News from all Nations.

—An amusing incident occurred at Wellsville, Ohio, during Mr. Lincoln's journey to Cleveland.—A large crowd had assembled,and Mr. Lincoln went out on be platform. He excused himself from making a speech having made a few remarks there on the previous day.—At this moment a man stepped forward and offered a couple of apples to the President elect. A little boy in the crowd yelled out, "Say, Mr. Linkin, that man is running for Postmaster!" The donor of the apples collapsed amid screams of laughter.

—The London Daily *News* in remarking upon the madness of the South, thinks the proposition that a "barbaric slaveholding community has a prospect of splendor and wealth, in virtue of its barbarism, while a free and thriving people will become a mere rump of the Republic, is treason to political principles in any civilized country in the world."

—Robert T. Lincoln, the eldest son of the President elect, and who is accompanying him to Washington, is a student at Harvard, and will shortly return to his class. He is a young man of fine abilities and much dignity of character. The reports in various papers intimating that his course of life is what is popularly denominated "fast," are strictly erroneous, and no less painful to him than to his excellent parents. to whom he has ever been a dutiful and affectionate son.

—There is a sublime insolence about John Chinaman, unsurpassed except by the seceding mutual admiration coterie now running the Southern Confederacy. Over the house assigned in Pekin to Mr. Ward, the American Ambassador,the Chinese authorities placed the following inscription: "Lent to American Barbarian Ward, Tribute Bearer."

—Gen. Butler, of Lowell, is a wit. The Boston *Courier* reports the he was in Washington the other day, and during a conversation with southern men, one of them, a Georgian, said, "I do not believe there is an honest man in Massachsetts." After a moment's reflection he added: "I beg to assure you, Mr. Butler I mean nothing personal." The general responded: "I believe there are a great many honest men in Georgia; but in saying so, sir, I do not mean anything personal."

—An official statement laid before the Louisiana Convention, shows that Louisana realized $734,330 by her thefts of public property at New Orleans.—This sum includes the value of two revenue cutters the McClelland and the Washington which were surrendered by their officers.

—A letter from Milwaukee says—The country is full of wheat. All the warehouses in the city are full, and they are shipping it off all the time in barrels and bags, by railroad, to make room.

—The Banks in New York are now nearly glutted with specie. They now held $36,000,000 with a prospect of a future increase.

—The family of Hon. J. Glancy Jones, Minister to Austria, comprising Mrs. Jones, two daughters and son Richmond arrived at Reading on Wednesday of last week. Mr. Jones will remain at his post until his successor is appointed.

—A member of the Illinois Legislature had the satisfaction of creating a decided sensation a few days since. Having expressed himself with much emphasis on a question before the house, he attempted to resume his seat, but forgeting that he had moved it back, was astonished at finding himself on the floor. Above the shout of laughter which ensued, his voice was heard asserting that he still "had the floor."

—There is an actual scarcity of provisions in Smith county, Miss. A resident of that section, Maj Hawkins. was recently deputed to visit Illinois, to purchase corn. On his arrival at Springfield, the people convened spontaneously,passed resolutions denouncing secession, and pledging themselves to give the destitute all the corn they needed.

—From the fact that $15,000,000 who bid for the new United States six per cent. loan of $8,000,000 it may be inferred that confidence in the government is not entirely gone. Of the sum, $13,500,000 was bid in New York city alone. The award was made in Washington on Saturday.

—Speaking of the number and variety of names suggested for the "Southern Confederacy," the Milwaukee *Sentinel* says: *Samboania, Niggeria and Cottonalia*, are all very pretty, but we suggest that they use the name of one of their leading men—take Rhett, for instance. How appropriate this would sound—"The Rhett-Ched Confederacy."

—The smartest young butcher in New York is named Gorman. He can kill and dress a sheep in four minutes and twenty-four seconds, and did it the other day for a wager. His competitor, a veteran butcher named Darby, occupied six minutes and twenty-six seconds in performing the same operation.

