

# THE EAGLE.

H. L. PHILLIPS,  
W. G. SPENCER,

EDITORS AND PROPRIETORS.

DECATUR, INDIANA.

FRIDAY MORNING, SEPT. 3, 1858.

## DEMOCRATIC STATE TICKET.

SECRETARY OF STATE,  
DANIEL MCCLURE,  
of Morgan.

AUDITOR OF STATE,  
JOHN W. DODD,  
of Grant.

TREASURER OF STATE,  
NATHANIEL F. CUNNINGHAM,  
of Vigo.

SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,  
SAMUEL L. RUGG,  
of Allen.

ATTORNEY GENERAL,  
JOSEPH E. McDONALD,  
of Montgomery.

FOR SUPREME JUDGES,  
SAMUEL E. PERKINS,  
of Marion.

ANDREW DAVISON,  
of Decatur.

JAMES M. HANNA,  
of Vigo.

JAMES L. WORDEN,  
of Whitley.

DISTRICT TICKET.

FOR CONGRESS,  
JOHN R. COFFROTH.

FOR STATE SENATOR,  
DAVID STUDBAKER.

JUDGE 10TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT,  
WM. W. CARSON.

PROSECUTING ATTORNEY,  
J. H. SCHELL.

COMMON PLEAS JUDGE,  
JOSEPH BRACKENRIDGE.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY,  
JOHN COLEMAN.

COUNTY TICKET.

REPRESENTATIVE,  
JONATHAN KELLEY, SEN.

TREASURER,  
DAVID SHOWERS.

RECORDER,  
W. J. ADELSPERGER.

SHERIFF,  
GEORGE FRANK.

COMMISSIONER,  
J. R. MILLER.

SURVEYOR,  
E. W. REED.

CORONER,  
LEVI EWING.

JOHN U. PETTIT.

This gentleman visited our place on Monday the 23d ult., in accordance with arrangements previously made by his Republican friends, who were much elated at the idea of hearing, as they said, one of John's best efforts. It being the first day of the Circuit Court, quite a number of persons were present; we with others, expected to hear why this gentleman should be elected the third time to Congress from this district and to learn from the fountain head what Republicanism was. He labored for three and one half hours, not in showing what he had done as the Representative of this district for the interest of those who had clothed him with authority, or the principles entertained by the party he is now acting with, in rendering an account of his stewardship—he pointed them to his "silent record" and said "my votes speak for me." But his effort was confined principally in misrepresenting his opponent (Mr. Coffroth who was absent) which was wilfully and corruptly done, in endeavoring to place Mr. Coffroth in a false position before the people of this County, his course was almost unanimously admitted to be ungentlemanly and unmanly and showed signs of weakness in the position he assumed as the leader of the Republican party, silence reigned throughout the assembly, and the anticipated defeat of their chieftain could be seen and read upon every Republican countenance.

We intend for the present to show a few of the many misrepresentations made by Mr. Pettit during his speech. He said "that one week after the Hon. J. D. Bright made his speech upon the admission of Kansas, in which he avowed the sentiment that it was a 'vicious principle' to submit constitutions to a vote of the people," that the Democratic Convention of the 8th of January, assembled at Indianapolis and by resolution approved of the course pursued by Senator Bright, and that Mr. Coffroth, as a delegate, voted for that resolution, therefore, Mr. Coffroth approved and endorsed the sentiments contained in Bright's speech uttered one week before, as Democratic doctrine."—Now this is untrue, and without the least foundation. Mr. Pettit either imagined that he was addressing an ignorant assembly and could wilfully falsify the record, and thereby place his competitor in an unenviable position, or, that he was totally ignorant of that of which he was speaking; either of which positions would render him incapable and unqualified to represent an honest and intelligent people.

