

# The Montrose Democrat.

"WE ARE ALL EQUAL BEFORE GOD AND THE CONSTITUTION."—James Buchanan.

McCullum & Gerritson, Proprietors.

Montrose, Susquehanna County, Penn'a, Thursday Morning, July 10, 1857.

Volume 14, Number 28.

## Remarks of The Hon. Stephen A. Douglas.

DELIVERED IN THE STATE HOUSE SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS, ON THE 12TH JUNE, 1857.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: I appear before you tonight at the request of the Grand Jury in attendance upon the United States Court, for the purpose of submitting my views upon certain topics upon which they have expressed a desire to hear my opinion. It was not my purpose when I arrived here among you, to have engaged in any public or political discussion; but when called upon by a body of men so intelligent and respectable, coming from all parts of the State, and connected with the administration of public justice, I do not feel at liberty to withhold a full and frank expression of my opinion upon the subjects to which they have referred, and which now engage so largely the share of the public attention.

The points which I am requested to discuss are:—  
1st. The present condition and prospects of Kansas.  
2d. The principles affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States in the Dred Scott case.

3d. The condition of things in Utah, and the appropriate remedies for existing evils.

Of the Kansas question but little need be said at the present time. You are familiar with the history of the question and my connection with it. Subsequent reflection has strengthened and confirmed my convictions of the soundness of the principle on which I acted, and the correctness of the course I have felt it my duty to pursue upon that subject. Kansas is about to speak for herself through her delegates assembled in Convention to form a Constitution, preparatory to her admission into the Union as an equal State with the original States. Peace and prosperity now prevail throughout her borders. The law under which her delegates are about to be elected is believed to be just and fair in all its objects and provisions. There is every reason to hope and believe that the law will be fairly interpreted and impartially executed, so as to insure to every bona fide inhabitant the free and quiet exercise of the elective franchise. If any portion of the inhabitants come under the advice of political leaders in distant States, shall choose to desert themselves from the polls, and withhold their votes, with a view of leaving the free State Democrats in a minority, and thus secure a pre-slavery Constitution in opposition to the wishes of a majority of the people living under it, let the responsibility rest on those who, for partisan purposes, will sacrifice the principles they profess to cherish and promote. Upon them and upon the political party who benefit and under the direction of whose leaders they act, let the blame be visited, for deserting upon the people of a new State, institutions repugnant to their feelings and in violation of their wishes. The organic act secures to the people of Kansas the sole and exclusive right of forming and regulating their domestic institutions to suit themselves, subject to no other limitation than that which the Constitution of the United States imposes.

The fundamental principle is determined to see the great fundamental principles of the organic act carried out in good faith. The present law in Kansas is acknowledged to be fair and just—the rights of the voters are clearly defined—and the exercise of those rights will be efficiently and scrupulously protected. Hence, if the majority of the people of Kansas desire to have a free State and if we are told by the Republican party that nine tenths of the people of that Territory are free State men, the admission of Kansas into the Union as a free State, by the votes and voice of her own people, and in conformity with the great principles of the Kansas-Nebraska act, provided all the free State men will go to the polls and vote their principles in accordance with their professions. If such is not the result let the consequence be visited upon the heads of those whose policy it is to produce strife, anarchy and bloodshed in Kansas; that they may profit by slavery agitation in the Northern States of this Union. That the Democrats in Kansas will perform their duty, fearlessly and nobly, according to the principles they cherish, I have no doubt, and that the result of the struggle will be such as will gladden the heart and strengthen the hopes of every friend of the Union, I have entire confidence.

The Kansas question being settled peacefully and satisfactorily, in accordance with the wishes of her own people, slavery agitation should be banished from the halls of Congress and cease to be an existing element in our political struggles. Give fair play to that principle of self government which recognizes the right of the people of each State and Territory to form and regulate their own domestic institutions, and sectional strife will be forced to give place to that fraternal feeling which animated the Fathers of the Revolution, and made every citizen of every State of this glorious Confederacy a member of a common brotherhood.

That we are steadily and rapidly approaching that result, I cannot doubt, for the slavery issue has already dwindled down into the narrow limits covered by the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Dred Scott case. The moment that decision was pronounced, and before the opinion of the Court could be published and read by the people, the newspaper press in the interior of a powerful political party in this country, began to pour forth torrents of abuse and misrepresentations, not only upon the decision, but upon the character and motives of the venerable Chief Justice and his illustrious associates upon the bench.

