CHICAGO DAILY PRESS AND TRIBUNE.

BY PRESS AND TRIBUNE CO. CHICAGO, TUESDAY MORNING, SEPTEMBER 21, 1858. VOLUME XII. NUMBER 69.

PRESS AND TRIBUNE.

TUESDAY MORNING, SEPTEMBER 21, 1858.

☞ For TO-DAY'S ADVERTISEMENTS, LOCAL, TELEGRAPHIC and COMMERCIAL NEWS See Fourth Page.

THE GREAT TRIUMPH OF THE CAMPAIGN.

DEBATE BETWEEN

LINCOLN AND DOUGLAS

AT CHARLESTON.

Twelve to Fifteen Thousand Persons Present.

LINCOLN TOMAHAWKS HIS ANTAGONIST WITH THE TOOMBS BILL.

Great Rout of the Douglasites in the Seventh District.

KILLED, WOUNDED AND MISSING.

Grand Demonstration of the Republican Girls of Charleston.

Etc., Etc., Etc.

Saturday last was a day to be remembered in the counties of Coles, Edgar, Cumberland, Clark, Champaign, Vermillion, etc.—Eastern Illinois. According to announcement, the fourth great debate between Lincoln and Douglas was "pitched" in the city of Charleston at the date before-mentioned, and we risk nothing in saying the joint demonstration eclipsed all previous political turn-outs in the central portion of the State. Ottawa and Freeport must try again, for while the latter perhaps brought a few more listeners to the debate, both together would not have made so imposing a display of the electoral strength of a great campaign.

On Friday evening the hotels in the town were already crowded to excess, and the streets were hung with national flags, banners, and all manner of artistic devices which could be pressed into political service. Early on Saturday morning the town began to fill up with delegations and teams from the adjoining precincts and the surrounding counties. A special train from Indiana brought eleven car loads of interested lookers on from that State. People came on horseback and mutback, in wagons, on freight trains and on foot—some with badges and some with banners, some with their dinners and some without. At ten o'clock the streets and sidewalks around the public square were almost impassable, and those who essayed out-doors for the purpose of business had to elbow their way in the crowd. The Chief decoration of the day was a gigantic banner, eighty feet long, hung across the street from the Court House to a high building on the west side of the street. On one side was inscribed:

COLES COUNTY
FOUR HUNDRED MAJORITY FOR LINCOLN.

On the reverse side was the motto "ERE ANE 30 YEARS AGO," driving three yoke of oxen, attached to a yawl-like Kentucky wagon. This was flanked by two magnificent specimens of the stars and stripes.

Mr. Lincoln and Mr. Douglas both passed the previous night in Mattoon. Two processions were detailed from that thriving town on Saturday morning, to escort the speakers to Charleston. About half past ten another long and imposing procession of carriages horsemen, bands of music, and conspicuous above all, a mammoth car covered with white muslin and silk and decorated with wild flowers, bearing a huge inscription, "LINCOLN, OGLESBY, MARSHALL AND CRADDOCK" and carrying thirty two young ladies with banners inscribed with names of the States of the Confederacy—moved out of Charleston to meet Mr. Lincoln. About an hour afterwards the two Republican processions returned together. They constituted without question the most formidable array of the campaign. Innumerable banners fluttered in the wind farther then the eye could reach through the cloud of dust that accompanied them. As they entered the town the procession was a mile in length. As compared with it, the Douglas escort was a very puny affair. The car provided for the thirty-two ladies on that side of the house, somehow contained only fifteen, and a majority of these were under eight years of age—suggesting the idea of their being Territories rather than States.

The carriage in which Mr. Lincoln was conveyed was driven to the entrance of the Capitol House where Mr. Bromwell of Charleston made the following reception speech:

HON. ABRAHAM LINCOLN:—Though oft welcomed before by the citizens of Coles, yet now a thousand times more welcome to the friends of free thought, free speech, free labor and free Constitutions through this portion of our State, when they hail you as the champion of the principles of liberty in this unparalleled contest, which brings such profit to our cause and honor to yourself. These friends have honored me with the commission which I now so gladly but so imperfectly fulfill of presenting you, through my voice, the accumulated welcome of assembled thousands.

There are those among us who have witnessed your course from dawning manhood till this hour. If they have marked with satisfaction your course in the walks of integrity and independence, they feel the more pride now in hailing you as their standard bearer in this great Republican phalanx which supports those principles only which are born to the eternal years of God. You, as well I, and thousands among our numbers, deem it no dishonor that we owe our honest labor all the position, whatever it may be, which we occupy in life's busy march, that we strive for the elevation of labor to no second position in honor in our Republic. We have seen you shedding lustre on this principle, and bringing free labor to the level of the occupants of the forum. We seek now to commission you as one who understands maintaining it side by side with the dignity of the Senate!

