



THURSDAY.....MARCH 7.
The Fourth of March, 1861.

The long-looked for and anxiously expected day, the 4th of March, has arrived and departed, and ABRAHAM LINCOLN and HANNIBAL HAMLIN are now President and Vice President of the United States. It is with a sense of relief that we pen these words. Well grounded fears had for some time been entertained that foul means would be used to prevent the inauguration of the PEOPLE'S choice; but thank God, the danger is over, and the country now breathes freer. Let us hope that this happy state of affairs may continue, and we never again be called upon to behold such a Reign of Terror as preceded the new era.

The eventful morning was ushered in by a slight rain, but the weather was cool and pleasant. The city was thronged by thousands upon thousands, and all the space in front of the Capitol for acres was early crowded by a dense mass of human beings. The greatest excitement prevailed, but everything passed off quietly and in good order.

During the delivery of the Inaugural, which commenced at 1 1/2 o'clock, Mr. Lincoln was much cheered, especially at any allusion to the Union.

The usual oath of office was administered by Chief Justice Taney. This inauguration makes the eighth ceremony of the kind in which the venerable Chief Justice has officiated, he having successfully administered the oath to Presidents Van Buren, Tyler, Polk, Taylor, Fillmore, Pierce, Buchanan and Lincoln.

Annexed is President Lincoln's Inaugural Address. Its tone and temper is firm; and, though not very satisfactory to compromisers and secessionists, it will meet with a hearty response from the true friends of Union and Liberty everywhere. Read it:

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. Apprehension seems to exist among the people of the Southern States that, by the accession of the Republican administration, their property and their peace and personal security are to be endangered. There never has been any reason or 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 addresses you. I do but quote from one of those speeches when I declare to you 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 had never recanted them; and more than this, they placed in the platform for my acceptance, as a law to themselves and to me, the clear and emphatic 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 on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depend, and we denounce the lawless invasion by an armed force of any State or Territory, no matter under what pretext, as among the gravest 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 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 delivery of fugitives from service or labor. The clause I 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 regulations 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 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 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 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 but little consequence to him or to others by which authority it is done; and should any one, in any case, be contented that his oath shall be 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 civilized and humane jurisprudence to be introduced, so that a freeman 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 by any hypocritical 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 these 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 succession 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 difficulties. A disruption of the Federal Union, heretofore only menaced, is now formidably attempted. I hold that, in contemplation of the 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 no government proper ever had a provision in its organic law for its own termination. If we continue to execute all the express provisions of our National Constitution, 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 the States in the nature of a contract merely, can it, as a contract, be peaceably revoked 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 a legal contemplation of the case, the Union is perpetually confirmed by a 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 by the Declaration of Independence, in 1776. It was further matured, and the faith of all the thirteen States expressly pledged and enjoined that it should be perpetual, by the articles of Confederation, in 1777, and finally in 1787. One of the declared objects in ordaining and establishing the Constitution was to form a more perfect union, by all or by a part only of the States. Can it 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 laws, the Union is unbroken, and to the extent of my ability I shall take care, as the Constitution itself expressly enjoins on me, that 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, and I shall perform it as far as practicable, unless my rightful masters, the American people, shall withhold the requisite means, 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 be forced upon national authority. The power confided to me will be used to hold, occupy and possess the property and places belonging to the Government; to collect 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 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 impracticable withal, that I deem it better to forego for some time the use 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 perfect sense of 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 an exigency my discretion will 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 the fraternal sympathies and affections. That there are some persons in one section or another who seek to destroy the Union at all events, and would be 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. 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 blessings, its memories and hopes, would it not be wise to ascertain previously why we do so? You may hazard so desperate a step while there is a possibility that any portion of the ill that you fly from have no real existence? Will you, while the certain ill 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 plain written provision of the Constitution has ever been denied. If, by the mere force of numbers, a majority shall deprive a minor-

ity of any plainly written constitutional right, it might, in a moral point of view, justify a revolution—it certainly would, if such rights were a vital one; but such is not our case.

