

PRESIDENT 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 upon 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 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 was open to their inspection.

It is found in nearly all the published speeches of him who now addresses you. I do not quote from one of those speeches when I declare that I have no purpose directly or indirectly to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it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 these, 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 emphatic resolution which I now read:

Resolved, That the maintenance or violation 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, is essential to that balance of power upon 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 Territory no matter under what pretext, as 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 anywise 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 or as reluctantly as 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 which 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, 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 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 State or National authorities, but surely the difference is not a very material one. If the slave be surrendered it can be of little consequence to him or to others by which authority it is done, and should by any one in any case be content that this oath shall be interpreted on a merely substantial controversy as to how it shall be kept?

Again, in any law upon the subject, ought not all the safeguards of liberty known in 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 no purpose to construe the Constitution or laws by any critical rules, and while I do not choose now to specify particular acts of Congress as proper to be enforced; I do suggest that it would be much safer for all, both in official and private stations, to conform to and abide by all those acts, which stand unrepealed; that it will be well not to violate any of them, trusting to find impunity in their having been 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 very 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 dif-

iculty. 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 no Government proper ever had a provision in its organic law for its own termination. Continue to execute all the express provisions of our National 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, 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; but I shall perfectly perform it so far as is practicable, 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 shall be no invasion, no using of force against one of the States, and where there shall be no hostility to the United States shall be so great 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 with me, that I deem it better to forego for the time the uses of such offices. The mails, unless repealed, 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 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 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 memories, and its hopes would it not be well to ascertain why we do it? Will you hazard so desperate a step while any portion of the Union flies from you with no fear of existence? 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. As 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; certain it would, if such right 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 af-

firmations and negations, guarantees 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 express provisions for all possible questions. Shall fugitives from labor be surrendered by National or 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 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, why may not any portion of a new Confederacy or 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 checks and limitations, and always changing easily with deliberate changes of popular opinion and sentiments, is the only true safeguard of a free people. Whoever rejects it, does, of necessity, fly to anarchy or despotism. Unanimity is impossible. The rule of a minority, as a permanent arrangement, 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 Constitutional questions are to be decided by the Supreme Court, nor do I deny that such decision 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 decision may be erroneous in any given case, still the evil effect following it, being limited to that particular case, it will never take precedence, 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 masters, having placed their destinies in the hands of their government into the hands of the eminent tribunal. Nor is there in this view any assault upon the Court or the Judges. It is a duty from which we 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. 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; and 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. 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 partially surrendered, would not be surrendered at all by the other.

Physically speaking, we cannot separate—we cannot remove our separate 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. Is it possible, then, to make that intercourse more advantageous or more satisfactory after separation than before? Can aliens make treaties easier than friends can make law? 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 on 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 recommendations 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 the people to act upon it. I will venture to add that to me the Convention mode seems preferable, in that it allows amendments to originate with the people themselves, instead of only permitting them to take or reject propositions 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 that 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 to 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 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 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 the present Government as it came 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 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 would wisely give 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 wickedness or folly, can very seriously injure the Government in the short space of four years.

My countrymen, you and I, think alike, 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 step which you would never take deliberately, that object will 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 are dissatisfied hold the right side in the dispute, there is still no single reason for precipitate action.

Intelligence, patriotism, Christianity, and a firm reliance on Him who 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 assault you. You can have no conflict with out being yourselves aggressors. You have no oath registered in Heaven to destroy the Government, while I have the most solemn one to "preserve, protect and defend" it. I am loath 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 patriotic grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again it is echoed, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature.

During the delivery of the Inaugural, which commenced at 12 o'clock, the President elect was much cheered, especially at all allusion to the Union. President Buchanan and Chief Justice Taney listened with the utmost attention to every word of the address.

At the conclusion of the address Chief Justice Taney administered the oath of office, as follows:

"I, ABRAHAM LINCOLN, do solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States."

The President, in taking the oath, was most cheerfully cheered by the vast assemblage.

