

The Democratic Watchman.

VOL. II.

BELLEFONTE, PA., WEDNESDAY, APRIL 1, 1857.

NO. 16.

The Watchman.
THE ONLY ENGLISH DEMOCRATIC NEWS-PAPER IN CENTRE COUNTY.
PUBLISHED AND OWNED BY JOHN T. HOOVER.

TERMS—\$1.50 for advance, or if paid within six months, \$2.00 with the charge of all subscription postage, and the cost of the paper.
ADVERTISEMENTS and Notices No less than one square, and at the usual rates, and every description of JOB PRINTING.

Professional.
J. CUTLER, ATTORNEY AT LAW, BELLEFONTE, PA.
JAMES H. HANKIN, ATTORNEY AT LAW, BELLEFONTE, PA.
WILLIAM H. BLAIR, ATTORNEY AT LAW, BELLEFONTE, PA.

CHAUNCEY HULBERT, WITH SMITH, MURPHY & CO. DRY GOODS, 77 Market St., 2d and 3d Alleys, Philadelphia. Jan 18-57.

MARTIN STONE & SON, AUCTIONEERS, Bellefonte, Pa. Will attend to all business in their line with punctuality.

J. HOLDEN ORVIS, ATTORNEY AT LAW, BELLEFONTE, PA. Office with the Postoffice, at the Court House. Jan 28-57.

IRA C. MITCHELL, ATTORNEY AT LAW, BELLEFONTE, PA. Office in the Arcade, one door from Snook's Hotel, will attend to all business in Centre, Clinton and Clearfield counties.

DR. FAIRMAN HAS ASSOCIATED DR. H. DOBBINS with him in the practice of Medicine. Office at the corner of Bishop street, opposite the Temperance Hotel. March 18-57.

DR. JAMES F. HUTCHISON, successor to Dr. Wm. J. McKim, respectfully tenders his professional services to the citizens of BELLEFONTE, PA. and vicinity. Office at the Bulwark House. Oct 17-56.

MUSIC—A LARGE ASSORTMENT of Joseph J. Mestry's celebrated Italian Violin, and Violoncello, also with his professional services, just received, and for sale at GREEN & MOORE'S.

GREEN & MOORE'S Successors to Geo. I. Mills. BELLEFONTE, PA. Wholesale and Retail Dealers in Drugs, Medicines, Perfumery, Paints, Oils, Yaks, Dyestuffs, Talc, Soap, Brushes, Hair and Tooth Brushes, Fancy and Stationery, Trunks, and all kinds of Goods. Customers will find our stock complete, and all sold at moderate prices. Particular attention given to the country trade. Orders solicited to examine our stock. 1724

MEDICAL CARD—DR. J. BROADBENT respectfully informs the citizens of Jackson, Pa., and of the surrounding country, that he has permanently located at Jackson, Pa., and will be pleased to attend to all calls in the different branches of his profession; medical or surgical, at reasonable charges.

GREEN & MOORE'S Successors to Geo. I. Mills. BELLEFONTE, PA. Wholesale and Retail Dealers in Drugs, Medicines, Perfumery, Paints, Oils, Yaks, Dyestuffs, Talc, Soap, Brushes, Hair and Tooth Brushes, Fancy and Stationery, Trunks, and all kinds of Goods. Customers will find our stock complete, and all sold at moderate prices. Particular attention given to the country trade. Orders solicited to examine our stock. 1724

MEDICAL CARD—DR. J. BROADBENT respectfully informs the citizens of Jackson, Pa., and of the surrounding country, that he has permanently located at Jackson, Pa., and will be pleased to attend to all calls in the different branches of his profession; medical or surgical, at reasonable charges.

GREEN & MOORE'S Successors to Geo. I. Mills. BELLEFONTE, PA. Wholesale and Retail Dealers in Drugs, Medicines, Perfumery, Paints, Oils, Yaks, Dyestuffs, Talc, Soap, Brushes, Hair and Tooth Brushes, Fancy and Stationery, Trunks, and all kinds of Goods. Customers will find our stock complete, and all sold at moderate prices. Particular attention given to the country trade. Orders solicited to examine our stock. 1724

DEPOSIT BANK—Jas. T. Halls, H. M. McCallister, J. M. Curtis, Wm. H. Murray. INTEREST PAID ON SPECIAL DEPOSITS.

HUMES, McALLISTER, HALE & CO., BELLEFONTE, CENTRE CO., PA. DEPOSITS RECEIVED. BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND NOTES DISCOUNTED.

