, must be the source of that right. What else does Mr. Buchanan assert, but that slavery exists in the Territories by virtue of the Federal Constitution? Where is, then, the point of difference between Mr. Buchanan and Mr. Douglas? Why all this pomp and circumstance of glorious war? Whence these fierce battles between the Montechi and Capuletti of the Democratic camp? Are ye not brothers?

But Mr. Douglas is a statesman, (so they are all, all statesmen,) and pretends that the Constitution does not establish slavery in the Territories, "*beyond the power of the people to control it by law.*" What does that mean? It means that the people of a Territory shall have the power to embarrass the slaveholder in the enjoyment of his right by "unfriendly legislation." "The right to hold slaves," says he in another place, "is a worthless right, unless protected by appropriate police regulations. If the people of a Territory do not want slavery, they have but to withhold all all protection and all friendly legislation." Indeed, a most ingenious expedient.

But, alas! Here is one of those cases where the *abstract* admission of a right is of decisive importance. Suppose, for argument's sake, a slave might escape from his owner in a Territory, without being in actual danger of recapture; would that in any way affect the constitutional right of the slaveholder to the possession and enjoyment of his property? I have already quoted Mr. Douglas's own answer to this question. "If," says he, "slavery exists in the Territories by virtue of the Constitution," (that is, *if a slaveholder has a right to introduce his "slave property" where there is no other law but the Constitution,*) "*then it becomes the imperative duty of Congress, to the performance of which every member is bound by his oath and conscience, and from which no consideration of policy or expediency can release him, to provide by law such adequate and complete protection as is essential to the enjoyment of that important right.*"

And Mr. Douglas, after having emphatically admitted the right of property in a slave, where that right can spring from no other law but the Constitution, then dares to speak of unfriendly legislation. Where is his conscience? Where is his oath? Where is his honor? [Applause.]

But Mr. Douglas says more;

"The Constitution being the supreme law of the land, in the States as well as in the Territories, then slavery exists in Pennsylvania just as well as in Kansas, and in South Carolina, and the irrepressible conflict is there!"

Aye, the irrepressible conflict is there, not only between the two antagonistic systems of labor, but between Mr. Douglas's own theories; not only in the States and Territories, but in Mr. Douglas's own head. [Laughter and cheers.] Whatever ambiguous expressions Mr. Douglas may invent, the dilemma stares him in the face, (and here I put myself on his own ground,) either slavery is excluded from the Territories so long as it is not admitted by a special act of Territorial legislation, or, if a slaveholder has the right to introduce his slave property there before such legislation is had, he can possess that right by virtue of no other but, the only law existing there, the Constitution of the United States. Either slavery has no rights in the Territories, except those springing from positive law of a local or municipal character, or, according to Judge Douglas's own admission, the Soushern construction of the Constitution and of the principle of popular sov-