

LEWISTOWN

GAZETTE

EXTRA

LAST ANNUAL MESSAGE

JAMES BUCHANAN, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

FELLOW-CITIZENS OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:—Throughout the year since our last meeting, the country has been eminently prosperous in all its material interests.

Why is it, then, that discontent now so extensively prevails, and the Union of the States, which is the source of all these blessings, is threatened with destruction? The long-continued and intemperate interference of the Northern people with the question of slavery in the Southern States has at length produced its natural effects.

But let us take warning in time, and remove the cause of danger. It cannot be denied that for five and twenty years, the agitation at the North against slavery in the South, has been incessant.

They, and they alone, can do it. All that is necessary to accomplish the object, is for which the slave States have ever contended, to be left alone, and permitted to manage their domestic institutions in their own way.

And this brings me to observe that the election of any one of our fellow-citizens to the office of President does not itself afford just cause for dissolving the Union. This is more especially true if his election has been effected by a mere plurality, and not a majority, of the people, and has resulted from transient and temporary causes, which may probably never again occur.

justice, a regard for the Constitution, all require that we shall wait for some overt and dangerous act on the part of the President elect before resorting to such a remedy.

It is said, however, that the antecedents of the President elect have been sufficient to justify the fears of the South that he will attempt to invade their constitutional rights.

Such apprehensions of contingent danger in the future, sufficient to justify the immediate destruction of the noblest system of government ever devised for mortals?

So far, then, as Congress is concerned, the objection is not to anything they have already done, but to what they may do hereafter.

Only three days after my inauguration the Supreme Court of the United States solemnly adjudged that this power did not exist in a territorial legislature.

The most palpable violations of constitutional duty which have yet been committed consist in the acts of different State legislatures to defeat the execution of the fugitive slave law.

It ought to be remembered, however, that for these acts, neither Congress nor any President can justly be held responsible.

How easy would it be for the American people to settle the slavery question forever, and to restore peace and harmony to this distracted country.

It is in my judgment, the only course which is consistent with the principles of justice and the rights of all the States, to leave them to their own institutions, and to be allowed to manage their domestic affairs in their own way.

The Southern States, standing on the basis of the Constitution, have a right to demand this act of justice from the States of the North.—Should it be refused, then the Constitution, to which all the States are parties, will have been violated.

as each became parties to the Union by the vote of its own people assembled in Convention, so any one of them may sever from the Union in a similar manner by the vote of such a convention.

In order to justify secession as a constitutional remedy, it must be on the principle that the Federal Government is a mere voluntary association of States, to be dissolved at pleasure by any one of the contracting parties.

Such a principle is wholly inconsistent with the history as well as the character of the Federal Constitution. After it was framed, with the greatest deliberation and care, it was submitted to conventions of the people of the several States for ratification.

It is not pretended that any clause in the Constitution gives countenance to such a theory. It is altogether founded upon inference drawn from the instrument itself, but from its sovereign character of the several States by which it was ratified.

It is not pretended that any clause in the Constitution gives countenance to such a theory. It is altogether founded upon inference drawn from the instrument itself, but from its sovereign character of the several States by which it was ratified.

It is not pretended that any clause in the Constitution gives countenance to such a theory. It is altogether founded upon inference drawn from the instrument itself, but from its sovereign character of the several States by which it was ratified.

It is not pretended that any clause in the Constitution gives countenance to such a theory. It is altogether founded upon inference drawn from the instrument itself, but from its sovereign character of the several States by which it was ratified.

It is not pretended that any clause in the Constitution gives countenance to such a theory. It is altogether founded upon inference drawn from the instrument itself, but from its sovereign character of the several States by which it was ratified.

It is not pretended that any clause in the Constitution gives countenance to such a theory. It is altogether founded upon inference drawn from the instrument itself, but from its sovereign character of the several States by which it was ratified.

It is not pretended that any clause in the Constitution gives countenance to such a theory. It is altogether founded upon inference drawn from the instrument itself, but from its sovereign character of the several States by which it was ratified.

It is not pretended that any clause in the Constitution gives countenance to such a theory. It is altogether founded upon inference drawn from the instrument itself, but from its sovereign character of the several States by which it was ratified.

It is not pretended that any clause in the Constitution gives countenance to such a theory. It is altogether founded upon inference drawn from the instrument itself, but from its sovereign character of the several States by which it was ratified.

It is not pretended that any clause in the Constitution gives countenance to such a theory. It is altogether founded upon inference drawn from the instrument itself, but from its sovereign character of the several States by which it was ratified.

It is not pretended that any clause in the Constitution gives countenance to such a theory. It is altogether founded upon inference drawn from the instrument itself, but from its sovereign character of the several States by which it was ratified.

let it in the discretion of each whether to obey or to refuse, and they often declined to comply with such requisitions. It thus became necessary for the purpose of removing this barrier, and in order to form a more perfect Union, to establish a Government which could act directly upon the people, and execute its own laws without the intermediate agency of the States.

In short, the Government created by the Constitution, and deriving its authority from the sovereign people of each of the several States, has precisely the same right to exercise its power over the people of all these States, in the enumerated cases, that each one of them possesses over subjects not delegated to the United States but reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people.

To the extent of the delegated powers the Constitution of the United States is as much a part of the constitution of each State, and is as binding upon its people, as though it had been textually inserted therein.

This Government, therefore, is a great and powerful Government, invested with all the attributes of sovereignty over the special subjects to which its authority extends.

It may be asked, then, are the people of the States without redress against the tyranny and oppression of the Federal Government? By no means. The right of resistance on the part of the governed against the oppression of their governments cannot be denied.