All the vital rights of minorities and of individuals are so plainly assured to them by affirmations and negations, guarantees and prohibitions in the Constitution, that controversies never arise concerning them. 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 State authority? The Constitution does not expressly say. May Congress prohibit slavery in the territories? The Constitution does not expressly say. Must Congress protect slavery in the Territories? The Constitution of this class 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 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 refuses to be controlled by such a minority. For instance, why may not any one of us secede, a year or two hence, arbitrarily, and withdraw upon them all the taxes which presently unite upon them? Shall we secede from the Union now? Shall we 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 checks and limitations, and always changing easily with the deliberate changes of popular opinions and sentiments, is the only true sovereign of a free people. Whoever rejects it, goes of necessity by to anarchy or despotism. Unanimity is impossible. The rule of a minority, as a permanent arrangement, is what is inadmissible; so that, rejecting the majority principle, anarchy and despotism in some form is all that is left.

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 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 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 people or the Congress; it is a duty from which they can only 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.

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; for 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 can ever be in a community where the moral sense of the people imperfectly supports the law itself. Would the great body of the people abide by the dry legal obligation in both cases, after the separation of the sections, more than before? The foreign slave trade, now imperfectly suppressed, would be ultimately revived, without restriction, in one section, while fugitive slaves, now only partially 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 as if intercourse between them, in some form, must continue between them. Is it possible, then, to make that intercourse more advantageous or more satisfactory after separating than before? Can aliens make treaties easier than friends can make laws? Can treaties be more faithfully enforced between aliens than laws among friends? Suppose you go to war; you cannot fight always, and when, after much loss on both sides, and no gain on either, you cease fighting, the old identical questions as to terms of intercourse are again upon you.

The 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 it. I cannot be ignorant of the fact that many worthy and patriotic citizens are desirous of having the National Constitution amended. While 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 offered 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 only 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 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 the States, including that of persons held to service. To avoid a 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 be not implied as 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 upon him to fix terms for the separation of the States. The people themselves can do this if they choose, but the Executive, as such, has nothing to do with it. His duty is to administer present government, as it comes 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 or 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 our side of the North, or on yours of the South, that truth and justice will surely prevail, by the judgment of this great tribunal, the American people.

By the frame of the Government under which we live, the 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 virtue and vigilance, no administration, by any extreme of 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 of the dispute, there still is no single good 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 troubles.

In your hands, my dissatisfied 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. The passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battle field and patriot grave, to every loving 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.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

WASHINGTON, March 4, 1861.

—Mr. Lincoln's Cabinet is as follows: Secretary of State, Wm. H. Seward, of New York; Treasury, Mr. Chase, of Ohio; War, Simon Cameron, of Pennsylvania; Navy, Mr. Welles, of Connecticut; Postmaster General, Mr. Blair, of Maryland; Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Smith, of Indiana; Attorney General, Mr. Bates, of Missouri. These appointments have been confirmed by the Senate.

Suppression of Fortune Telling.

The bill for the suppression of fortune telling has passed the House and will probably pass the Senate. It provides that any person who shall pretend, for gain or lure, to predict future events by cards, tokens, the inspection of the head or hands of any person, or by any other means, or by consulting the movements of the heavenly bodies; or who shall pretend, for gain or lure, to effect any purpose by spells, charms, necromancy, or incantation, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, punished by any Court of Quarter Session in this Commonwealth, with fine and imprisonment. The first offence shall be punished with not more than two years imprisonment, nor less than fifteen days, and a fine of not more than \$100, nor less than 10; the second offence, 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 are commonly called love powders or potions, or who shall prepare the same to be taken or administered, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be punished as above provided.

Andrew Johnson, of Tennessee, in reply to an attack made on him in the United States Senate on Saturday by Jo Lane, said: "The Constitution defines treason to be the levying war against the Government, and aiding those who did so. If I were President of the United States, I would have those who make war on the Government and fire on its vessels arrested, and if tried and convicted, by the Eternal God I would have them hung." He furthermore asserted that Tennessee would ever remain in the Union.

We see by the official record, that a petition, signed by forty-four citizens of Ebensburg, praying that compensation in money be paid to slaveholders for fugitive slaves that may be rescued from their masters in this State, has been presented to the Legislature. Of the forty-four signers, thirty-eight are Loco-Focos.