These laudable aims are being thwarted by the introduction of principles repugnant to the enlightened sentiments of freemen. A double-headed opposition, warring in its own members as to the mode, unites to crush out the principle we recognize in this only the continuation of that war against true freedom which has always existed, and in which there is no discharge, yet still we anticipate triumphwhen the bright standards of truth shall sweep the dark shadows of error from the portals of her broad pavillion, when the congregated majorities of our land shall join with that of Illinois in treading the whiteness of public indignation, in which alike all factions of climes to the people shall mingle their blood. I again welcome you to our hospitalities. Gentlemen and citizens, allow me to introduce to you the Hon. Abraham Lincoln—the next Senator of the United States from the State of Illinois.

To which Mr. Lincoln responded:

Fellow citizens, I have not been accustomed to these demonstrations and popular gatherings in my journeyings through our State heretofore. I accept, then, and I propose to accept this as a testimonial, not to myself, but to the cause and the principles which your favor has caused me to represent in this contest. I thank you most sincerely for this flattering reception, for the kind welcome your speaker has uttered, and (turning to the carriage containing the young ladies,) for this beautiful basket of flowers. (Great cheers.) I can now only express my thanks for this fine demonstration, and say that I will more fully address you and discuss the issues involved in the present struggle, at another hour.

Three loud cheers were then given, and a general dispersion took place for dinner. Those who partook of the fare of our friend Johnson, at the Capitol House, were abundantly fortified for the exercises of the afternoon.

It would be impossible to give in our columns a tithe of the interesting adjuncts and incidents of the day. We will merely add that the Republicans of Coles County are a host, and no mistake.

Mr. Lincoln's Speech.

Mr. Lincoln took the stand at a quarter before three, and was greeted with vociferous and protracted applause; after which, he said:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—It will be very difficult for an audience so large as this to hear distinctly what a speaker says, and consequently it is important that as profound silence be preserved as possible.

While I was at the hotel to-day an elderly gentleman called upon me to know whether I was really in favor of producing a perfect equality between the negroes and white people. (Great laughter.) While I had not proposed to myself on this occasion to speak upon that subject, yet as the question was asked me, I thought I would occupy perhaps five minutes in saying something in regard to it. I will say then that I am not, nor ever have been in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races, [applause]—that I am not nor ever have been in favor of making voters or jurors of negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people; and I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will for ever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality. And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together there must be the position of superior and inferior, I its much as any other man am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race.

I say upon this occasion I do not perceive that because the white man is to have the superior position the negro should be denied everything. I do not understand that because I do not want a negro woman for a slave I must necessarily want her for a wife. (Cheers and laughter.) My understanding is that I can just let her alone. I am now in my fifteen year and I certainly never have had a black woman for either a slave or a wife. So much for this. It seems to me quite possible for me to get along without making either slaves or wives of negroes. I will add to this that I have never seen to my knowledge a man, woman or child who was in favor of producing a perfect equality, social and political, between negroes and white men. (Laughter.) But in the distinguished instances that I ever heard so frequently as to be entirely satisfied of its correctness—and that is the case of Judge Douglas' old friend Col. Richard M. Johnson. (Laughter and cheers.) I will also add to the few remarks I have made, (for I am not going to speak at large upon this subject,) that I have never had the least apprehension that I or my friends would marry negroes if there was no law to keep them from it, [laughter] but as Judge Douglas and his friends seem to be in great apprehension that they might, if there were no law to keep them from it, [roars of laughter] I give him the most solemn pledge that I will to the very last stand by the law of this State, which forbids the marrying of white people with negroes. (Continued laughter and applause.) I will add one further word, which is this, that I do not understand there is any place where an alteration of the social and political relations of the negro and the white man can be brought about except by the State Legislature—not in the Congress of the United States, and as I do not really apprehend the approach of any such thing myself, and as Judge Douglas *seems* to be in constant horror that some such danger is rapidly approaching, *I propose as the best means to prevent it, that the people be kept at home and placed in the State Legislature to fight the measure.* (Uproarious laughter and applause.) I do not propose dwelling longer at this time on this subject.