COLLECTIONS MADE AND PROCEEDS REMITTED PROMPTLY. MONEY PAID ON SPECIAL DEPOSITS FOR THIRTY DAYS AND UNDER SIX MONTHS AT THE RATE OF FOUR PER CENT. PER ANNUM—FOR SIX MONTHS AND UPWARDS AT THE RATE OF FIVE PER CENT PER ANNUM.

BOOK AND JOB PRINTING OFFICE The Publisher of THE DEMOCRATIC WATCHMAN has in connection with his Newspaper, a Book and Job Printing Office, where he executes in the most perfect manner, all orders for BOOKS, BILLS, CIRCULARS, RECEIPTS, AND ALL KINDS OF PRINTING. He is also prepared to print in the most beautiful style, all kinds of BOOKS, BILLS, CIRCULARS, RECEIPTS, AND ALL KINDS OF PRINTING. He is also prepared to print in the most beautiful style, all kinds of BOOKS, BILLS, CIRCULARS, RECEIPTS, AND ALL KINDS OF PRINTING.

LIFE.
BY PHILIP.
Transient as the tints on the morning sky
Are the hopes and sorrows of youth;
So bright and so rapidly they pass,
When shrouded by pure virtue and truth.

Even as the thorn blooms with the rose,
There are sorrows mingled with our joy;
Or as darkness might the glory glow,
Our pleasures are not without alloy.

Soon the brightness of noon-day is past,
Even as a bubble on the foaming spray;
So the top of youth, too bright to last,
Swift as the bubble—passes away.

The twilight of day so sad and soft,
Is an hour to trace fond fancy's line;
So, in life's eve, the thought's ear soft,
Hears the soft murmuring of time.

Fairer than this there's a land above,
Where there is no sickness, death or sorrow;
Here all is life, life, joy and love,
But the Christian's hope—our life's to-morrow.

DECISION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE U. S. STATES—CHIEF JUSTICE TANEY'S OPINION.

Chief Justice Taney, in delivering the opinion of the court, said that this case, after argument at the last term, was directed to be reargued at the present term owing to difference of opinion existing among members of the court, and in order to give the subject more mature deliberation.

There were two leading questions: first, had the circuit court of the United States for the district of Missouri jurisdiction in the case; and if it had jurisdiction was its decision erroneous or not?

The defendant denied, by plea in abatement, the jurisdiction of the circuit court of the United States, on the ground that the plaintiff "is a negro of African descent, his ancestors were of pure African blood, and were brought into this country and sold as slaves," and therefore the plaintiff "is not a citizen of the State of Missouri." To this plea the plaintiff demurred, and the court sustained the demurrer. Thereupon the defendant pleaded over, and justified the trespass on the ground that the plaintiff and his family were his negro slaves; and a statement of facts, agreed to by both parties, was read in evidence.

The Chief Justice, having stated the facts in the case, proceeded to say that the question first to be decided was, whether the plaintiff was entitled to sue in the court of the United States. This was a peculiar question, and for the first time brought before the court under such circumstances; but it had been brought here, and it was the duty of the court to meet and to decide it.

The question was simply this: can a negro, whose ancestors were imported and sold as slaves, become a member of the political community formed and brought into existence by the constitution of the United States and, as such, become entitled to all the rights and immunities of a citizen, one of which rights is suing in the courts of the United States in cases therein specified?

In discussing this question we must not confound the rights of a citizen which a state may confer within its own limits with the rights of a citizen within the limits of the United States.

No one can be a citizen of the United States, unless under the provisions of the constitution; but it does not follow that a man, being a citizen of one state, is not recognized as such by every state in the Union. He may be a citizen in one state and not recognized as such in another. Previous to the adoption of the constitution, every state might confer the character of a citizen, and endow a man with all the rights pertaining to it. This was confined to the boundaries of a state, and gave him no rights beyond its limits. Nor have the several states surrendered this power by the adoption of the constitution. Every state may confer the right upon an alien or on any other class or description of persons, who would, to all intents and purposes, be a citizen of the state, but not a citizen in the sense used in the constitution of the United States. He would not thereby become a citizen of the United States, nor could he enjoy the immunities of a citizen in the other states. His rights would be confined strictly to his own state. The constitution gives Congress the power to establish a uniform rule of naturalization; consequently, no state, by naturalizing an alien, could confer upon him the rights and immunities of all the states under the general government. It is very clear, therefore, that no state can, by any act, introduce a new member into the political Union created by the constitution. The question then arises, whether the provisions of the constitution of the United States in relation to personal rights, to which a citizen of a state is entitled, embraced negroes of the African race, at that time in the country, or afterwards imported, or made free by any state; and whether it is in the power of any state to make such a one a citizen of the state, and to confer upon him full citizenship in any other states without their consent? Does the constitution of the United States act upon him, and clothe him with all the rights of a citizen? The court, think the affirmative cannot be maintained; and if not, the plaintiff could not be a citizen of Missouri within the meaning of the constitution, nor a citizen of the United States, and, consequently, not entitled to sue in its courts.