—A most desperate affray took place in Carbondale, Luzerne county, on Saturday night, during which George Brennon was killed. Andrew Farrell was fatally stabbed, and —— Berole dangerously injured by a man named Martin Gibson who used a bowie knife with fatal execution. Gibson when arrested, expressed regret that he had not killed all his victims.

—The Republicans of New York State have *gained* in the County Elections for Supervisors as far as heard from. John Brownism and Secessionism are alike impotent to inspire any love for Slavery among educated people who have time to think and act intelligently.

—In the recent flood on the West Branch at Youngwomanstown, the gorged ice was piled fifty feet high, destroying houses and bridges and doing great damage to many persons.

—The returns of 1850 show the militia of the Northern States to be 1,255, 573; and of the South ern States, 778,864.

—The *Charleston Courier* is moved to anger because, on Washington's Birthday, Fort Sumter "belched forth its saucy salute" of 34 guns.

—Missouri has decided by 20,000 majority, against a Convention to even *consider* about Secession. They are sensible in that.

—The Congress of the Southern Confederacy has adopted a resolution in favor of the free navigation of the Mississippi. It is evidently fearful of provoking a collision.

—The Baltimore *Sun*, a rabid secession paper openly confesses that the sole purpose of the South Carolina Rebellion was to break the Republican party into pieces,and that the failure of the Border Slave States to side with South Carolina and go out of the Union has blown up, not the Republicans, but the Cotton States.

—The Town Elections in New York State are as strongly in favor of Republicanism, as they were last year—in some instances they even show gains.

—The oddest of all gifts to the President elect came to hand, in the course of yesterday morning. It was neither more nor less than a whistle made out of a pig's tail. There is no "sell" in this. Your correspondent has seen the tangible refutation of the time honored saying that no "whistle can be made out of a pig's tail" with his own eyes. The donor of the instrument is a prominent Ohio politician, residing at Columbus, and connected with the State government. Mr. Lincoln enjoys the joke hugely.

—Judge Low, of the Land Court, St. Louis, has decided that a paper published in the interest of a religious sect, is not a *newspaper*, and that legal notices published in such journals are void.

—In the United States Senate the other day, while the tariff was under consideration, Mr. Collamer proposed to raise the duties on Havana cigars as luxuries. Whereupon Mr. Seward remarked: "I desire to know of the Senator from Vermont, if I correctly understand him, whether he regards cigars as luxuries; because I have come to regard them as a necessary of life?" Mr. Seward is an inveterate smoker.

Bradford Reporter.

E. O. GOODRICH, } EDITORS.
R. W. STURROCK, }

TOWANDA:

Thursday Morning, March 7, 1861.

The Inaugural Address.

On the Fourth of March, in the presence of an immense and enthusiatic assemblage, with the customary ceremonies, the oath of office was administered to ABRAHAM LINCOLN, and he was inducted into the office of the Chief Magistrate of this Nation. We have no space for the details of the ceremonies of this important and interesting occasion; but everything was done amidst peace and good order, and without violence or accident.

We give the Inaugural Address in full, and we are sure our readers will be gratified with its sentiments. It meets the momentous questions fairly and squarely. It repeats the oft-declared purpose of the Republican party not to interfere with the rights of the Southern states; and acknowledges the Constitutional obligation to return fugitive slaves. The Union "must and shall be preserved"—and the Inaugural takes mild, forbearing, yet firm ground for the enforcement of the laws. Finally, Mr. LINCOLN appeals earnestly for the Union.

Those who have looked to Mr. LINCOLN to humiliate the Republican party, have little comfort from the present indications of his policy. Our faith in him is confirmed—that his prudence, sagacity and firmness combined, make him the man for the times.

— The struggle for places in the Cabinet has been tremendous. The following is probably the programme:

Secretary of State.—WM. H. SEWARD, of N. York.
Secretary of Treasury.—SALMON T. CHASE, of Ohio.
Secretary of War.—SIMON CAMERON, of Penn.
Secretary of Navy —MONTGOMERY BLAIR, of Md.
Secretary of Interior.—CALEB B. SMITH, of Indianna.
Postmaster General.—GIDEON WELLES, of Conn.
Attorney-General.—EDWARD BATES, of Missouri.