The character of Chief Justice Taney and associate Judges who concurred with him, require no eulogy—no vindication from me. They are endeared to the people of the United States by their eminent public services—venerated for their great talents—widely known and experienced—and beloved for the spotless purity of their characters and their exemplary lives. The poisonous shafts of partisan malice will fall harmless at their feet, while their judicial decisions will stand in all future time a proud monument to their greatness, the admiration of the good and wise, and a rebuke to the partisans of faction and lawless violence. If, unfortunately, any United States citizen should so far forget his obligations to society as to allow the partisans of a party to array them in violent resistance to the final decision of the highest judicial tribunal on

earth, it will become the duty of all the friends of order and constitutional government, without reference to past political differences, to organize themselves and marshal their forces under the glorious banner of the Union, in vindication of the Constitution and the supremacy of the laws over the advocates of faction and the champions of violence.—To preserve the Constitution unviolated, and vindicate the supremacy of the laws, is the first and highest duty of every citizen of a free Republic.

The peculiar merit of our form of government over all others, consists in the fact that the law, instead of the arbitrary will of a hereditary Prince, prescribes, defines and protects all our rights. In this country the law is the will of the people, embodied and expressed according to the forms of the Constitution. The Courts are the tribunals prescribed by the Constitution, and created by the authority of the people to determine, compound and enforce the law. Hence, whoever resists the final decision of the highest judicial tribunal, aims a deadly blow at our whole republican system of Government—a blow, which, if successful, would place all our rights and liberties at the mercy of passion, anarchy and violence. I repeat, therefore, that resistance to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, in a matter like the points decided in the Dred Scott case, clearly within their jurisdiction as defined by the Constitution, shall be forever upon the country as a political issue, it will become a distinct and naked issue, between the friends and the enemies of the Constitution—the friends and the enemies of the supremacy of the laws.

The case of Dred Scott was an action of trespass, *vi et contra*, the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Missouri, for the purpose of establishing his claim to be a free man, and was taken by a writ of error on the application of Scott to the Supreme Court of the United States, where the final decision was pronounced by Chief Justice Taney. The facts of the case were agreed upon and admitted to be true by both parties and were in substance, that Dred Scott was a negro slave in Missouri; that he went with his master who was an officer of the army, to Fort Armstrong, on Rock Island; and thence to Fort Snelling, on the west bank of the Mississippi river, and within the country covered by the act of Congress known as the Missouri Compromise, and thence he accompanied his master to the State of Missouri, where he has since remained a slave.—Upon this statement of facts two important and material questions arose, besides several incidental and minor ones, which it was incumbent upon the Court to take notice of and decide. The Court did not attempt to avoid responsibility by disposing of the case upon technical points without touching the merits, nor did they go out of their way to decide questions not properly before them and directly presented by the record. Like honest and conscientious judges, as they are, they met and decided each point as it arose, and faithfully performed their whole duty, and nothing but their duty to the country, in settling all the questions in the case, and nothing but what was essential to the decision of the case upon its merits.

The State Courts of Missouri had decided against Dred Scott, and declared him and his children slaves, and the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Missouri had decided the same thing in this very case, which had thus been removed to the Supreme Court of the United States by Scott, with the hope of reversing the decision of the Circuit Court and securing his freedom. The Supreme Court had dismissed the writ of error for want of jurisdiction, without first examining into and deciding the merits of the case, as they are now denounced and abused for not having done, the result would have been to remand Dred Scott and his children to perpetual slavery under the decisions which had already been pronounced by the Supreme Court of Missouri, as well as by the Circuit Court of the United States, without obtaining a decision on the merits of the case by the Supreme Court of the United States. Suppose Chief Justice Taney and his associates had thus remanded Dred Scott and his children back to slavery on a plea in abatement or any mere technical point not touching the merits of the question, and without deciding whether under the constitution and laws, as applied to the facts of the case, Dred Scott was a free man or a slave, would it have not been denounced as an act of violence and bitterness, on the charge of having remanded Dred Scott to perpetual slavery, without first examining the merits of his case and ascertaining whether he was a slave or not?