It is true that every person, and every class, and description of persons at the time of the adoption of the constitution, regarded as citizens of the several states, became citizens of this new political body, and none

other. It was forged for themselves and their posterity, and for nobody else; and all the rights and immunities were intended to embrace only those of state communities, or those who became members according to the principles on which the constitution was adopted. It was a union of those who were members of the political communities, whose power, for certain specified purposes, extended over the whole territories of the United States, and gave each citizen rights outside his state, which he did not, before possession, and placed all rights of persons and property on an equality.

It becomes necessary, therefore, to determine, who were citizens of the several states when the constitution was adopted. In order to do this, we must recur to the colonies when they separated from Great Britain, formed new communities, and took their place among the family of nations. They were recognized as citizens of Great Britain, and defended it by force of arms. Another class of persons, who had been imported as slaves, or their descendants, were not recognized or intended to be included in that memorable instrument—the Declaration of Independence. It is difficult at this day to realize the state of public opinion, respecting that unfortunate class, with the civilized and enlightened portion of the world, at the time of the Declaration of Independence and the adoption of the constitution. But history shows they have, for more than a century, been regarded as beings of an inferior order, and inferior associates for the white race, either socially or politically; and had no rights which white men were bound to respect; and the black man might be reduced to slavery, bought and sold, and treated as an ordinary article of merchandise. This opinion, at that time, was fixed and universal with the civilized portion of the white race. It was regarded as an axiom in morals, which no one thought of disputing, and every one habitually acted upon it, without doubting for a moment the correctness of the opinion. And in no nation was this opinion more fixed and generally acted upon than in England, the subjects of which government not only seized them on the coast of Africa, but took them as ordinary merchandise, to where they could make a profit on them. The opinion thus entertained, was universally impressed on the colonists; and it was, in fact, the basis of the Declaration of Independence. At that time, accordingly, negroes of the African race were regarded by them as property, and held, bought and sold, as such, in every one of the thirteen colonies, which united in the Declaration of Independence, and afterwards formed the constitution. The doctrine of which we have spoken is strikingly enforced by the Declaration of Independence, and afterward formed the constitution. The doctrine of which we have spoken is strikingly enforced by the Declaration of Independence, and afterward formed the constitution.

The following facts appear on the record: In 1834 the plaintiff was a negro slave belonging to Dr. Emerson, who was a surgeon in the army of the United States. In that year (1834) said Dr. Emerson took the plaintiff from the State of Missouri to the military post at Rock Island, in the State of Illinois, and held him there as a slave until the month of April, 1836. At the same time mentioned, said Dr. Emerson removed the plaintiff from said military post at Rock Island, to the military post at Fort Snelling, situated on the west bank of the Mississippi river, in the territory known as Upper Louisiana, acquired by the United States from France, and situated north of the latitude of 36 d. 30 min. north, and north of the State of Missouri. Said Dr. Emerson held the plaintiff in slavery at said Fort Snelling until 1838.

In the year 1835, Harriet (who is named in the second count of the plaintiff's declaration) was the slave of Major Taliaferro, who belonged to the army of the United States. In that year (1835) said Major Taliaferro, a military post situated as beforeforesaid, and kept her there as a slave until the year 1836, and then sold and delivered her as a slave at Fort Snelling unto said Dr. Emerson, hereinbefore named; and said Dr. Emerson held said Harriet in slavery at said Fort Snelling until the year 1838.

In the year 1836, the plaintiff and said Harriet, at said Fort Snelling, with the consent of said Dr. Emerson, who then claimed to be their master and owner, intermarried and took each other for husband and wife. Eliza and Lizzie, named in the third count of the plaintiff's declaration, are the fruit of that marriage. Eliza is about fourteen years of age, and was born on board the steamer Gapey, north of the north line of the State of Missouri, and upon the Mississippi river; Lizzie is about seven years old, and was born in the State of Missouri at the military post called J. K. Snelling barracks.