It will only be necessary to refer to one fact, which is incontrovertible, in order to refute this willful charge manufactured for the occasion. That the speech of the Hon. J. D. Bright referred to, was delivered on the 20th day of March 1858, nearly three months after the Convention of January 8th assembled, we know that Mr. Coffroth does not approve the sentiments contained in Bright's speech. Then we ask, in view of this falsehood, uttered by a Republican leader seeking the suffrage of the people, what confidence can the honest portion of them have in him as their representative in Congress.

Again he said "That the Convention which nominated Mr. Coffroth, did by resolution endorse the Democratic platform of 1856, and that platform endorsed President Peirce and his slavery policy in regard to Kansas." Now this is untrue, in this, that there is no resolution to be found in the Democratic Platform of 1856 endorsing Peirce's or any other man's policy, with regard to Kansas or any other Territory, nor can it be found as a part of the Platform, then why did he make such charges? Was it not for the love of misrepresentation and to deceive the unsuspecting?

Again he said "the Huntington Convention also endorsed the State platform of January 8th 1858, where they endorsed Buchanan in full, in forcing a slave Constitution on the people of Kansas, against their will." In order, to show this Republican leader up in his true light, we will publish the resolutions passed at Huntington that the public may learn what reliance there is to be placed in the man who has twice had their suffrage. There was but two resolutions passed, they are as follows:

Resolved, That we hereby re-affirm and endorse the Platform adopted by the National Convention of the Democratic party at Cincinnati in 1856 as embodying the true and time honored principles of our party.

Resolved, That we hereby declare our faith in the right of the people of territories to ratify and confirm their Constitutions in their own way, and we believe the ballot-box affords the best evidence of such confirmation.

This is the platform upon which Mr. Coffroth was placed, upon receiving the nomination, and in his acceptance, said he cordially approved and endorsed the same. Where are those resolutions, of which Mr. Pettit spoke? Where is the endorsement of Mr. Bright's speech?

It must be admitted by every candid man, that the charges made by Mr. Pettit against his competitor, was without the least foundation of truth, and was uttered by a demagogue, who would, "if it were possible deceive the very elect," in order to obtain the three thousand dollars salary and mileage for going after it: But if we mistake not the signs of the times, he will be permitted for the present, to stay at home.

### ALEY ROSS.

This gentleman's motto at the Republican Convention which gave him the nomination for Representative, was, "Down with slavery everywhere." What this Republican meant by the expression may be difficult to divine; but the language justifies the conclusion that he was intending to inform his Republican friends, that he was a downright Abolitionist, and was in favor of interfering with, and abolishing slavery in the States where it legally exists.

If this gentleman is "down on slavery everywhere," and intends to carry his principles into execution, the irresistible conclusion is, that he, as a citizen of Indiana, intends to claim the right to say what the domestic institutions of Kentucky and other slave holding States should be.—The Democratic doctrine upon this point is, that Mr. Ross, a constituent member of the Republic of Indiana, shall have his voice in saying what her domestic institutions shall be; but it was for the citizen of Kentucky, exclusively, to say what institutions they desire to live under; and Mr. Ross, as a citizen of Indiana, has no right, either morally or politically, to interfere with their decision in the matter, nor has he the right to be down on her citizens for their decision. With this doctrine many that have been acting with the Republican party concur, and entirely repudiate Mr. Ross' motto, and if we mistake not, will have nothing to do with the motto, or the man who promulgated it.

But we imagine some ardent Black Republican will say we pervert Mr. Ross' meaning; to all such we would ask in candor, what did he mean by the expression? If he is down on slavery, it is reasonable to suppose he meant something by the legislature that he is going to be down on it in the State of Indiana? Certainly not, for none exists, he cannot be down on a thing that has no existence,

then in order to carry into practical operation his motto, he must necessarily go where the institution of slavery exists, to Kentucky or some other Slave State.