It is not pretended that any clause in the Constitution gives countenance to such a theory. It is altogether founded upon inference drawn from the instrument itself, but from its sovereign character of the several States by which it was ratified.

It is not pretended that any clause in the Constitution gives countenance to such a theory. It is altogether founded upon inference drawn from the instrument itself, but from its sovereign character of the several States by which it was ratified.

It is not pretended that any clause in the Constitution gives countenance to such a theory. It is altogether founded upon inference drawn from the instrument itself, but from its sovereign character of the several States by which it was ratified.

It is not pretended that any clause in the Constitution gives countenance to such a theory. It is altogether founded upon inference drawn from the instrument itself, but from its sovereign character of the several States by which it was ratified.

It is not pretended that any clause in the Constitution gives countenance to such a theory. It is altogether founded upon inference drawn from the instrument itself, but from its sovereign character of the several States by which it was ratified.

It is not pretended that any clause in the Constitution gives countenance to such a theory. It is altogether founded upon inference drawn from the instrument itself, but from its sovereign character of the several States by which it was ratified.

It is not pretended that any clause in the Constitution gives countenance to such a theory. It is altogether founded upon inference drawn from the instrument itself, but from its sovereign character of the several States by which it was ratified.

It is not pretended that any clause in the Constitution gives countenance to such a theory. It is altogether founded upon inference drawn from the instrument itself, but from its sovereign character of the several States by which it was ratified.

It is not pretended that any clause in the Constitution gives countenance to such a theory. It is altogether founded upon inference drawn from the instrument itself, but from its sovereign character of the several States by which it was ratified.

and enumerated powers granted to Congress; and it is equally apparent that its exercise is not necessary and proper for carrying into execution any one of these powers.

It appears from the proceedings of that body, that on the 31st of May, 1787, the clause "authorizing an extradition of the force of the whole against a delinquent State" came up for consideration.

Without descending to particulars, it may be safely asserted, that the power to make war against a State is at variance with the whole spirit and intent of the Constitution.

But, if possessed of this power, would it be wise to exercise it under existing circumstances? The object would doubtless be to preserve the Union.

But may I be permitted solemnly to invoke my countrymen to pause and deliberate, before they determine to destroy this, the grand temple which has ever been dedicated to human freedom since the world began?

It is not every wrong, may it be not every grievous wrong—which can justify a resort to such a fearful alternative.

It is not every grievous wrong, may it be not every grievous wrong—which can justify a resort to such a fearful alternative.

It is not every grievous wrong, may it be not every grievous wrong—which can justify a resort to such a fearful alternative.

It is not every grievous wrong, may it be not every grievous wrong—which can justify a resort to such a fearful alternative.

It is not every grievous wrong, may it be not every grievous wrong—which can justify a resort to such a fearful alternative.

It is not every grievous wrong, may it be not every grievous wrong—which can justify a resort to such a fearful alternative.

It is not every grievous wrong, may it be not every grievous wrong—which can justify a resort to such a fearful alternative.

It is not every grievous wrong, may it be not every grievous wrong—which can justify a resort to such a fearful alternative.

It is not every grievous wrong, may it be not every grievous wrong—which can justify a resort to such a fearful alternative.

property in slaves in the States where it now exists or may hereafter exist.

It may be objected that this construction of the Constitution has already been settled by the Supreme Court of the United States, and what more ought to be required.

When I entered upon the duties of the Presidential office, the aspect of neither our foreign nor domestic affairs was at all satisfactory.

A restoration of the African slave trade had numerous and powerful advocates. Unlawful military expeditions were sanctioned by many of our citizens, and were sustained, in defiance of the efforts of the Government, to escape from our shores, for the purpose of making war upon the unfeeling people of neighboring republics with whom we were at peace.

The discordant construction of the Clayton and Bulwer treaty between the two governments, which at different periods of the discussion, bore a threatening aspect, have resulted in a final settlement entirely satisfactory to this Government.

The discordant construction of the Clayton and Bulwer treaty between the two governments, which at different periods of the discussion, bore a threatening aspect, have resulted in a final settlement entirely satisfactory to this Government.

The discordant construction of the Clayton and Bulwer treaty between the two governments, which at different periods of the discussion, bore a threatening aspect, have resulted in a final settlement entirely satisfactory to this Government.

The discordant construction of the Clayton and Bulwer treaty between the two governments, which at different periods of the discussion, bore a threatening aspect, have resulted in a final settlement entirely satisfactory to this Government.

The discordant construction of the Clayton and Bulwer treaty between the two governments, which at different periods of the discussion, bore a threatening aspect, have resulted in a final settlement entirely satisfactory to this Government.

The discordant construction of the Clayton and Bulwer treaty between the two governments, which at different periods of the discussion, bore a threatening aspect, have resulted in a final settlement entirely satisfactory to this Government.

The discordant construction of the Clayton and Bulwer treaty between the two governments, which at different periods of the discussion, bore a threatening aspect, have resulted in a final settlement entirely satisfactory to this Government.

The discordant construction of the Clayton and Bulwer treaty between the two governments, which at different periods of the discussion, bore a threatening aspect, have resulted in a final settlement entirely satisfactory to this Government.

The discordant construction of the Clayton and Bulwer treaty between the two governments, which at different periods of the discussion, bore a threatening aspect, have resulted in a final settlement entirely satisfactory to this Government.

The discordant construction of the Clayton and Bulwer treaty between the two governments, which at different periods of the discussion, bore a threatening aspect, have resulted in a final settlement entirely satisfactory to this Government.