In the year 1838, said Dr. Emerson removed the plaintiff and said Harriet, and their said daughter Eliza, from said Fort Snelling to the State of Missouri, where they have since resided.

Before the commencement of this suit, said Dr. Emerson sold and conveyed the plaintiff, said Harriet, Eliza and Lizzie, to the defendant, said Charles D. White, who claimed to hold each of them as slaves.

At the times mentioned in the plaintiff's declaration, the defendant, claiming to be owner as aforesaid, laid his hands upon said plaintiff, Harriet, Eliza and Lizzie, and imprisoned them: doing in this respect, however, no more than what he might lawfully do if they were of right his slaves at such times.

The Chief Justice proceeded to examine the constitution, for two purposes: first, to determine whether the right of government then formed should endure. And this shows conclusively that another description of persons were embraced in the other provisions of the constitution. These two classes were not intended to confer upon them or their posterity the blessings of liberty so carefully conferred upon the whites. None of this class ever emigrated to the United States voluntarily. They were all subjects of merchandise. The number emigrated were few as compared with those who held in slavery, and not sufficiently numerous to attract public attention as a separate class, and were regarded as a part of the slave population. **Canter was free.**

It cannot be supposed that the States conferred citizenship upon them for all those States at that time established. The regulations for the security of themselves and families, as well as of property. In some minor cases there were different modes of trial, it could not be supposed that these States would have formed or committed to a government which abolished the right and took from them the safe guard essential to their own protection. They have not the right to bear arms, and appear at public meetings to discuss political questions, or urge measures of reform which they might deem advisable. They do not vote at elections, nor serve as jurors, nor appear as witnesses where whites are concerned. Their rights are secured in every State to which they emigrate. It is impossible to suppose that the men of the slave holding States who took as large a share in the formation of the Constitution could be so regardless of themselves and the safety of those who trusted and confided in them.

Every law of naturalization confers citizenship upon white persons. This is a marked separation from the Blacks. Under the confederation every State had a right to decide for itself, and the term "free inhabitant," the generality of form, certainly excluded the African race. Laws were framed for the latter exclusively. Under the Constitution the word "citizen" is substituted for "free inhabitant." After further elaboration on this point, the Chief Justice said, from the best consideration, we have come to the conclusion that the African race who came to this country, whether free or slave, were not intended to be included in the Constitution for the enjoyment of any personal rights or benefits; and the two provisions which relate to them treat them as property, and make it the duty of the government to protect them as such. Hence, the court is of opinion, from the facts stated in the plea in abatement, that Dred Scott is not a citizen of Missouri, and is not, therefore, entitled to sue in the U. S. Courts.

The following facts appear on the record: In 1834 the plaintiff was a negro slave belonging to Dr. Emerson, who was a surgeon in the army of the United States. In that year (1834) said Dr. Emerson took the plaintiff from the State of Missouri to the military post at Rock Island, in the State of Illinois, and held him there as a slave until the month of April, 1836. At the same time mentioned, said Dr. Emerson removed the plaintiff from said military post at Rock Island, to the military post at Fort Snelling, situated on the west bank of the Mississippi river, in the territory known as Upper Louisiana, acquired by the United States from France, and situated north of the latitude of 36 d. 30 min. north, and north of the State of Missouri. Said Dr. Emerson held the plaintiff in slavery at said Fort Snelling until 1838.

In the year 1835, Harriet (who is named in the second count of the plaintiff's declaration) was the slave of Major Taliaferro, who belonged to the army of the United States. In that year (1835) said Major Taliaferro, a military post situated as beforeforesaid, and kept her there as a slave until the year 1836, and then sold and delivered her as a slave at Fort Snelling unto said Dr. Emerson, hereinbefore named; and said Dr. Emerson held said Harriet in slavery at said Fort Snelling until the year 1838.

In the year 1836, the plaintiff and said Harriet, at said Fort Snelling, with the consent of said Dr. Emerson, who then claimed to be their master and owner, intermarried and took each other for husband and wife. Eliza and Lizzie, named in the third count of the plaintiff's declaration, are the fruit of that marriage. Eliza is about fourteen years of age, and was born on board the steamer Gapey, north of the north line of the State of Missouri, and upon the Mississippi river; Lizzie is about seven years old, and was born in the State of Missouri at the military post called J. K. Snelling barracks.