The Peace Conference resolutions were rejected by Congress by a vote of 7 years against 28 nays. The Crittenden resolutions were also rejected; yeas 18, nays 20. The House Committee's joint resolutions were passed by a vote of 24 yeas to 12 nays.

The bill repealing the Tonnage Tax has passed the Senate, and is now a law.

President Buchanan has signed the Tariff Bill, and it is now a law.

The Peace Conference.

ADOPTION OF THE FRANKLIN SUBSTITUTE.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 27.—The Peace Conference to-day revived and passed, by a vote of nine States against eight States, the Franklin substitute to Mr. Guthrie's proposition.

The proposition before the Conference was voted on by sections. The first, with reference to dividing the territory, was barely adopted. Indiana did not vote at all; Kansas and New York were divided, and Virginia and Missouri voted in the negative. The result was 8 against 7, and but for the temporary absence of one of the New York Commissioners there would have been a tie vote. The following is the proposition as adopted.

Section 1. In all the present territory of the United States north of the parallel of thirty-six degrees thirty minutes of north latitude, involuntary servitude, except in punishment of crime, is prohibited. In all the present territory south of that line, the status of persons held to service or labor, as it now exists, shall not be changed. Nor shall any law be passed by Congress or the territories, of a nature to hinder or prevent the taking of such persons from any of the States of this Union to said territory, nor to impair the rights arising from said relation. And the same shall be subject to judicial cognizance in the federal courts, according to the course of common law. When any territory north or south of said line, with such boundary as Congress may prescribe, shall contain a population equal to that required for a member of Congress, it shall, if its form of government be republican, be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, with or without involuntary servitude, as the Constitution of such State may provide.

Section 2. No territory shall be acquired by the United States, except by discovery, and for naval and commercial stations, depots and transit routes, without the concurrence of a majority of all the Senators from States which allow involuntary servitude, and a majority of all the Senators from States which prohibit that relation; nor shall territory be acquired by treaty, unless the votes of a majority of the Senators from each class of States herein before mentioned be cast as a part of the two-third majority necessary to the ratification of such treaty.

Section 3. Neither the Constitution, nor any amendment thereto, shall be construed to give Congress power to regulate, abolish or control, within any State or territory of the United States, the relation established or recognized by the laws thereof, touching persons bound to labor or involuntary service in the District of Columbia, without the consent of Maryland, and without the consent of the owners, or making to owners, who do not consent, just compensation; nor the power to interfere with or prohibit representatives and others from bringing with them to the city of Washington, retaining and taking away, persons so bound to labor or service; nor the power to interfere with or abolish involuntary service in places under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States within those States and territories where the same is established and recognized; nor the power to prohibit the removal or transportation of persons held to labor or involuntary service in any State or territory of the United States to any State or territory thereof where it is established or recognized by law or usage; and the right during transportation by sea or river, of touching at ports, shores and landings, and of landing in case of distress, but not for sale or traffic, shall exist; nor shall Congress have power to authorize any higher rate of taxation on persons held to labor or service than on land. The bringing into the District of Columbia of persons held to labor or service for sale, or placing them in depots to be afterwards transferred to other places for sale as merchandise, is prohibited, and the right of transit through any State or territory, against its dissent, is prohibited.

Section 4. The third paragraph of the second section of the fourth article of the Constitution shall not be construed to prevent any of the States, by appropriate legislation and through the action of their judicial and ministerial officers, from enforcing the delivery of fugitives from labor to the person to whom such service or labor is due.

Section 5. The foreign slave trade is hereby forever prohibited, and it shall be the duty of Congress to pass laws to prevent the importation of slaves, coolies or persons held to service or labor, into the United States and territories from places beyond the limits thereof.

Section 6. The first, third and fifth sections, together with this section six of these amendments, and the third paragraph of the second section of the first article of the Constitution, and the third paragraph of the second section of the fourth article thereof, shall not be amended or abolished without the consent of all the States.

Section 7. Congress shall provide by law that the United States shall pay to the owner the full value of his fugitives from labor, in all cases where the Marshal or other officer, whose duty it was to arrest such fugitive, was prevented from so doing by violence or intimidation from mobs or riotous assemblages, or when, after arrest, such fugitive was rescued by like violence or intimidation, and the owner thereby prevented and obstructed in the pursuit of his remedy for the recovery of such fugitive. Congress shall provide by law for securing to the citizens of each State

the privileges and immunities of the several States.