None but a physician knows how much a reliable alternative is needed by the people. On all sides of us, in all communities everywhere there are multitudes that suffer from complaints that nothing but an alternative cure. Hence a great many of them have been made and put abroad with the assurance of being effectual. But they fail to accomplish the cures they promise because they have not the intrinsic virtues they claim. In this state of the case, Dr. J. C. Ayer & Co., of Lowell, have supplied us with a compound Extract of Sarsaparilla, which does prove to be the long desired remedy. Its peculiar difference from other kindred preparations in market is that it cures the diseases for which it is recommended, while they do not. We are assured of this fact by more than one of our intelligent Physicians in this neighborhood, and have the further evidence of our own experience at its truth.—Tennessee Farmer, Nashville.

Adjustment Measures—Letter from Hon. Jas. T. Hale.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 22, 1861. EDITOR OF POTTER JOURNAL:—The article in your last paper under the head of "Border State Propositions" not being quite accurate in its statement of the seventh proposition, the one relating to Territories, I wish to correct it, and while on the subject to say a very few words respecting the others. The article relating to the existing Territories as agreed to by me and reported to the Republican caucus were as follows:

1. That the line of 36° 30' shall be run through all the existing Territories of the United States, that in all north of that line, Slavery shall be forever prohibited, and south of that line neither Congress nor a Territorial legislature shall hereafter pass any law either for or against Slavery, and when any territory south of that line containing a sufficient population for one member of Congress on an area of 60,000 square miles shall apply for admission as a State, it shall be admitted with or without Slavery, as its constitution may determine.

With this correction the propositions which are to be regarded as the basis of a settlement are as follows:

1. Recommending the repeal of all the Personal Liberty bills.
2. That the Fugitive Slave law be amended for the preventing of kidnapping, and so as to provide for the equalization of the Commissioners' fee, &c.
3. That the Constitution be so amended as to prohibit any interference with slavery in any of the States where it now exists.

4. That Congress shall not interfere with the Southern dockyards, arsenals, &c., nor in the District of Columbia without the consent of Maryland and the consent of the inhabitants of the District, nor without compensation.
5. That Congress shall not interfere with the inter-State slave trade.
6. That there shall be a perpetual prohibition of the African slave trade.

[The 7th proposition as corrected by Mr. Hale is given above.—Ed.]

The first two propositions may be regarded substantially as one. The Fugitive Slave law being justly regarded as affording facilities for kidnapping free persons and taking them into slavery, many States believed it necessary to pass laws for the prevention of this crime, called personal liberty bills. When the fugitive slave law shall be altered so as to prevent the very evil that personal liberty bills were intended to remedy, then there would seem to be no propriety in asking the States to repeal them. These bills are very offensive to the South, being regarded as a violation of their constitutional rights and are one of the chief causes of complaint. The North all desires that they are required to protect free persons from unlawful seizure under the Fugitive Slave Law. Now when the South consents to change the Fugitive Slave Law so as to prevent all danger from this source, is it unreasonable in them to ask the repeal of these offensive bills? I did not so regard it, therefore, if it added the cause of peace I consented to it.

The third proposition which proposed that the Constitution should be so amended as to prevent any interference (by Congress) with Slavery in any of the States where it now exists, simply puts into a distinct and unmistakable form a doctrine that has always been held by the Republican party, so far as I know, without exception. We have declared it in the Chicago Platform, in all our Conventions and speeches before the election, on every occasion and in every form, and when asked by Union men in the Border States to put it in such a shape that there could be no doubt about it, that apprehensions excited by designing and unprincipled demagogues as to the purposes of our party might be allayed and the hands of Union men strengthened, was that request unreasonable? If refused by us might they not, with some show of reason doubt our sincerity and good faith in the declarations we have made upon the subject? I of course agree there was no necessity for it as the Constitution now gives Congress no power over the subject, as every Republican member of Congress without exception, has this session voted that it did not. Still I did not think it either wise or necessary to refuse this request, especially as it was alleged, and I have no doubt truly, that it would tend to hasten peace and prevent a total dismemberment of the Union.

The fourth and fifth propositions were not to be Constitutional amendments but simply joint resolutions of Congress, agreeing not to do what nobody proposes to do, and which I presume not a single Republican in Congress contemplates doing or attempting to do. It is precisely the ground taken by Mr. Lincoln on the subject before his nomination and election. No Republican that I know of believes that it would be a wise expedient to attempt it, and yet this hairless resolution that may be repealed by any subsequent Congress that thinks proper to do so, is regarded it seems, as a very dangerous concession to Slavery.