In the year 1838, said Dr. Emerson removed the plaintiff and said Harriet, and their said daughter Eliza, from said Fort Snelling to the State of Missouri, where they have since resided.

Before the commencement of this suit, said Dr. Emerson sold and conveyed the plaintiff, said Harriet, Eliza and Lizzie, to the defendant, said Charles D. White, who claimed to hold each of them as slaves.

At the times mentioned in the plaintiff's declaration, the defendant, claiming to be owner as aforesaid, laid his hands upon said plaintiff, Harriet, Eliza and Lizzie, and imprisoned them: doing in this respect, however, no more than what he might lawfully do if they were of right his slaves at such times.

The Chief Justice proceeded to examine the constitution, for two purposes: first, to determine whether the right of government then formed should endure. And this shows conclusively that another description of persons were embraced in the other provisions of the constitution. These two classes were not intended to confer upon them or their posterity the blessings of liberty so carefully conferred upon the whites. None of this class ever emigrated to the United States voluntarily. They were all subjects of merchandise. The number emigrated were few as compared with those who held in slavery, and not sufficiently numerous to attract public attention as a separate class, and were regarded as a part of the slave population. **Canter was free.**

It cannot be supposed that the States conferred citizenship upon them for all those States at that time established. The regulations for the security of themselves and families, as well as of property. In some minor cases there were different modes of trial, it could not be supposed that these States would have formed or committed to a government which abolished the right and took from them the safe guard essential to their own protection. They have not the right to bear arms, and appear at public meetings to discuss political questions, or urge measures of reform which they might deem advisable. They do not vote at elections, nor serve as jurors, nor appear as witnesses where whites are concerned. Their rights are secured in every State to which they emigrate. It is impossible to suppose that the men of the slave holding States who took as large a share in the formation of the Constitution could be so regardless of themselves and the safety of those who trusted and confided in them.

Every law of naturalization confers citizenship upon white persons. This is a marked separation from the Blacks. Under the confederation every State had a right to decide for itself, and the term "free inhabitant," the generality of form, certainly excluded the African race. Laws were framed for the latter exclusively. Under the Constitution the word "citizen" is substituted for "free inhabitant." After further elaboration on this point, the Chief Justice said, from the best consideration, we have come to the conclusion that the African race who came to this country, whether free or slave, were not intended to be included in the Constitution for the enjoyment of any personal rights or benefits; and the two provisions which relate to them treat them as property, and make it the duty of the government to protect them as such. Hence, the court is of opinion, from the facts stated in the plea in abatement, that Dred Scott is not a citizen of Missouri, and is not, therefore, entitled to sue in the U. S. Courts.

The following facts appear on the record: In 1834 the plaintiff was a negro slave belonging to Dr. Emerson, who was a surgeon in the army of the United States. In that year (1834) said Dr. Emerson took the plaintiff from the State of Missouri to the military post at Rock Island, in the State of Illinois, and held him there as a slave until the month of April, 1836. At the same time mentioned, said Dr. Emerson removed the plaintiff from said military post at Rock Island, to the military post at Fort Snelling, situated on the west bank of the Mississippi river, in the territory known as Upper Louisiana, acquired by the United States from France, and situated north of the latitude of 36 d. 30 min. north, and north of the State of Missouri. Said Dr. Emerson held the plaintiff in slavery at said Fort Snelling until 1838.

In the year 1835, Harriet (who is named in the second count of the plaintiff's declaration) was the slave of Major Taliaferro, who belonged to the army of the United States. In that year (1835) said Major Taliaferro, a military post situated as beforeforesaid, and kept her there as a slave until the year 1836, and then sold and delivered her as a slave at Fort Snelling unto said Dr. Emerson, hereinbefore named; and said Dr. Emerson held said Harriet in slavery at said Fort Snelling until the year 1838.

In the year 1836, the plaintiff and said Harriet, at said Fort Snelling, with the consent of said Dr. Emerson, who then claimed to be their master and owner, intermarried and took each other for husband and wife. Eliza and Lizzie, named in the third count of the plaintiff's declaration, are the fruit of that marriage. Eliza is about fourteen years of age, and was born on board the steamer Gapey, north of the north line of the State of Missouri, and upon the Mississippi river; Lizzie is about seven years old, and was born in the State of Missouri at the military post called J. K. Snelling barracks.

