

THE MONTROSE DEMOCRAT,
IS PUBLISHED THURSDAYS, BY
A. J. Gerritson.
OFFICE OF PUBLIC AVENUE,
THREE HOURS ABOVE SEARLE'S HOTEL.
TERMS—\$1.50 per annum in advance,
otherwise \$2 will be charged, and fifty cents per annum
added to subscribers, at the option of the Publisher, to pay
expenses of collection. Advance payment preferred.
ADVERTISEMENTS will be inserted at the
rate of \$1 per square, of ten lines or less, for the first three
weeks, and 25 cents for each additional week—per day.
Merchants, and others, who advertise by
the year, will be charged at the following rates, viz:
For one square, or less, one cent per line, per week.
Each additional square, at the rate of .06
No credit given except to those of known responsibility.

MONTROSE DEMOCRAT.

We Join Ourselves to no Party that Does not Carry the Flag and Keep Step to the Music of the Whole Union.

VOL. 18. MONTROSE, PA., THURSDAY, MARCH 14, 1861. NO. 11.

JOB PRINTING OF ALL KINDS,
DONE AT THE OFFICE OF THE
DEMOCRAT,
NEATLY AND PROMPTLY,
AND AT "LIVE AND LET LIVE" PRICES.
THE office of the Montrose Democrat
has recently been supplied with a new and choice variety
of type, etc., and we are now prepared to print pamphlets,
Handbills, Posters, Programmes, and
all kinds of work in this line, clean, according to order.
Business, Wedding, and Ball Cards
Tickets, etc., printed with neatness and dispatch.
Justices' and Constables' Bonds, Notes
Deeds, and all other Bonds, or printed to order.
Job work and blanks, to be paid for on delivery.

BUSINESS CARDS.

W. H. COOPER & CO.
BANKERS
McCORMICK & SEARLE
HENRY B. MCKEAN
DR. E. F. WILMOT
L. W. BINGHAM & D. C. ANEY
DR. G. Z. DIMOCK
DR. W. L. WHEATON
DR. H. N. SMITH & SON
DRS. OLMSTEAD & READ
DR. N. Y. LEET
SOUTH WORTH & VADAKIN
W. M. A. SNOW
JOHN SAUTTER
FASHIONABLE TAILOR
JOHN GROVES
L. B. ISBELL
W. M. W. SMITH & CO.
C. M. F. FOULHAM
ABEL TURRELL
PROF. CHARLES MORRIS
HAYDEN BROTHERS
FANCY GOODS
P. E. BRUSH, M. D.
DR. J. S. SMITH
AT SMITH'S
HARNESSES,
HOME INSURANCE COMPANY
NEW STOVES! NEW STOVES!
MEDICAL CARD
Dandelion Coffee

COURAGE.

Keep up your courage, friend,
Nor flinch on the track—
Look on the foe,
And soon to slay him back!
A true heart rarely falls to wit—
A will can make a way—
The darkness will yield at last
To the perfect day!
See yonder little flower,
You've crushed beneath your tread,
The sunbeam and the shower
Beat on its head; how
Though low, it is not broken.
It rises up again—
And sheds a sweet perfume
Across the hungry desert plain.
They like the tender flower,
That grows on the mountain side,
In many ways God blesses you!
Deary fit you are!
You've loved to cheer your way,
And give strength and healing breath;
For those, full many a heart
Would yield up all its wealth.
Never despair! It kills the life!
And digs an early grave—
The sunbeams and the shower
Beat on its head; how
Though low, it is not broken.
It rises up again—
And sheds a sweet perfume
Across the hungry desert plain.

RUINS.