When Judge Trumbull, our other Senator in Congress returned to Illinois at the beginning of August, he made a speech at Chicago in which he made what may be called a *charge* against Judge Douglas, which I understand proved to be very offensive to him. The Judge was at that time out upon his circuit of this speaking tour through the country, and when the news of it reached him, as I am informed, he denounced Judge Trumbull in rather harsh terms for having said what he did in regard to that matter. I was traveling at that time and speaking at the same places with Judge Douglas, and for a few days, and when I heard of what Judge Trumbull had said of Douglas and what Douglas had said back again I felt that I was in a position where I could not remain entirely silent in regard to the matter. Consequently upon two or three occasions I alluded to it, and I felt bound to it in no other wise than to say that in regard to the charge brought by Trumbull against Douglas, I *personally* knew nothing and sought to say nothing about it—that I did personally know Judge Trumbull—that I believed him to be a man of veracity—that I believed him to be a man of capacity sufficient to know very well whether an assertion he was making is a conclusion drawn from a set of facts, was true or false; and as a conclusion of my own from that, I stated as my belief, that Judge Trumbull should ever be called upon he would prove everything he had said. I said this upon two or three occasions. Upon a subsequent occasion Judge Trumbull spoke again before an audience at Alton and upon this occasion not only repeated the charge against Douglas, but arranged the evidence he relied upon to substantiate it. This speech was published at length, and subsequently at Jacksonville Judge Douglas alluded to the matter. In the course of his speech, (and perhaps I should be stated that I am taking a novel if what I will now read: "Judge Douglas proceeded to remark that he should not hereafter "ter occupy his time in refuting such charges "made by Trumbull, but that Lincoln having "adopted the character of his friend, Trumbull "owed it to him to be quite possible for me to get along without making voters of his slaves or wives of negroes. I will add to this that I have never seen to my knowledge a man, woman or child who was in favor of producing a perfect equality, social and political, between negroes and white men. (Laughter.) But upon distinguished instances that I ever heard so frequently as to be entirely satisfied of its correctness—and that is the case of Judge Douglas' old friend Col. Richard M. Johnson. [Laughter and cheers.] I will also add to the few remarks I have made, (for I am not going to speak at large upon this subject,) that I have never had the least apprehension that I or my friends would marry negroes if there was no law to keep them from it, [laughter] but as Judge Douglas and his friends seem to be in great apprehension that they might, if there were no law to keep them from it, [roars of laughter] I give him the most solemn pledge that I will to the very last stand by the law of this State, which forbids the marrying of white people with negroes. (Continued laughter and applause.) I will add one further word, which is this, that I do not understand there is any place where an alteration of the social and political relations of the negro and the white man can be brought about except by the State Legislature—not in the Congress of the United States, and as I do not really apprehend the approach of any such thing myself, and as Judge Douglas *seems* to be in constant horror that some such danger is rapidly approaching, *I propose as the best means to prevent it, that the people be kept at home and placed in the State Legislature to fight the measure.* [Uproarious laughter and applause.] I do not propose dwelling longer at this time on this subject.

[The extracts handed in our reporter by Mr. Lincoln are quite correctly to appear in this number of the Press and Tribune. Judge Trumbull's speech at Alton has already had a place in our columns, and Senator Douglas's speech at Jacksonville will be duly repeated in his portion of this (Charleston) debate.]

It will be perceived Judge Trumbull shows that Senator Bigler, upon the floor of the Senate had declared there had been a conference among the Senators at which conference it was determined to have an Enabling Act passed for the people of Kansas to form a Constitution under, and in this conference it was agreed among them that it was best not to have a provision for submitting the Constitution to a vote of the people. This charge should be formed. He then brings forward evidence to show, and showing, as he deemed it, that Judge Douglas reported the bill back to the Senate with that clause stricken out. He then shows that there was a new clause inserted into the bill, which would in its nature *prevent* a reference of the Constitution back for a vote of the people—if, indeed, upon a mere silence in the law, it could be assumed that they had the right to vote upon it. These are the general statements that he has made.