CABINET OF THE NEW CONFEDERACY.

We understand that the Cabinet of the Southern Confederacy is arranged as follows:

Secretary of State,	Herschell V. Johnson, Ga.
Secretary of War,	P. O. Hider, La.
Secretary of the Navy,	S. R. Mallory, Florida.
Secretary of the Interior,	W. Porcher Miles, S. C.
Post Office Dedartment,	J. H. Homphill, Texas.
Attorney General,	John A. Elmore, Ala.

The premier of this Cabinet, Mr. Johnson, was lately the candidate for the Vice Presidency on the Douglas ticket. He has always been, says the *U. S. Gazette*, a rank partisan of the extreme southern school of political doctrines, and how he ever got into the company of Douglas in the late canvass remains a mystery. When he was Governor of Georgia he was a fire-eater in opposition to the Union men, then victorious. During the Presidential canvass his sentiments were quoted far and wide in direct opposition to the tenets of the Northern Douglasites. He is a proper companion of Cobb, Toombs, and the rest of the school of troublesome men. This same State of Georgia seems to cut an extensive figure among the cottonocracy. She has the President of their Congress, Mr. Cobb, the Vice President of the Republic, Mr. Stephens, and the premier of the Cabinet, Mr. Johnson. South Carolina, the head and front of secessionism, gets the small sop of Secretary of the Interior.

Under the great Union this Department had a province of vast importance. It dealt with the patent office, Indian, pension, land and census bureaus, and the government of the territories and public buildings. The new republic has no territories to govern, no Indians to control, no pension list to pay, no patent office to manage; the census has just been finished at Washington, and the public lands are seized by the States. What then will the Interior Department do? When it gets any money it may engage in spending it to erect public buildings, but that and all the rest of its business is yet to be created. It is a Department without a function. And this is the equality, and this the honor, for which South Carolina seceded! How are the great men of the Palmetto State rewarded? Their crop of laurels is absolutely prodigious.

A NEW DIVORCE BILL of some interest has been read in the Legislature. It enacts that the jurisdiction of the several Courts of Common Pleas of this Commonwealth shall hereafter extend to all cases of divorce from the bonds of matrimony for causes not designated by existing laws of this Commonwealth, when either or both of the parties were or may be at the time of occurring of said causes, domiciled in another State or foreign country. Provided, that no application for the divorce shell be received by said Courts, unless the applicant shall have been a citizen of this State, and shall have resided therein at least one whole year previous to the filing of his or her petition or libel. Any woman who shall have had a *bona fide* residence in this State at least one whole year previous to the filing of her petitions for libel, shall be taken to be a citizen for the purposes of this act.

THE TARIFF BILL at last passed the Senate, by a vote of 25 yeas to 14 nays. Of the fourteen Senators who voted against the bill, every man is a Democrat. Even Mr. Douglas, who made Tariff speeches in this State, voted against it, but spoke against it.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS
OF
ABR'M LINCOLN,
March 4, 1861.

Fellow citizens of the United States:

In compliance with a custom as old as the Government itself, I appear before you to address you briefly, and to take in your presence the oath prescribed by the Constitution of the United States to be taken by the President before he enters on the execution of his office.

I do not consider it necessary at present for me to discuss those matters of Administration, about which there is no special anxiety or excitement.

Apprehensions seem to exist among the people of the Southern States that, by the accession of a Republican Administration, their property, and their peace and personal security are to be endangered. There has never been any reasonable cause for such apprehension. Indeed, the most ample evidence to the contrary has all the while existed, and been open to their inspection. It is found in nearly all the published speeches of him who now addresses you. I do but quote from one of these speeches, when I declare that "I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of Slavery in the States where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so." Those who nominated and elected me did so with a full knowledge that I had made this and many similar declarations, and had never recanted them. And more than this, they placed in the platform for my acceptance, and as a law to themselves and to me, the clear and explicit resolution which I now read:

Resolved, That the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of power of which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depend; and we denounce the lawless invasion, by armed force, of the soil of any State or Tearritory, no matter under what pretext, as the greatest of crimes.