Some of the Commissioners say that if their conference has been productive of no other good result, it has produced a most friendly feeling among them.

The Peace Conference adjourned *die* at one o'clock.

English View of American Affairs.

From the stand-point occupied by the English Press they are in a more favorable position to judge properly and unimpaired of the true condition of American affairs, and of the real causes which have provoked our present difficulties, than almost any in the United States, however unprejudiced they may assume to be. Taking advantage of its opportunity the London *Times* makes a fierce attack upon Mr. Buchanan. After discussing the singular facility afforded by the quadrennial election of a President for raising and bringing to an issue any question on which parties in America may differ, and contending that the interregnum between an outgoing and incoming administration gives opportunity for rebellion the *Times* remarks:

These considerations should not be lost sight of in estimating the position of Mr. Buchanan, and he certainly needs all the excuse and allowance that the most tolerant critic can suggest in his behalf. He owes his election to the very Southern States who are now in open rebellion to his authority, and his best friends have left him in a body rather than to submit to be employed in preserving the Union whose bread they have eaten and whose official stations they have filled during the last four years. * * * We fear it is impossible to avoid the conviction that few men called upon to play a great historical part have been found more utterly unequal to their station than Mr. Buchanan. In the vain hope of conciliating the Southern members of his Cabinet, he inaugurated the meeting of Congress by a message which was in itself the most powerful inducement to disunion. In the face of threatened secession he told his countrymen that secession would be justified unless the North made very ample concessions. He stated distinctly that the power of putting down a rebellion had not been delegated to Congress, and that while he would continue to collect the public revenue and to protect the public property, he would use no means to bring the seceders to a sense of their duty. This language could have but one effect. It gave the intended seceders to understand that what might be wrong in constitutional law, would be valid fact, defensible in morality, and attended with the most perfect impunity.—Mr. Buchanan's Cabinet to whom he had degraded his office, lowered his personal character, and opened the door to the disruption of his country, have resigned, and leave him now to make unavailing appeals to Congress that they will supply to crisis that wisdom and firmness which America had a right to expect from her Chief Magistrate. If, instead of flattering and encouraging rebellion, Mr. Buchanan had acted up to his recent declaration that it is his duty to execute the laws, it is very possible that the fire might have been trampled out before it had time to spread. A small naval force in Charleston harbor and in the Mississippi, coupled with a resolute declaration of the only line of policy which is open to a President of the United States worthy of his position—a declaration of his unflinching resolution to employ the whole power of the government of which he is the head for the purpose of its preservation—would probably have rendered any further appeal to force unnecessary. But the precious, the irrevocable moments have been allowed to escape, and America must weep in tears of blood the misfortune which has given to faction its strongest encouragement in the weakness of her Constitution and the vacillation of her Chief Magistrate.

A GOOD HIT.—Mr. McKewen, a member of Congress from New York, introduced the following pungent resolution, in the course of a short speech he made in the House, on the 18th inst. It presents the whole secret of the secession movement in a "nut shell." It is perhaps the only amendment to the Constitution that would satisfy Southern secessionists and Northern sympathisers, in the Democratic party.

Resolved, That disunion and treason may be made lawful by adding to Art. 2 of the Constitution, the following amendment, to wit: Section 5. Whenever a party shall be defeated in an election for President and Vice President, such party may rebel and take up arms, and unless the successful shall adopt as its own the principles of the defeated party, and consent to such amendments of the Constitution as the latter party shall dictate, then the Union shall be at an end."

ENGLAND HAS SOMETHING TO SAY ABOUT THE MISSISSIPPI.—The English papers claim a right to navigate the Mississippi, which, they say, secession cannot abrogate. By the treaty of Paris, signed on the 30th of November, 1782, it was stipulated that navigation of the Mississippi, from its source to the ocean, shall forever remain free and open to the subjects of Great Britain and the citizens of the United States.

MRS. DOUGLAS IN A FIX.—A newspaper cotemporary says that the beautiful and accomplished wife of Judge Douglas made a wager of \$100, prior to the late election, that she would sleep with the next President of the United States.