If the case had been disposed of in that way, who can doubt that such would have been the character of the denunciations which would have been hurled upon the devoted heads of these illustrious judges, with much more plausibility and show of fairness than they have not been denounced for having decided the case fairly and honestly upon its merits?

The material and controlling points in the case—those which have been made the subject of unmeasured abuse and denunciation, may be thus stated:—

1st. The court decided that under the Constitution of the United States a negro descended from slave parents is not and cannot be a citizen of the United States.

2d. That the act of the 9th of March, 1850, commonly called the Missouri Compromise act, was unconstitutional and void. It was repealed by the Nebraska act, and consequently did not and could not have the legal effect of extinguishing a master's right to his slave in that Territory. While the right continues in full force under the guarantees of the Constitution, and cannot be divested or alienated by an act of Congress, it necessarily remains a barren and worthless right, unless sustained, protected and enforced by appropriate police regulations and local legislation, prescribing adequate remedies for its violation. These regulations and remedies must necessarily depend entirely upon the will and wishes of the people of the Territory as they can only be prescribed by the local legislatures. Hence the great principle of popular sovereignty and self government is sustained and firmly established by the authority of this decision.

It thus appears that the only sin involved in the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska act consists in the fact that it removed from the statute book an act of Congress which was unauthorized by the Constitution of the Uni-

ted States, and void because passed without constitutional authority, and substituted in lieu of it that great fundamental principle of self government which recognizes the right of the people of each State and Territory to form and regulate their domestic institutions and internal affairs to suit themselves in accordance with the Constitution. [Applause.] The wisdom and propriety of the measure have been sustained by the decision of the highest judicial tribunal on earth, and ratified and approved by the voice of the American people in the election of James Buchanan to the Presidency of the United States upon that naked and distinct issue. I am willing to rest the vindication of the measure and my action in connection with it upon that decision and that verdict of the American people. [Immense applause.]

Passing now to the second point, I will proceed to the discussion of the main proposition decided by the Court, which is, that under the Constitution of the United States a negro descended from slave parents imported from Africa is not and cannot be a citizen of the United States.

We are told by the leaders of the "Republican" or Abolition party that this proposition is cruel, inhuman and infamous, and should not be respected nor obeyed by any good citizen. In what does the objection consist? Wherein is the cruelty, the inhumanity, the infamy? It is supposed to consist in depriving the negro of citizenship, and consequently excluding him from the exercise of those rights and privileges which are enjoyed in common, and on terms of entire equality, by all American citizens, whether native born or naturalized. They quote the Declaration of Independence which says:—

"We hold these truths self-evident, that all men were created equal, and that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to promote their Safety and Happiness."—

It is granted that each of their premises it would be vain to resist the force of their reasoning or the correctness of their conclusions. Indeed, we would be compelled, as honest men, to acknowledge and adopt the principle and carry it out in good faith in all our political action, by modifying or repealing any local and constitutional provision in conflict with that principle. Let us examine and see what changes this principle would require in the Constitution and laws of this State as well as of the United States. Of course it would instantly emancipate and set at liberty every slave in any State of this Union, and in every other place under the American flag, and within the jurisdiction of the Federal Constitution. Slavery being abolished, the same principle would compel us to stretch from the Constitution of Illinois the clause which denies to a negro, whether free or slave, the right to come and live among us, and in lieu of it to open the door for the three millions of colored people who are now being driven into our country as an equal footing with ourselves. The principle would compel us to strike the word "white" out of our Constitution, and of course control us at the polls when they became a majority. The same principle would compel us to change the Constitution so as to render a negro eligible to the Legislature, to the Bench, to the Governorship, to Congress, to the Presidency, and to all other places of honor, profit or trust, on an equal footing with the white man.

When all these things shall have been done, and the principle of negro equality shall have been carried out to this extent, still the requirements of the Declaration of Independence will not have been satisfied, if it really means what the "Republican" or Abolition party assert it does in an declaring that a negro was created by the Almighty equal to the white man. If their interpretation of the Declaration of Independence be correct, the principle of equality be true, as supposed by the opponents of the Dred Scott decision, we shall certainly be compelled, as conscientious and just men, to go one step further—repeal all laws making any distinction whatever on account of race and color, and authorize negroes to marry white women on an equality with white men. [Immense cheering.]