I propose to examine the points in Judge Douglas' speech, in which he attempts to answer that speech of Judge Trumbull's. When you come to examine Judge Douglas' speech, you will find that the first point he makes is—"Suppose it were true "that there was such a conference as is what "that I struck it out—is that proof of a plot to "force a Constitution upon them against their "will?" His striking out such a provision, if there was such a one in the bill, he argues does not establish the proof that it was stricken out for the purpose of robbing the people of that right. I would say, in the first place, that that would be the *most manifest* reason for it. It is true, as Judge Douglas states, that many Territorial bills have passed without having such a provision in them. I believe it is true, though I am not certain, that, in some instances, Constitutions framed under such bills have been submitted to a vote of the people, with the law silent on the subject, but it does not appear that they once had the bill before them with a provision in it requiring the people to submit the Constitution to be framed, to a vote of the people, and then that they were stricken out when Congress did not mean to alter the effect of the law. That there have been bills which never had that provision in, I do not believe. There when was that provision taken out of one that it was in? More especially does this evidence tend to prove the proposition that Trumbull advanced, when we remember that that provision was stricken out of the bill almost simultaneously with the time that Bigler says there was a conference among certain Senators, and in which it was agreed that a bill should be passed leaving that out. Judge Douglas, in answering Trumbull, omits to attend to the testimony of Bigler, that there was a meeting in which it was agreed to leave out of the bill that there should be no submission of the Constitution to a vote of the people. The Judge does not notice this part of it. If you take this as one piece of evidence, and then ascertain that similar language was used at another place in a provision in it, saying that "until the complete execution "of this act there shall be no election in said "Territory," which Trumbull argued was not only taking the provision for submitting to a vote of the people out of the bill, but was adding an affirmative one, in that it would prevent the people from exercising the right under a bill that was merely silent on the question. Now in regard to what he says, that Trumbull shifts the issue—that he shifts his ground—and I believe he has shifted his ground—I think in this case, he has changed ground"—I call upon all of you, when you come to examine that portion of Trumbull's speech, (for it will make a part of mine,) to examine whether Trumbull has shifted his ground or not. I say that Trumbull in his speech, put forth that he brought forward his original charge and the evidence to sustain it yet more fully, but precisely as he originally made it. Then, in addition thereto, he brought in a new piece of evidence. He shifted no ground. He brought forward no new piece of evidence inconsistent with his former testimony, and he brought a new piece, tending, as he thought, and as I think, to prove his proposition. To illustrate: A man brings an accusation against another and on trial the man making the charge introduces A and B to prove the accusation. On another trial he introduces the same witnesses, who tell the same story as before, and a third witness, who tells the same thing, and in addition gives further testimony corroborative of the charge. So with Trumbull. There is no shifting of ground, nor inconsistency of testimony, between the new piece of evidence and what he originally introduced.

But Judge Douglas says that he himself moved to strike out this last provision of the bill, and that on his motion it was stricken out and a substitute inserted. That I presume is the truth. I presume it is true that that last proposition was stricken out by Judge Douglas. Trumbull has not said it was not. Trumbull has himself said that it was so stricken out. He says: "I am speaking of the bill as Judge Douglas reported it back. He proceeds to some—"what in the Senate before it passed, but I am "speaking of it as he brought it back." Now when Judge Douglas parades the fact that the provision was stricken out of the bill when it came back, he assents to the proposition that "that I struck it out—is that proof of a plot to "force a Constitution upon them against their "will?" His striking out such a provision, if there was such a one in the bill, he argues does not establish the proof that it was stricken out for the purpose of robbing the people of that right. I would say, in the first place, that that would be the *most manifest* reason for it. It is true, as Judge Douglas states, that many Territorial bills have passed without having such a provision in them. I believe it is true, though I am not certain, that, in some instances, Constitutions framed under such bills have been submitted to a vote of the people, with the law silent on the subject, but it does not appear that they once had the bill before them with a provision in it requiring the people to submit the Constitution to be framed, to a vote of the people, and then that they were stricken out when Congress did not mean to alter the effect of the law. That there have been bills which never had that provision in, I do not believe. There when was that provision taken out of one that it was in? More especially does this evidence tend to prove the proposition that Trumbull advanced, when we remember that that provision was stricken out of the bill almost simultaneously with the time that Bigler says there was a conference among certain Senators, and in which it was agreed that a bill should be passed leaving that out. Judge Douglas, in answering Trumbull, omits to attend to the testimony of Bigler, that there was a meeting in which it was agreed to leave out of the bill that there should be no submission of the Constitution to a vote of the people. The Judge does not notice this part of it. If you take this as one piece of evidence, and then ascertain that similar language was used at another place in a provision in it, saying that "until the complete execution "of this act there shall be no election in said "Territory," which Trumbull argued was not only taking the provision for submitting to a vote of the people out of the bill, but was adding an affirmative one, in that it would prevent the people from exercising the right under a bill that was merely silent on the question. Now in regard to what he says, that Trumbull shifts the issue—that he shifts his ground—and I believe he has shifted his ground—I think in this case, he has changed ground"—I call upon all of you, when you come to examine that portion of Trumbull's speech, (for it will make a part of mine,) to examine whether Trumbull has shifted his ground or not. I say that Trumbull in his speech