In the year 1838, said Dr. Emerson removed the plaintiff and said Harriet, and their said daughter Eliza, from said Fort Snelling to the State of Missouri, where they have since resided.

Before the commencement of this suit, said Dr. Emerson sold and conveyed the plaintiff, said Harriet, Eliza and Lizzie, to the defendant, said Charles D. White, who claimed to hold each of them as slaves.

At the times mentioned in the plaintiff's declaration, the defendant, claiming to be owner as aforesaid, laid his hands upon said plaintiff, Harriet, Eliza and Lizzie, and imprisoned them: doing in this respect, however, no more than what he might lawfully do if they were of right his slaves at such times.

The Chief Justice proceeded to examine the constitution, for two purposes: first, to determine whether the right of government then formed should endure. And this shows conclusively that another description of persons were embraced in the other provisions of the constitution. These two classes were not intended to confer upon them or their posterity the blessings of liberty so carefully conferred upon the whites. None of this class ever emigrated to the United States voluntarily. They were all subjects of merchandise. The number emigrated were few as compared with those who held in slavery, and not sufficiently numerous to attract public attention as a separate class, and were regarded as a part of the slave population. **Canter was free.**

It cannot be supposed that the States conferred citizenship upon them for all those States at that time established. The regulations for the security of themselves and families, as well as of property. In some minor cases there were different modes of trial, it could not be supposed that these States would have formed or committed to a government which abolished the right and took from them the safe guard essential to their own protection. They have not the right to bear arms, and appear at public meetings to discuss political questions, or urge measures of reform which they might deem advisable. They do not vote at elections, nor serve as jurors, nor appear as witnesses where whites are concerned. Their rights are secured in every State to which they emigrate. It is impossible to suppose that the men of the slave holding States who took as large a share in the formation of the Constitution could be so regardless of themselves and the safety of those who trusted and confided in them.

Every law of naturalization confers citizenship upon white persons. This is a marked separation from the Blacks. Under the confederation every State had a right to decide for itself, and the term "free inhabitant," the generality of form, certainly excluded the African race. Laws were framed for the latter exclusively. Under the Constitution the word "citizen" is substituted for "free inhabitant." After further elaboration on this point, the Chief Justice said, from the best consideration, we have come to the conclusion that the African race who came to this country, whether free or slave, were not intended to be included in the Constitution for the enjoyment of any personal rights or benefits; and the two provisions which relate to them treat them as property, and make it the duty of the government to protect them as such. Hence, the court is of opinion, from the facts stated in the plea in abatement, that Dred Scott is not a citizen of Missouri, and is not, therefore, entitled to sue in the U. S. Courts.

The following facts appear on the record: In 1834 the plaintiff was a negro slave belonging to Dr. Emerson, who was a surgeon in the army of the United States. In that year (1834) said Dr. Emerson took the plaintiff from the State of Missouri to the military post at Rock Island, in the State of Illinois, and held him there as a slave until the month of April, 1836. At the same time mentioned, said Dr. Emerson removed the plaintiff from said military post at Rock Island, to the military post at Fort Snelling, situated on the west bank of the Mississippi river, in the territory known as Upper Louisiana, acquired by the United States from France, and situated north of the latitude of 36 d. 30 min. north, and north of the State of Missouri. Said Dr. Emerson held the plaintiff in slavery at said Fort Snelling until 1838.

In the year 1835, Harriet (who is named in the second count of the plaintiff's declaration) was the slave of Major Taliaferro, who belonged to the army of the United States. In that year (1835) said Major Taliaferro, a military post situated as beforeforesaid, and kept her there as a slave until the year 1836, and then sold and delivered her as a slave at Fort Snelling unto said Dr. Emerson, hereinbefore named; and said Dr. Emerson held said Harriet in slavery at said Fort Snelling until the year 1838.

In the year 1836, the plaintiff and said Harriet, at said Fort Snelling, with the consent of said Dr. Emerson, who then claimed to be their master and owner, intermarried and took each other for husband and wife. Eliza and Lizzie, named in the third count of the plaintiff's declaration, are the fruit of that marriage. Eliza is about fourteen years of age, and was born on board the steamer Gapey, north of the north line of the State of Missouri, and upon the Mississippi river; Lizzie is about seven years old, and was born in the State of Missouri at the military post called J. K. Snelling barracks.