When the "Republican" or Abolition party shall have done all these things, and then have carried out practical operations on the Declaration of Independence as they understand it, they will have laid the foundation for their organized opposition to so much of the decision of the Dred Scott case as declares that a negro is not a citizen of the United States. [Great applause.]

If on the contrary the opponents of the Dred Scott decision shall refuse to carry out their views of the Declaration of Independence and negro citizenship, by conferring upon the African race all the rights, privileges and immunities of citizenship, the same as they are now or should be enjoyed by the white, how will they vindicate the integrity of their motives and the sincerity of their professions? If the negro is equal to the white man, and was thus created by the Almighty, what right have they or we to reduce him to a condition of inequality, by denying to him the privilege of voting, holding office, marrying the women of his choice, entering into holding him from all political rights and consigning him to political slavery? Perceiving the inconsistency between their professions and their past action on this point, the leaders of the "Republican" or Abolition party in the Legislatures of New York, and some of the New England States, and indeed, in Wisconsin and such other States as they think proper sentiment is prepared for the measure, have recently taken the preliminary steps to amend the Constitution of their States so as to allow negroes to vote and hold office, and enjoy all the rights and privileges of citizenship on an equal footing with white men.

These movements have been initiated in those States and will soon follow in others,

upon the ground that the "Republican" party was bound and pledged by its creed and its professions, as proclaimed from the pulpit, from the stump, and through the newspaper press, to carry out the Declaration of Independence as they profess to understand it, by placing the negro on an equality with the white man in all those States where they created the Presidential election last Fall, and secured the absolute control of all the partitions of State government. It is not to be presumed that any step for changing the Constitution of Illinois so as to confer the rights and privileges of citizenship upon negroes will be taken until after the next election, nor will any such purposes be openly avowed, but, on the contrary, in the central and southern portions of the State it will be stoutly denied, at the same time that all their orators, lecturers and papers will continue to quote the Declaration of Independence to prove that the Almighty created a negro equal to the white man, and consequently he has a divine right to enjoy all the privileges of the white man, and that all human laws in conflict with that divine right, must yield and give place to the "higher law."

The time has not arrived when it is deemed prudent by the leaders of the "Republican" party in this State to make a frank and honest confession of faith and avowal of their policy in tones that can be heard and language that can be understood to mean the same thing in all portions of the State. But so long as they quote the declaration of independence to prove that a negro was created equal to a white man, we have no excuse for closing our eyes and professing ignorance of what they intend to do, so soon as they get the power.

It is not to be supposed that the Declaration of Independence has reference to, or included the negro race when it declared all men created equal; it only necessary to refer to a few historical facts, recorded in our school books.

On the 4th of July, 1776, when the Declaration of Independence was promulgated to the world, African slavery existed in each one of the thirteen Colonies. Every signer of the Declaration of Independence was elected, elected and represented a slaveholding constituency. Every battle of the Revolution, from Lexington and Bunker Hill to Kings Mountain and Yorktown, was fought in a slaveholding State.

The treaty of peace acknowledging and confirming the independence of the United States was made and signed on behalf of Great Britain of the one part and of the thirteen slaveholding States on the other.

The Constitution of the United States under which we now live so happily, which we all profess to cherish and revere, was framed, adopted and put into operation by the people of twelve slaveholding States and one free State, slavery having disappeared from Massachusetts about that time under the operation of the great fundamental principle of self government, which recognizes the right of each State and Colony to regulate its own domestic and local affairs.

In view of these incontrovertible facts, can any sane man believe that the signers of the Declaration of Independence, and the heroes who fought the battles of the Revolution, and the sages who laid the foundation of our complex system of Federal and State governments, intended to place the negro race on an equal footing with the white race? If such had been their purpose, would they have abolished slavery and converted every negro into a citizen live so happily which we now enjoy, and the Declaration of Independence? Did they do it? Did any of the thirteen States abolish slavery—much less place the negro on an equality with the white man during the whole Revolutionary struggle? History records the emphatic answer, No. Not one of the original States abolished slavery during the Revolution, nor has any one of them, at any time since extended to the African race all the rights and privileges of citizenship, on an equality with the white man.