Over sea and over desert,
Woe's many a weary wail,
By the rocky banks of Ganges—
By the softly flowing Nile;
Travellers wander, seeking ever
Ruins which mark the march
Of the rude, barbaric invader.
Of the mycenaean days of old,
And they watch with aching vision
Watch as pilgrims at a shrine—
For a glimpse of the past,
Castles crumble along the hills,
Over all ancient lands they wander,
Ever with a new delight,
Which ruins which are sacred
To their wonder-loving sight.
But they know not that around them,
Close at hand, are ruins grand,
Strange as those that glimpse give them
Of the ages that are dead.
Crumbling domes and broken towers,
Rained upon or misruined,
Towers not the olden lesson,
Which we learn but to forget.
Everywhere around are scattered
The bones and broken heads
Of wrecks of manhood for whom shattered
These fragments of lost art,
And need not go to seek them
Far from our own sacred land,
Near, unnumbered and forsaken,
Near as many ruins stand.
But when eyes and hearts are heavy
With the thoughts of the thought,
That those who come to see
Soon shall be buried in the night,
Still these darkened human ruins,
Which remain shall one day stand,
And witness to the world,
Within God's most glorious land.

Samphire Gatherer's Story.

BY ARTHUR HUME PECKETT.
"It was here, sir, that Mr. Clements descended."
"How fearful!" I exclaimed, scarcely daring to look down a precipice at least six hundred feet deep.
To repeat the words that had occupied nearly an hour, and omitting the numerous digressions, the samphire gatherer's story ran thus:
"At the close of the last century, he and his father, samphire gatherers by trade, had assisted in lowering one Mr. Clements down the cliff under rather extraordinary circumstances. Mr. Clements was returning home, along the downs from the then retired but now fashionable town of—, when he recognized a boat in mile from shore, strongly resembling the one in which he and his sister were in the frequent habit of passing hours in a little bay or inlet near the house. He hastened home only to have all doubts removed as to their identity, and hurrying back to the spot where he first observed them, found to his extreme terror, that the boat had been deserted by its occupants, who had been seen wandering on the rocks under the cliff. To approach them by the shore, he felt in time to rescue them from the peril impending danger was impossible. The tide was rising fast, and their destruction seemed inevitable. In this emergency the samphire gatherers were thought of and sought for, and declining all their offers, Clements insisted upon descending the cliff in the hope of placing his wife upon some rock or spot where she might remain in safety till the arrival of the boat from—.
"The father and the samphire gatherer got in his story, which he was relating to me as I was strolling along the cliffs, when he paused as I have already mentioned, and pointed to the spot where Mr. Clements descended.
"Following his example, and taking a seat on the grass, he continued his tale. I give it in his own words:
"I give it, sir, when we found we could not prevent him from leaving us to go down in his place, father, as usual, secured a crow-bar into the earth, a few feet from the edge of the cliff, and then twining the rope once round it, so as to give us the staid hold on Mr. Clements, fastened it under his arm. We then made him change his seat, for one of our rocks, such as you see the common people wear in these parts, and taught him how to put both feet against the side of the cliff—as it were thus, and made him take the rope between his hands just above the knot, and told him to lean out from the rock as far as he could, and to work downwards with his feet, and look up, and keep a look-out for stones and rubbish which the rope might dislodge. We told him all this, sir, and bade him not be frightened at the birds, as they would not hurt him—the sun had set, and they always make a horrid screaming if you go down the cliff after they are gone to roost, and that if he altered his mind, and wished to come back, he had only to give the rope a couple of pulls, and we'd pull him up directly.
"No—no," said Mr. Clements, "there's no necessity for that. When I get to the bottom, wait for a quarter of an hour; if at the end of that time I give no signal for you to pull me up, you will know that the ladies are safe, and then make what haste you can, and get a boat from—, I am ready now," said he in a faint voice,

Lincoln's Inaugural Address.