We feel satisfied that Mr. Ross, as a Republican, entertains just the sentiment that the language of his motto attributes to him that it is part of the Republican creed as expressed by Judge Dickerson in his speech at the Court House last week. He avowed the sentiment "that the Republican party desired to smother out the cursed institution of Slavery where ever it legally existed, then Mr. Ross' motto has no bounds, and we think it will have few advocates, at the polls in October next,

### Perry Crabs, the Proscriptionist.

In the last number of the Adams County Democrat—which, by the way, has become the regular organ and mouth piece of this Republican leader—we notice a low scurrilous article from the pen of that blackest of all black hearted falsifiers, Perry Crabs. He is decidedly the most contemptible, mean and treacherous thing that was ever formed after human, and permitted to associate with men. He is void of every principle of honor, both in a political and social relation. In his business life we believe him to be as dishonest as his heart is black in politics; as deceitful as he is mean looking. His conscience is so seared by being kept in continual contact with mean, low, contemptible and dishonest acts that he feels, not even one blush of shame, for the perpetration of the vilest of all vile deeds: the crime of robbing his fellowman, who happens to be ignorant, of his good name, his honor and his reputation. All this he has done and we shall prove the same against him. Now for the proof:

In the first place, he says he dared us to prove an assertion made in a former number of our paper. We did prove it and published the proof in the form of a certificate from Mr. Meibers and Mr. Barnhart—given by themselves, with their own free will and without any persuasion on our part whatever; and Mr. Meibers will refute the charge at any time that he signed it not knowing what it contained; and that he did not authorize its publication; they both signed it for the purpose of having it published. As soon as Mr. Crabs found that we had the evidence of his guilt and was using it; he goes to Messrs. Meibers and Barnhart and represents to them that we had inserted language in their certificate which they were not aware of; among other words which he said we had inserted, was the word "coercion." They not suspecting anything of his vile treachery, gave him a certificate stating that they had not heard Mr. Johnson make use of that word.

Now Mr. Crabs well knew that there was no such language in the certificate we published; and just as soon as Messrs. Meibers and Barnhart learned that such was the case, they immediately procured the certificate they had given Mr. Crabs and tore their names from it. Mr. Crabs now was abashed by being caught in the act of perpetrating a foul and malicious slander upon the veracity of Messrs. Meibers and Barnhart, went to work and drew up two more certificates and endeavored to get Messrs. Meibers and Barnhart to sign them. Mr. Barnhart signed one before he knew what it really contained; but afterwards went and endeavored to get it back; Mr. Crabs, knowing the fate of his other ill-gotten certificate and fearing the same for the one he then had, mean-like he refused to give it up. Mr. Meibers after being deceived once by him would have nothing more to do with him, although he hung round him nearly one whole week, using every means his imbecile brain could invent to gain his object; but he failed, and the bystander might have seen him sneaking away, crestfallen.

Failing there in his vile object, he next goes to Mr. Johnson and obtained a certificate of him, denying all he had said and admitting himself to be a liar. How he obtained this certificate we know not, but the circumstances lead us to believe that it was either through a bribe or a threat; for surely Mr. Johnson never done that act voluntarily which would ruin his reputation for truth in the community in which he lives, and sink him in the estimation of his friends, by what means he obtained it we cannot tell; but it will avail him nothing; we have proved all we asserted, and could prove by others that he made those declarations in the squire's office at the time he was sued; and that he has since declared he would be qualified to it before any court. But we have proved enough already to show this stink of iniquity that he has failed in his object,

which object was to deceive the public and cover up his own black deeds.—He not only carries his proscription feelings into his social walk, but he makes a political trap of his place of business; and baits it with his every day dealings; and woe to the unfortunate voter who places himself within his power; if he be a Democrat, he must either forfeit his right of franchise and let him cast the vote to suit himself or perish at the stake a martyr to his principles.

What shall we think of such a man? A man who does not hesitate to assert a willful and malicious falsehood! A man who has no regard for his own honor, or that of his fellow man! A man that would basely betray his bosom friend that he might obtain the object for which he sought! A man who would sue a Democrat because he would not vote for him! A man who would publish his customers' accounts to the world merely because those customers were Democrats and dared speak out in an open and manly manner against his acts of tyranny and proscription! Yes, you might well exclaim in holy horror! what think we of such a man? Verily, do we believe, that even the very Secretary of the internal regions, himself, would blush to record his name on the black books of damnation.