I now reiterate these sentiments, and in doing so, I only press upon the public attention the most conclusive evidence of which the case is susceptible, that the property, peace and security of no section are to be in any wise endangered by the now incoming administration. I add too, that all the protection which, consistently with the Constitution and the laws, can be given, will be cheerfully given to all the States when lawfully demanded, for whatever cause, as cheerfully to one section as to another.

There is much controversy about the delivering up of fugitives from service or labor.—The clause I now read is as plainly written in the Constitution as any other of its provisions.

"No person held to service or labor in one State under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due."

It is scarcely questioned that this provision was intended by those who made it for the reclaiming of what we call fugitive slaves, and the intention of the lawgiver is the law. All Members of Congress swear their support to the whole Constitution—to this provision as much as any other. To the proposition, then, that slaves whose cases come within the terms of this clause "shall be delivered up," their oaths are unanimous. Now if they would make the effort in good temper, could they not with nearly equal unanimity frame and pass a law by means of which to keep good that unanimous oath? There is some difference of opinion whether this clause should be enforced by National or by State authority, but surely that difference is not a very material one. If the slave is to be surrendered, it can be of but little consequence to him or to others by which authority it is done. And should any one in any case, be content that this oath shall go unkept on a merely unsubstantial controversy, as to how it shall be kept? Again, in any law upon this subject, ought not all the safeguards of liberty known in the civilized and humane jurisprudence to be introduced, so that a freeman be not in any case surrendered as a slave? And might it not be well at the same time to provide by law for the enforcement of that clause in the Constitution which guarantees that "the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States." I take the official oath to day with no mental reservations, and with no purpose to construe the Constitution or laws by any hypercritical rules; and while I do not choose now to specify particular acts of Congress as proper to be enforced, I do suggest that it will be much safer for all, both in official and private stations, to conform to, and abide by all, those acts which stand unrepealed, than to violate any of them, trusting to find impunity in having them held to be unconstitutional.

It is seventy-two years since the first inauguration of a President under our National Constitution. During that period, fifteen different and greatly distinguished citizens have in succeesion administered the Executive branch of the Government. They have conducted it through many perils, and generally with great success. Yet with all this scope for precedent, I now enter upon the same task, for the brief constitutional term of four years, under great and peculiar difficulty. A disruption of the Federal Union, heretofore only menaced, is now formidably attempted. I hold that in contemplation of universal law and of the Constitution, the union of these States is perpetual. Perpetuity is implied, if not expressed, in the fundamental law of all National Governments. It is safe to assert that Government proper never had a provision in its organic law for its own termination. Continue to execute all the express provisions of our nationnl Constitution, and the Union will endure forever, it being impossible to destroy it except by some action not provided for in the instrument itself. Again, if the United States be not a Government proper, but an association of States in the nature of a contract merely, can it, as a contract, be peaceably unmade by less than all the parties who made it. One party to a contract may violate it—break it, so to speak—but does it not require all to lawfully rescind it? Descending from these general principles, we find the proposition that, in legal contemplation, the Union is perpetual, confirmed by the history of the Union itself. The Union is much older than the Constitution. It was formed in fact by the articles of association in 1774. It was matured and continued in the Declaration of Independence, in 1776. It was further matured and the faith of all the then thirteen States, expressly plighted and engaged, that it should be perpetual by the articles of Confederation in 1778 and finally in 1787, one of the declared objects for ordaining and establishing the Constitution was, to form a more perfect Union. But if the destruction of the Union by one, or by a part only of the States, be lawfully possible the Union is less than before, the Constitution having lost the vital element of perpetuity.—It follows from these views that no State upon its own mere motion can lawfully get out of the Union; that resolves and ordinances to that effect are legally void, and that acts of violence within any State or States against the authority of the United States are insurrectionary or revolutionary according to circumstances.