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 which there is no special anxiety or excitement.
UNREASONABLE APPREHENSION.
Apprehension seems 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 an 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, and I have no inclination to do so."
Those who nominated and elected me, did so with the full knowledge that I had made this and many similar declarations, and have never recanted them.
THE LAW OF THE PLATFORM.
And, more than this, they placed in the platform, for my acceptance, as a law to myself, and to the people, a large and emphatic resolution which I now read—
Resolved, That the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, and especially of the right of each State against

THE UNION UNBROKEN AND THE LAWS TO BE ENFORCED.

Therefore consider that, in view of the Constitution and laws, the Union is unbroken, and, to the extent of my ability, I shall take care, as the Constitution expressly enjoins on me, that the laws of the Union be faithfully executed in all the States.
THE FEDERAL PROPERTY AND PUBLIC OFFICES.
Doing this I deemed to be only a simple duty on my part, and I shall perform it so far as practicable, unless my rightful masters, the American people, shall withhold the requisite means, or in some other 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 it. In the event there shall be no bloodshed or violence, and there shall be none, unless it be forced upon the national authority.
The power conferred to me will be used to hold, occupy, and possess the property and places belonging to the Government, and to collect the duties on imports; but beyond what may be necessary for these objects, there will be no invasion, no using of force against or among the people anywhere.
NO OFFICERS TO BE FORCED UPON HOSTILE SECTIONS.
Where hostility in any interior locality shall be so great and so universal as to prevent competent resident citizens from holding Federal offices, there will be no attempt to force obnoxious strangers among the people for that object. While the strict legal right may exist in the Government to enforce the exercise of these offices, the attempt to do so would be so irritating and so nearly intolerable, that I deem it better to forego for a time the uses of such offices.
MAILS TO BE CONTINUED.
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 the most favorable and calm thought and reflection on the part of the Government can give them.
The course here indicated will be followed, unless current events and exigencies shall show a modification or change to be proper; and in every case and exigency my best discretion shall be exercised according to 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 nor deny; but if there be such I need address no words to them.
APPEAL TO THE UNIONISTS.
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 memories and hopes? Would it not be wise to constitute the laws and execute them so? Will you hazard a desperate step, while there is any possibility that any portion of the ill you fly from, have no real existence? Will you, while the certain ill you fly from are greater than all the unreal ones you fly from? Will you risk the commission of so fearful a mistake? All profess to be content if the Union, if all constitutional rights can be maintained.
HAVE RIGHTS BEEN DENIED?
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 part 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 a revolution. It certainly would, if such a right were a vital right of minorities and of individuals as so plainly assured to them by affirmation and negations, guarantees and prohibitions in the Constitution, that controversies never arise concerning them.
But no organic law can be framed with a provision specifically applicable to every question which may occur in the practical administration. No President can anticipate nor any document of reasonable length contain express provisions for all possible questions.
I shall fugitives from labor be surrendered by national or State authority? The Constitution does not expressly say. May Congress prohibit 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.
MAJORITY AND MINORITY.
If the minority will not acquiesce, the majority must, or the Government must cease. There is no other 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 divide and ruin them; for a minority of their own will secede from them whenever a majority refuse to be controlled by such a minority.
For instance, why 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 a perfect identity of interest among the States to compose a new Union, as to produce harmony only and prevent renewed secession?
SECESSION IS ANARCHY.
Plainly, the central idea of secession is the essence of anarchy. A majority, held in restraint by constitutional checks and

PROTECTION FOR ALL THE STATES.