We have a few more cases for Mr. Crabs to digest and he can have them whenever he asks for them, and perhaps before.

Mr. Studabaker has commenced the canvass in Jay County, he speaks at sixteen different points in that County, he will next canvass Wells County, Mr. G. A. Dent his Competitor although requested refused to meet Mr. Studabaker upon the stump to discuss the questions, which will agitate the next legislature.

Dr. William Freeman, who was charged with the murder of Mr. Murphy was tried and acquitted last week in the Wells Circuit Court.

Martin Witz a Butcher of Allen County was tried and sentenced last week in the Circuit Court of this County for Grand Larceny, and is now in the Penitentiary.

OUR PROSPECT.—The State Journal, opposition, publishes a table showing the vote in each Legislative district at the last gubernatorial election. If the same vote should be given to the members of the Legislature at the ensuing election, the new Legislature will stand—Senate, Democrats 27, Republicans 23, House, Democrats 59, Republicans 41. Dem. majority on joint ballot 22.

LECOMPTON DEFEATED BY THE PEOPLE.—The Board of Commissioners constituted by the English Compromise have issued a proclamation declaring the official vote for and against the Constitution on the first Monday of August last, to be as follows: The whole vote given was 13,088 the vote for the acceptance of the proposition was 1,788 the vote against the proposition accepted was 11,300. Proposition rejected by a majority of 9,512 being more than 6 to 1.

What has the Opposition ever Accomplished.

What has the opposition to the Democratic party ever accomplished in a national way? They enacted the Alien and Sedition Laws, but the Democratic party repealed them, and since then they have not been heard of. At the instance of Thomas Jefferson, the Democratic party enacted the present naturalization laws; the Democratic party divorced the Federal Government from gigantic money corporation, and established the Independent Treasury system, a measure the opposition reviled, but whose excellence is universally acknowledged, and no one now has the temerity to advocate its repeal. It enacted the tariff, under which the country has prospered. In 1812, it humbled British insolence. It acquired Louisiana, Florida, Texas and Mexico, and thus has laid the foundation for one of the mightiest and freest of governments that has ever existed on the face of the earth. A Democratic State was the first to abolish slavery, and every State except one, that has been admitted into the Union, has been admitted under a Democratic President. In every State where the rights of the people have been enlarged and made more secure through their constitutions, it has been done by the Democratic party. The Fugitive Slave Law may be said to belong to the opposition, as it bears the approving signature of Millard Fillmore. What other great measures can the opposition lay claim to? They had the honor, it is true of expelling some of their own members from the floor of Congress two years ago, when they were in the majority there, for shameless corruption, a thing the Democratic party was never constrained to do.

Has the opposition done anything else?—Franklin Democrat.

### Douglas and Democracy

The emphasis and enthusiasm of Senator Douglas' public reception at Chicago bear grateful testimony to the existence of a deep and indestructible popular sympathy with manly dealing, even in politics. We hail the incident with unaffected pleasure. In these days of hollow words and counterfeit emotions, it is a double satisfaction to be reminded by the dash of a genuine moral outburst upon one's parched spirit, that there is still such a thing as a love of heroic political daring in the public heart. It revives the flagging energies of the man, while it reassures the not less flagging convictions of the patriot. We congratulate Senator Douglas on the benign fortune which has made him the subject of so glorious a tribute. His reception at Chicago, if we may credit universal report, was one which might justly kindle the pride of the proudest amongst us. Like the welcome given to our own Crittenden, on the threshold of his native Kentucky, it was heart-felt soul-stirring. It was clearly a spontaneous, irrepressible, thrilling expression of popular feeling. Unlike too many of the exhibitions of applause that heretofore have marked the career of Senator Douglas, it was a true electric burst of public admiration. It was a live demonstration. There was so far at least as we, at this distance, can judge, no galvanism in its thrill, no tinsel in its glow. It was a greeting from the heart to the heart—such a greeting as only high duties nobly discharged could awaken in the bosoms of a generous and intelligent constituency. Senator Douglas may well cherish it among the most precious recollections of his life. We venture to say that it constitutes the sweetest reward that ever solaced the spirit of that gallant tribune of Democracy. The breath of applause so richly merited is such stuff as fame is made of. It is a breath, we may be pardoned for saying, that has never before in such volume fanned the nostrils, of Senator Douglas. Let the herd of cowardly time-servers in the ranks of our public men take careful note of the lesson. Let Senator Douglas himself see to it that he cherishes an abiding sense of its significance.