I, therefore, consider that, in view of the Constitution and the laws, the Union is unbroken, and, to the extent of my ability, I shall take care, as the Constitution itself expressly enjoins upon me, the laws of the Union be faithfully executed in all the States. Doing this I deem to be only a simple duty on my part. I shall perfectly perform it, so far as is procticable, unless my rightful masters, the American people, shall withhold the requisition, or in some authoritative manner direct the contrary. I trust this will not be regarded as a menace, but only as the declared purpose of the Union, that it will constitutionally defend and maintain itself.

In doing this, there need be no bloodshed or violence, and there shall be none unless it is forced upon the national authority. The power confided to me will be used to hold, occupy and possess the property and places belonging to the Government, and collect the duties and imposts, but beyond what may be necessary for these objects there will be no invasion, no using of force against or among the people anywhere.

Where hostility to the United States in any interior section shall be so great and so universal as to prevent competent resident citizens from holding the Federal offices, there will be no attempt to force obnoxious strangers among the people that object. While the strict legal right may exist of the Government to enforce the exercise of these offices, the attempt to do so would be so irritating, and so nearly impracticable withal, that I deem it better to forego for the time the uses of such offices.

The mails, unless repelled, will continue to be furnished in all parts of the Union.

So far as possible, the people everywhere shall have that sense of perfect security which is most favorable to calm thought and reflection. The course here indicated will be followed, unless current events and experience shall show a modification or change to be proper, and in every case and exigency my best discretion will be exercised, according to the circumstances actually existing, and with a view and a hope of a peaceful solution of the national troubles and the restoration of fraternal sympathies and affections. That there are persons in one section or another who seek to destroy the Union at all events, and are glad of any pretext to do it, I will neither affirm or deny. But if there be such I need address no word to them.

To those, however, who really love the Union, may I not speak. Before entering upon so grave a matter as the destruction of our national fabric with all its benefits, its memoirs and its hopes, would it not be well to ascertain why we do it. Will you hazard so desperate a step while there is any portion of the ills you fly from have no real existence? Will you, while the certain ills you fly to are greater than all the real ones you fly from?

Will you risk the commission of so fearful a mistake? All profess to be content in the Union, if all Constitutional rights can be maintained. Is it true, then, that any right plainly written in the Constitution has been denied? I think not. Happily the human mind is so constituted that no party can reach to the audacity of doing this. Think, if you can, of a single instance in which a plainly written provision of the Constitution has ever been denied. If, by the mere force of numbers, a majority should deprive a minority of any clearly written constitutional right, it might, in a moral point of view, justify revolution—certainly would, if such right were a vital one. But such is not our case.

All the vital rights of minorities and individuals are so plainly assured to them by affirmation and negotiations, guaranties and prohibitions in the Constitution, that controversies never arise concerning them. But no organic law can ever be framed with a provision specifically applicable to every question which may occur in practical administration. No foresight can anticipate nor any document of reasonable length contain express provisions for all possible questions. Shall fugitives from labor be surrendered by National or by State authority? The Constitution does not expressly say. Must Congress protect Slavery in the Territories? The Constitution does not expressly say. From questions of this class spring all our constitutional controversies, and we divide upon them into majorities and minorities.

If the minority will not acquiesce the majority must, or the Government must cease.—There is no alternative for continuing the Government but acquiescence on the one side or the other. If a minority in such a case will secede rather than acquiesce, they make a precedent which in turn will ruin and divide them, for a minority of their own will secede from them whenever a majority refuses to be controlled by such a minority.

For instance, may not any portion of a new confederacy, a year or two hence, arbitrarily secede again, precisely as portions of the present Union now claim to secede from it? All who cherish disunion sentiments are now being educated to the exact temper of doing this. Is there such perfect identity of interests among the States to compose a new Union, as to produce harmony only and prevent renewed secession? Plainly, the central idea of secession is the essence of anarchy.