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 anywise endangered by the new, 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.
FUGITIVES FROM SERVICE.
There is much controversy about the delivery 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 reclamation of our own fugitive slaves, and the intention of the law-giver is the law. All members of Congress swear their support to the whole Constitution—to this provision as much as to any other. To the proposition, then, that slaves, whose cases come within the terms of this clause, and "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 State authority; but surely that difference is not a very material one. If the slave is to be surrendered, it can be of little consequence to him or to others by which authority it is done. And should any one, in any case, be content that his oath shall go unkept, on a merely substantial controversy as to how it shall be kept?
AGAIN.—In any law upon this subject, ought not all the safeguards of liberty known in civilized and humane jurisprudence to be introduced, so that a free man may not be, 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 reservation, and with no purpose to construe the Constitution or laws except by their literal meaning, and to do so. Will you hazard a desperate step, while there is any possibility that any portion of the ill you fly from, have no real existence? Will you, while the certain ill you fly from are greater than all the unreal ones you fly from? Will you risk the commission of so fearful a mistake? All profess to be content if 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 part 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 a revolution. It certainly would, if such a right were a vital right of minorities and of individuals as so plainly assured to them by affirmation and negations, guarantees and prohibitions in the Constitution, that controversies never arise concerning them.
But no organic law can be framed with a provision specifically applicable to every question which may occur in the practical administration. No President can anticipate nor any document of reasonable length contain express provisions for all possible questions.
I shall fugitives from labor be surrendered by national or State authority? The Constitution does not expressly say. May Congress prohibit 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.
MAJORITY AND MINORITY.
If the minority will not acquiesce, the majority must, or the Government must cease. There is no other 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 divide and ruin them; for a minority of their own will secede from them whenever a majority refuse to be controlled by such a minority.
For instance, why 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 a perfect identity of interest among the States to compose a new Union, as to produce harmony only and prevent renewed secession?
SECESSION IS ANARCHY.
Plainly, the central idea of secession is the essence of anarchy. A majority, held in restraint by constitutional checks and

DECISIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT.

I do not forget the position assumed by some, that 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 decisions may be erroneous in any 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 those cases, can be better 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 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 any assault upon the Court or the Judges. It is a duty from which they may not shrink to decide cases properly brought before them, and it is no fault of theirs if others seek to turn their decisions into political purposes.
SLAVERY THE SUBSTANTIAL DISPUTE.
One section of our country believes that slavery is right and ought to be extended, while the other believes that it is wrong and ought not to be extended.—This is the only substantial dispute.
The fugitive slave clause of the Constitution, and the law for the suppression of the foreign slave trade, are each as well enforced, perhaps, as any law ever can 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 the barrier. This I think cannot be perfectly cured, and it would be worse in both cases after the separation of the sections than before.
RESULTS UNDER SECESSION.
The foreign slave trade, now imperfectly suppressed, would be ultimately and more fully suppressed, now only partially suppressed, would not be surrendered at all by the other.
NO PHYSICAL SEPARATION POSSIBLE.
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 of each other, and there be no more seen of each other, but the different parts of our country cannot do this. They cannot be separated, to face, and an intercourse, either amicable or hostile, must continue between them.
QUESTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION.
Is it possible, then, to make that intercourse more advantageous or more satisfactory after separating than before? Can citizens make treaties with each other, as if they were not under the same laws? Can they make laws for each other, as if they were not under the same laws? Can they, as if they were separated, make laws for each other, as if they were not under the same laws?
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 it, or their revolutionary right to dismember or overthrow it.
AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION—THE PEOPLE'S RIGHTS.
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 recommendations of amendments, I fully recognize the rightful 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 the people to act upon it. I will venture to add, that to me the Convention mode seems preferable, inasmuch as it allows the amendment to originate with the people themselves, instead of permitting them to take or reject a proposition originated by others not especially chosen for the purpose, and which might not be precisely such as they would wish to either accept or refuse.
THE LAW OF MARCH FOURTH.
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 the States, including that of persons held to service. To avoid a misconception of what I have said, I depart from my purpose not to speak of particular amendments, so far as to say that I hold such a provision to be now implied as Constitutional law. I have no objection to its being made express and irrevocable.
POWERS OF THE EXECUTIVE.
The Chief Magistrate derives all his authority from the people, and they have conferred none upon him to fix terms for the separation of the States. The people themselves can do this also if they choose, but the Executive, as such, has nothing to do with it. His duty is to administer the present Government, as it came to his hands, and to transmit it unimpaired in all its parts to his successor.