The Senator's speech on the occasion will attract the public eye. It is chiefly interesting as a proclamation of the issues upon which he intends to wage the canvass as a candidate for re-election to the Senate against the opposing if not combined forces of the Republicans and Lecompton Democracy of Illinois. The effort exhibits the characteristic merits of Mr. Douglas' oratory in every great perfection, with nearly all its characteristic defects. It is uncommonly bold, vigorous, sinewy, and racy, with rather less than the usual proportion of bad grammar, loose logic, and bastard rhetoric. It is, in fact, one of Senator Douglas' most admirable of his efforts, however, scarcely invite criticism as mere exhibitions of intellect. The plan of his canvass as sketched in the Chicago speech is exceedingly simple. He takes up the gauge, or what he considers the gauge, of his Republican opponent, Mr. Lincoln, and announces his determination to maintain the rights of the States and the authority of the Supreme Court of the Union. In other words, he asserts, in opposition to Mr. Lincoln, that it is neither desirable nor possible that there should be uniformity in the local institutions and domestic regulations of the different States of the Union; and that the right and province of expounding the Constitution and construing the law is vested in the judiciary established by the Constitution, to the 'majesty' opinions 'must yield.' He denies that a sectional war of extermination as respects slavery is either inevitable or beneficial, and affirms the constitutional supremacy of the Supreme Court. This, if a little general, is at all events sufficiently plain and easy. The position is impregnable. If Mr. Lincoln goes into the conflict as thus defined, his overthrow must be signal, and all good citizens will heartily rejoice in it. In such a struggle the Republican candidate will stand on quick-sand. And if, as seems certain, the slavery question is to be the absorbing feature of the canvass, we do not see how he can get any solid ground.—Senator Douglas' well known position in relation to popular sovereignty stretches as far north as it is possible to get, without sinking into the quagmires of abolition. If, accordingly, there is to be any issue, save a personal one, between him and his competitor, the latter must of necessity fight neck-deep in that quagmire. With so decided a vantage-ground, Senator Douglas' triumph, we think, is assured.

The strong probability of this result opens up a fresh view to ambition of the Illinois Senator—or, rather, it lifts the clouds from the old one. It puts, as we conceive, an altogether new face on his future political prospects. Reseated in the Senate, crowned with the laurels won in a life-and-death struggle with the Republicans in his State on the extreme Republican platform, there is no telling in how plausible a character he may present himself to the Charleston Convention in 1860. And there is no knowing how civilly the Charleston Convention may entertain his pretensions. Necessity is a matchless conciliator. And, then, undoubtedly, there is a great deal of the oil of political kindness even in the Disunionists. Be this as it may, it is clear that there is a world of Democratic fight in Senator Douglas yet.—Louisville Journal.

The Queen's Bench, in England, have decided that ill-health is sufficient excuse for breach of promise of marriage.