I pass by the sixth proposition, as I presume to one would object to that. The Territorial question is the only one of real difficulty, and has exercised the friends of the Union more than all others. To appoint it so as not to sacrifice our principles and yet satisfy the Border States was unquestionably a difficult task, and therefore is not yet accomplished and may never be. Yet I firmly believe the terms of my proposition are no real giving up of Republican principles, and they certainly did at the time satisfy the representatives of the Border Slave States. It will be observed that it does not recognize Slavery as existing south of that

line, and does not establish or protect it there. It simply agrees to let the subject remain as it is under the act of 1850, and allows them to come into the Union when of sufficient population, with or without Slavery, as provided by the same act. I have long maintained that freedom needs no legislation for its protection in the Territories. All it asks or requires is fair play and an honest administration of affairs. Even with all the injustice and oppression of the Federal Government with its Border Ruffians, corrupt Judges, dishonest officials, and regular army, it overturned slavery in Kansas and triumphed. If it could do this with all these fearful odds against it, what chance Slavery would have without any of these aids, it would not be difficult to foretell. If the twenty millions of active, intelligent and energetic freemen cannot outstrip the half million of idle and enervated Slaveholders in the possession of the the Territories, it would be passing strange indeed. The Chicago Platform says Congress shall legislate to keep Slavery out of the Territories "when necessary." Is it "necessary" in the case of New Mexico, &c., to legislate? I do not believe it, nor do I believe a single Republican in Congress does. Under a pro-slavery government and pro-slavery Federal office-holders of every shade, with all their influence, but twelve slaves have been introduced there in the past eight years. Is it possible that under directly opposite influences the institution is likely to increase, or even live?

But I have already said more than I intended, and I shall stop with the single remark that I prefer peace and the preservation of the Union to war and dissolution, when it can be had on honorable terms and without the sacrifice of any valuable principle. Believing that neither dishonor nor a sacrifice of principle was involved in the terms proposed, and that the interests of freedom and progress, the happiness and prosperity of our country are all on the side of peace, I therefore thought it my duty to agree to the settlement.

Whether I did right or not my constituents must decide. Yours &c., JAMES T. HALE.

The Potter Journal. COUDERSPORT, PA., Thursday Morning, Feb. 28, 1861. J. S. CHASE, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

No paper has been issued from this office the past two weeks, in consequence of the sickness of the editor. We are not entirely recovered yet, but by the assistance of an obliging craftsman we are enabled to get the JOURNAL before its readers this week, in order to publish the President's Inaugural, and in justice to our Member of Congress, to lay his communication before the people of Potter at the earliest moment in our power. We offer no comments upon it at present.

No JOURNAL will be issued next week as we desire to entirely regain our strength before testing it with the severity necessary to publish our paper. Furthermore, we do not care to be prostrated again by too soon putting our nerves on trial. We may have to suspend a longer time for want of means to go ahead. Will not some of those owing us come to our rescue?

Cassius M. Clay, has been appointed Minister to Spain, D. C. Jud. Minister to Prussia, Wm. L. Dayton to France, Charles F. Adams to England, George P. Marsh to Italy, and James Watson Webb to Turkey.

M. H. Cobb, formerly of the Tioga Advertiser, has the snug berth of disbursing clerk in the War Department—salary \$1,800. We are really glad of it—he well deserves the promotion.

The State Legislature, after a temporary adjournment from the 1st to the 13th inst., have reassembled, and elected the Hon. DAVID WILMOT to fill the vacancy in the U. S. Senate occasioned by the resignation of Mr. Cameron. This is a just and long deserved compliment to a pioneer Republican, and reflects honor alike on the Legislature and the people. Mr. Wilmot's term expires March 4th 1863, when if the party should continue in the ascendant, he will no doubt, we hope, be reelected for a full term. The vote stood, Wilmot, 95; Welsh, 34; Ketchum, 1; Wilkins, 1.

Mr. Lincoln's Cabinet consists of the following named gentlemen—every one of them suited to their position, and capable and worthy men.

Secretary of State—William H. Seward, of New York.
Secretary of the Treasury—Salmon P. Chase, of Ohio.
Secretary of War—Simon Cameron, of Pennsylvania.
Secretary of the Navy—Gideon Welles, of Connecticut.
Secretary of the Interior—Caleb B. Smith, of Indiana.
Postmaster General—Montgomery Blair, of Maryland.
Attorney General—Edward Bates, of Missouri.