United States, and must be held for their common and equal benefit; for it was the acquisition of the people of the United States acting through their agents, and government held it for the common benefit until it should become associated as a member of the Union. Until that time it was undoubtedly necessary that some government be established to protect the inhabitants in their person and property. The power to acquire carries with it the power to preserve. The form of government necessarily rests on the discretion of Congress. It is their duty to establish the best suited for the United States, and that must depend upon the number of its inhabitants, and the character and situation of the territory. What government is best must depend on the condition of the territory at the time, to be continued until it shall become a State. But there can never be a mere discretionary power over persons and property. These are plainly defined by the constitution. The constitution provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances," etc. Thus the rights of property are united with the personal rights, and this extends to the territories as well as to the States. Congress cannot authorize the territories to do what it cannot do itself; it cannot confer on the territories power to violate the provisions of the constitution.

It seems, however, that there is supposed to be a difference between slaves and other property. The people in the formation of the constitution, delegated to the general government certain enumerated powers and forbade the exercise of others. It has no powers over persons and property of citizens except those enumerated in the constitution. If the constitution recognizes the right of master and slave, and makes no distinction between slaves and other property, no tribunal acting under the authority of the United States can draw such a distinction and deny the provisions and guarantees secured against the encroachment of the government. As we have already said, the right of property in a slave is expressly conferred in the constitution, and guaranteed to every State. This is in language too plain to be misunderstood; and no words can be found in the constitution giving Congress greater power over slaves than over any other description of property.

It is therefore the opinion of this court that the act of congress which prohibits citizens from holding property of this character north of a certain line, is not warranted by the constitution and is therefore void; and neither Dred Scott nor any one of his family were made free by his residence in Illinois. The plaintiff was not a citizen of Missouri, but was still a slave, and therefore had no right to sue in the court of the United States.

The court having thus examined the case as it stands under the constitution, proceeded to other points, saying, as Scott was a slave when he was brought back to Missouri from Illinois, he was under the law of the former and not of the latter. It has been settled by the highest tribunals that an individual does not acquire his freedom under such circumstances. As it appears to the court that the plaintiff is not a citizen of Missouri, the case is dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

GEN. PIERCE'S DEPARTURE FROM THE WHITE HOUSE.
The correspondent of the Boston Journal, a Fremont paper that has always been opposed to the war and measures of the Democratic party, thus beautifully writes about the departure of Gen. Pierce from the President's mansion:

"It may be safely said that the residents of Washington city part with President Pierce with great regret. He has endeared himself to them by his kindness, generosity and urbanity. Allusion was made to him in the session of Rev. Sunderland, his pastor, on the Sabbath preceding the inauguration, and the pastor and people were referred to tears. Mrs. Pierce's health is poor, the blow that struck down her only son, a hero's own heart. Her husband will accompany her to a warmer clime, and he will not visit the North till the summer. It is hardly to be expected that Mrs. Pierce will ever see another Northern winter.

As the Cabinet of Gen. Pierce was the same from the opening of his administration to its close, so was it with his domestic arrangements. His coachman, doorknocker, steward and domestics, all went with him as he came into power, remaining with him through the whole term, and with tears and loud sobbing took his hand at parting, as on the morning of the third he rode to the President's mansion. A personal friend of President Pierce, who took breakfast with him on the day he removed from the White House, one who witnessed the farewell of the servants, said it was one of the most affecting sights he ever saw. The genuine goodness and kindness of the President to his servants had riveted them to him with cords stronger than bands of steel; and as they came in to say farewell they were completely overcome, and he who could have down the harness of State and power, and leave no sigh, exchange parting salutations, consultation for four years, and with whom no word of misunderstanding had ever been known, melted to tears as the beneficiaries of his benevolence, to whom he had been so kind a master, fell upon honest grateful weepers, and the hollow humanness of the multitude, or the shouting of the captives.

There are those who believe that it is the special privilege of the "lured" land, to be the land of the "lured" land, who are left behind them. Such a notion has done many a mother's head. In the overwhelming grief that death brings, it is a relief unenviable to think that the lamented parent—the cherished partner, or the darling child are still with us, separated only by a thin division of air, sympathizing with us, watching over us, and silently persuading us to holy actions. Often has my conviction checked the rising thought of grief, and turned the tempting and erring back to a path of virtue.