### THE DUTY OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

The Democratic party of the present day has a great duty to perform—one that must tell upon the future peace and prosperity of our great country. It is a high and imperative duty of the Democratic party to secure and perpetuate its own union and harmony—because it is alone through this means that the Union and the Constitution of our common country can be preserved, and all their inestimable advantages and blessings transmitted to those who are to come after us. We do not believe our Union, which is the wonder and admiration of the world, could survive a single year, were it not for the influences, the guidance and the principles of the National Democracy.—Take these away—remove entirely their conciliatory and harmonizing influences, and give loose reign to the mad spirit of sectional fanaticism for a single year, and our proud confederacy would be at an end forever. Is this true? Is there a single intelligent Democrat in the country that does not believe it? Or, at least, is there one who would not greatly fear to risk the experiment? What, then, under such circumstances—under such a fearful weight of responsibility—is the duty of the Democratic party? We answer—It is to unite! It is to harmonize! It is to forget and forgive all past differences upon mere questions of judgment or expediency, and to rally to the maintenance of those great fundamental principles—those ancient landmarks, of the party, which have been so long and so successfully maintained, and carried into practical operation by the National Democracy. For the future let Lecompton and anti-Lecompton be cast to the moles and the bats, or bequeathed to our political opponents, as the next winding sheet of their defunct and dissipated hopes.—Let not Lecompton or anti-Lecompton any longer be a test of Democracy. It is a question upon which the ablest and best minds of the Democratic party of the nation have differed, and we have no doubt honestly differed too. It has also become a dead issue—has no longer any life or vitality in it—and the putrid remains should now be buried from the sight and the memory of those who have heretofore bestowed but too much time and attention to it. Again, we say, let the National Democracy—both candidates and voters—mount their glorious old platform, which is wide enough, and long enough, and strong enough, to bear them on to renewed victories, and their country to increasing greatness and glory. Let them stand by their old Revenue Tariff policy, and oppose all unequal and unjust schemes for the favoritism and protection of a few iron masters or cotton lords, at the expense of the great agricultural and mechanical interests of the country.—Let them maintain their opposition to a National Bank, the distribution of the proceeds of the public lands among the States, and other kindred gigantic schemes for corrupting the government, and defrauding the people. Let them strictly adhere to the impregnable doctrine that to the people of each State and Territory belongs the right—the exclusive right—to model and regulate its domestic affairs in its own way, without interference or dictation from those not immediately interested in such institutions. Let them stand by, and reiterate their confidence in the wisdom and purity of the U. S. Supreme Court, in its decision in the Dred Scott case. Let these distinctive principles of the Democratic party, with a conformity to its usages, be made the only tests of membership, and we may again and speedily expect to see her united and harmonious—renewing her strength, and marching forward to great and certain victories.

We commend the following resolution, passed by the late Democratic State Convention of Ohio, to the consideration and imitation of our Democratic brotherhood throughout the Union:

Resolved, That we regard the Lecompton controversy, so called, as at an end, and as being a settled issue; therefore, we refuse to recognize it as a test, to be prescribed by either side of those who differed in position upon it, believing that all those who uphold the cardinal principles of the party, and sustain its organization by voting the Democratic ticket, as good enough Democrats for all purposes.

Let the spirit of this resolution be carried out generally by the Democratic party of the country, and all will be well again. Our party will be united and victorious and the integrity of the Union and Constitution thus secured.—Waynesburg Messenger.

LINCOLN AND THE GERMANS.—Abraham Lincoln, the Black-Republican candidate for Senator, seems to have as poor an opinion of the Germans now as he had four years ago, when he came to this city and organized a Know-Nothing lodge, and administered Know Nothing oaths to two hundred of his political friends. Judge Douglas in his Chicago speech, said that when the Declaration of Independence says, "all men are created equal," it means all men of the white race. Lincoln, when he came to reply, said that if this was true, it would exclude the Germans! So, it seems that Lincoln doesn't admit that the Germans are a portion of the white race! Judge Douglas, however, thinks that the Germans are of the white race, and they are consequently embraced by the Declaration of Independence. The Germans will make a note of this.—Quincy Herald.

Time, which is most valuable, is the most trifled with.