A majority held in restraint by constitutional check and limitations, and always changing easily with deliberate changes of popular opinions and sentiments, is the only true sovereign of a free people. Whoever rejects it, does of necessity, fly to anarchy or to despotism.—Unanimity is impossible. The rule of a minority, as a permanent agreement, is wholly inadmissible.

So that, rejecting the majority principle, anarchy or despotism in some form is all that is left. I do not forget the position assumed by some that the constitutional questions are to be decided by the Supreme Court, nor do I deny that such decisions must be binding in any case upon the parties to a suit, as to the object of that suit, while they are also entitled to very high respect and consideration in all parallel cases by all other Departments of the Government, and while it is obviously possible that such a decision may be erroneous in any given case, still the evil effect following it being limited to that particular case, with the chance that it may be overruled and never become a precedent for other cases, can better be borne than could the evils of a different practice. At the same time the candid citizen must confess, that if the policy of the Government upon the vital questions affecting the whole people, is to be irrevocably fixed by the decisions of the Supreme Court, the instant they are made in ordinary litigation between parties in personal actions, the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having to that extent practically resigned their Government into the hands of that eminent tribunal. Nor is there in this view any assault upon the Court or the Judges.

It is a duty from which they may not shrink to decide cases of property brought before them, and it is no fault of theirs if others seek to turn their decisions to political purposes.—One section of our country believes Slavery is right, and ought to be extended, while the other believes it is wrong, and ought not to be extended.

This is the only substantial dispute in the Fugitive Slave clause of the Constitution; and the laws for the suppression of the foreign Slave-trade are each as well enforced, perhaps as any law can ever be in a community where the moral sense of the people imperfectly supports the law itself.

The great body of the people abide by the dry legal obligation in both cases, and a few break over in each. This, I think, cannot be perfectly cured, and it would be worse in both cases after the separation of the sections than before. The foreign Slave-trade, now imperfectly suppressed, would be ultimately revived without restriction, in one section, while fugitive slaves now only partialy surrendered, would not be surrendered at all by the other.

Physically speaking, we cannot separate—we cannot remove our respective sections from each other, nor build an impassable wall between them. A husband and wife may be divorced, and go out of the presence and beyond the reach of each other—but the different parts of our country cannot do this.

They cannot but remain face to face, and intercourse either amicable or hostile must continue between them. It is possible then to make that intercourse more advantageous or more satisfactory after separation than before? Can aliens make treaties easier than friends can make laws? Can treaties be more faithfully enforced between aliens than laws can among friends?

Suppose you go to war, you cannot fight always, and when, after much loss on both sides and no gain or either, you cease fighting, the identical questions as to terms of intercourse are again upon you. This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing Government, they can exercise their Constitutional right of amending or their revolutionary right to dismember or overthrow it. I cannot be ignorant of the fact that many worthy and patriotic citizens are desirous of having the National Constitution amended.—While I make no recommendation of amendment, I fully recognize the full authority of the people over the whole subject to be exercised in either of the modes prescribed in the instrument itself, and I should, under existing circumstances, favor rather than oppose a fair opportunity being afforded to the people to act upon it.

I will venture to add that to me the Convention mode seems preferable in that it allows amendment to originate, with the people themselves, instead of only permitting them to take or reject proposit ons originated by others not especially chosen for the purpose, and which might not be precisely such as they would wish either to accept or refuse. I understand a proposed amendment to the Constitution,which amendment, however, I have not seen, has passed Congress to the effect that the Federal Government shall never interfere with the domestic institutions of States, including that of persons held for service. To avoid misconstruction of what I have said, I depart from my purpose not to speak of particular amendments, so far as to say that holding such a provision to now be implied by constitutional law I have no objection to its being made express and irrevocable.

The Chief Magistrate derives all his authority from the people, and they have conferred none upon him to fix the terms for a separation of the States The people themselves, also, can do this if they choose, but the Executive, as such, has nothing to do with it.