We would fain believe that those sweet innocents who are given to their parents for a while, and who are taken away, just as they have begun to weave themselves about our hearts, go angelic in disguise, just as we are from earthly things and receive in our souls a longing for Paradise. God, sympathizing in this way with all other beings, sends them to us in the form of angels, who are sometimes seen with peculiar beauty. Oh! what an inexpressible joy to think that the guardian angels attend the wanderer in the wilderness of the night, in the storm at sea, on the wide prairie, and on the vast steppes. Green men, separated by the vast oceans from their native homes, often feel as if some invisible presence was with them, as though a celestial spirit, was by a mother's pulsations, constantly protecting their footsteps.

There is a German legend which says that each of us is fifth, has a guardian angel appointed, who remains with us until death, unless driven away by our remorseless wickedness. Alas for those who have banished their invisible attendant. "What a difficulty there must be as they go into the dark eternity to come, lonely wanderers, who are messenger from Paradise taken by the hand to conduct his spirit to the realm of purity and bliss, where countless spirits look eternally in the golden sunlight of God's love."

Sufferers of Texas.—There is a bereavement in Texas. They are a mark of weakness, but of power. They speak more eloquently than ten thousand tongues. They are the messengers of overwhelming grief, of deep contrition, of unspoken love. If there were anything more to prove that they are not mortal, I would look for it in the strong, convulsive, I think of the breath when the soul has been deeply agitated, when the fountain of feeling is rising, and when the atmosphere is thick with crystal tears. Oh, speak not harshly of the slightest one, weeping in silence. Break not the solemnity by rude laughter, or intrusive footsteps. Despite all our women's tears—they are not weak, but angelic. God's soul, if the sun, heart of manhood is continually melting to sympathy—they are what helps to bring him about the globe. I have to see the tears of a woman. They are painful, indeed, but still holy joy. There is pleasure in tears—an awful pleasure. If there were nothing on earth to shed a tear for, I should never live; and if no one might weep, my grave, I could never be in peace.

DEATH OF THE PRINCESS LIEVEN.
Here is a bit of Parisian gossip, communicated by the correspondent of the Boston Post:

"An orange salad deprived the world of the Princess Lieven, the petticoat diplomatist, the Russian spy, Guizot's chere amie, and one of Parisian society's most conspicuous characters.

"You have heard of the disease, undoubtedly, but not all the world knows the story of the orange salad. It appears that just before one of her latest dinners in the entree of Trilby's hotel in the Rue Rivoli, the princess went to an adjacent fruiterer's to buy a dozen of oranges for several dessert. As she went her maid because she discovered her maid was in the habit of leaving her in the accounts of the household expenses; so desiring to economize in her old age, she determined to dispense with the washer woman's help, and she took a basket, and took a fruit cold, which was aggravated while preparing the salad, and grew worse during the dinner. She became so ill after being safely in bed that she summoned a physician, who remained by her bolster during the night and throughout the following day. But she was beyond help, and died, and, with and standing by the bed, she read her death in the morning. She had troubled her maid, and finally, her maid's poison as usual as a sign of her circumstances! I shall be dead before this night," she said. "I know it, I feel it, and he is in vain that you seek to deceive me." Call my son Paul, let me be alone with him until I can dispose of my property, my papers &c., according to my desires, and then I will quietly wait to see what is death. My wishes were complied with, and having satisfactorily arranged everything, she resigned herself to the final struggle. Kings, princes and statesmen, she well knew, would lament themselves about her last moments, and, through woman of the world that she was, she determined to keep up a respectable appearance to the end. And as far as we can judge, her death was as perfectly contented as if she would have desired could she have lived to hear it talked about!

"What a powerful thing is sugar-angel!"

Guarlan Angels.
There are those who believe that it is the special privilege of the "lured" land, to be the land of the "lured" land, who are left behind them. Such a notion has done many a mother's head. In the overwhelming grief that death brings, it is a relief unenviable to think that the lamented parent—the cherished partner, or the darling child are still with us, separated only by a thin division of air, sympathizing with us, watching over us, and silently persuading us to holy actions. Often has my conviction checked the rising thought of grief, and turned the tempting and erring back to a path of virtue.

We would fain believe that those sweet innocents who are given to their parents for a while, and who are taken away, just as they have begun to weave themselves about our hearts, go angelic in disguise, just as we are from earthly things and receive in our souls a longing for Paradise. God, sympathizing in this way with all other beings, sends them to us in the form of angels, who are sometimes seen with peculiar beauty. Oh! what an inexpressible joy to think that the guardian angels attend the wanderer in the wilderness of the night, in the storm at sea, on the wide prairie, and on the vast steppes. Green men, separated by the vast oceans from their native homes, often