His duty is to administer the present Government as it come to his hands, and to transmit it unimpaired by him to his successor. Why should there not be a patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people? Is there any better for equal hope in the world? In our present differences is either party without faith of being in the right.

If the Almighty ruler of Nations, with His eternal truth and justice be on your side of the North, or on yours of the South, that truth and that justice will surely prevail by the judgment of this great tribunal, the American people.

By the frame of the Government under which we live, this same people have wisely given their public servants but little power for mischief, and have with equal wisdom provided for the return of that little to their own hands at very short intervals. While the people retain their virture and vigilance, no Administration, by any extreme wickedness or folly can very seriously injure the Government in the short space of four years.

My countrymen, one and all, think calmly and well upon this whole subject. Nothing valuable can be lost by taking time.

If there be an object to hurry any of you in hot haste to a step which you would never take deliberately, that object will be frustrated by taking time; but no good object can be frustrated by it. Such of you as are now dissatisfied still have the old Constitution unimpaired, and on the sensitive point, the laws of your own framing under it, while the new Administration will have no immediate power, if it would, to change either. If it were admitted that you who are dissatisfied hold the right side in the dispute, there still is no single reason for precipitate action.

Intelligence, patriotism, Christianity and a firm reliance on Him who has never yet forsaken this favored land, are still competent to adjust in the best way all our present difficulties.

In your hands, my dissatisfied fellow-countrymen, and not in mine, is the momentous issue of civil war. The Government will not assail you. You can have no conflict without being yourselves the aggressors.

You have no oath registered in Heaven to destroy the Government, while I shall have the most solemn one to "preserve, protect and defend it."

I am loth to close. We are not enemies but friends. We must not be enemies.

Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory stretching from every battle field and patriot's grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature.

☞ The Peace Conference was held with closed doors, hence but a meagre report of its proceedings has been given to the public. Of the Commissioners from this State Mr. MEREDITH and Judge WILMOT, were firm and unyielding in their determination not to compromise their principles, at the same time desirous of giving to our National difficulties earnest and serious consideration, and willing to go all reasonable lengths to produce peace and harmony. Messrs. POLLOCK, WHITE, LOOMIS and MCKENNAR, seem to have been ready to yield up everything, to satisfy JOHN TYLER, who did not come there to be satisfied with anything.

We find in the Philadelphia *Press*, of the 2d, an article concerning the action of the Commissioners from this State, from which Mr. WILMOT'S friends can learn what his course was in the deliberations of that body.

There was no more uncompromising member than Mr. WILMOT, yet his action seems to have gained him the applause and respect of the Southern men. The correspondent of the *Press* (whom we take to be Mr. FORNEY) says:

Mr. MEREDITH took no active part in the debates; but Judge WILMOT, I am informed, during the last few days was frequently on the floor, and by his frank and manly course gained universal esteem. After concluding the first speech he made in the Convention, General DOWNHAN, of Missouri, and several other prominent Southern commissioners, as well as those from the North, flocked around him and offered their cordial congratulations—thanking him for his "straightforward, courteous, and manly" speech.

SUPPRESSION OF FORTUNE TELLING.—A bill for the suppression of fortune telling has just been passed by the Pennsylvania House of Representatives:

It provides that any person who shall pretend, for gain or lucre, the inspection of the head or hands of any person, or by any one's age, or by consulting the movements of the heavenly bodies; or who shall pretend, for gain or lucre, to effect any purpose by spells, charms, necromancy or incantation, shall be guilty of a misdemenor, punishable by any Court of Quarter Sessions in this Commonwealth, with fine and imprisonment. The first offense shall be punished with not more than two years' imprisonment, nor less than fifteen days, and a fine of not more than $100, none less than $10; the second offense with any term of imprisonment and fine exceeding the above that the court may deem proper. That any person or persons who shall advise the taking or administering of what is commonly called love powders or potions, or who shall prepare the same to be taken or administered, shall be punished as above provided.