No one can vindicate the character, motives and conduct of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, except upon the hypothesis that they referred to the white race alone, and not to the African, when they declared all men to have been created equal—that they were speaking of British subjects on this continent being equal to British subjects born and residing in Great Britain.—The negro was not entitled to the same individual rights, and among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The Declaration was adopted for the purpose of justifying the colonists in the eyes of the civilized world in withdrawing their allegiance from the British crown, and dissolving their connection with the mother country. In this point of view the Declaration of Independence is in perfect harmony with the events of the Revolution, and the line of policy pursued uniformly by the white man, and the principles which have since been established in the Federal Constitution. The history of the times clearly shows that the negro were regarded as an inferior race, who, in all ages, and in every part of the globe, and under the most favorable circumstances, had shown themselves incapable of self-government, and consequently under the protection of those who were capable of providing for and protecting them in the exercise of all the rights and duties of citizenship.

It is on this principle that in all civilized and christian countries the government provides for the protection of the insane, the idiotic, and all other unfortunate who are incompetent to take care of themselves. It does not follow by any means that because the negro race are incapable of governing themselves, that therefore they should become slaves and be treated as such. The rule upon that subject is to be applied to the African race as it is applied to the insane, and to the idiotic, and to the incompetent to take care of themselves. It is not to be presumed that the African race are capable of exercising all the rights and privileges which they are capable of enjoying consistent with the welfare of the community in which they reside, and that under our form of government the people of each State and Territory must be allowed to determine for themselves the nature and extent of those privileges. [Applause.]

The whole history of our country clearly shows that our fathers acted on this principle, not only in providing for the insane, the idiotic, and the incompetent to take care of themselves, but in laying the foundation and erecting the superstructure of our complex system of Federal and State Governments. Whoever will take the pains to examine the journals of the Continental Congress will find that nearly every colony

before it would authorize its delegates to assent to a Declaration of Independence, placed on record an express condition, reserving to itself the sole and exclusive right of regulating its own internal affairs and domestic concerns, and local policy, without the interference of the General Congress, or of any other State or colony. The battles of the Revolution were all fought in defense of this principle, and the Constitution of the United States was formed and adopted for the purpose of perpetuating it in all time to come; at the same time it combined all the people of the Union in one confederacy with certain specified and limited powers for the common defense and general welfare.

Under this system of Government the rights and privileges of the African race remain precisely as they were when the Constitution of the United States was adopted, dependent entirely upon the local legislation and policy of the several States where they may be found. In my opinion, the policy of Illinois has been a wise and just one in regard to this race, and ought to be continued, only making such changes from time to time as experience shall prove to be just and necessary. While Illinois had the undoubted right, under the Constitution of the United States, to adopt or persevere in this line of policy, Virginia and each other State has a right equally clear and undeniable to pursue a line of policy, on the same subject, directly the reverse of ours, and we have no more right to complain or interfere with the local and domestic concerns of other States and Territories than they have with ours. [Applause.]

The founders of Government did not deem it possible, nor desire if practicable, to maintain entire uniformity in local legislation and domestic institutions of the different States, and for the reason that each State allowed a separate and distinct Legislature, with full powers over all internal and local concerns, in order that each might shape and vary its internal policy, and adapt it to the circumstances, wishes and interests of its own people. While there was a diversity of opinion in regard to the extent of the rights and privileges which could be safely entrusted to the African race in the different States, they all required the doctrine of the equality of the white and black races, and concurred in that line of policy which would preserve the purity of each, and prevent any species of amalgamation, political, social or domestic. They had witnessed the sad and melancholy results of the mixture of the races in Mexico, South America and Central America, and where the Spanish motives of policy had admitted the negro and other inferior races to citizenship, and consequently to political and social amalgamation. The moralization and degeneration which prevailed in the Spanish and French colonies, where no distinction on account of color or race were tolerated, operated as a warning to our Revolutionary fathers to preserve the purity of the white race, and to establish the political, social and domestic institutions upon such a basis as would forever exclude the idea of negro citizenship and negro equality. [Applause.]

They understood that great natural law which declares that amalgamation between superior races brings their posterity down to the lower level of the inferior, but never elevates them to the high level of the superior race. I appeal to each of those gallant young men in a noble cause, who won immortal glory on the bloody fields of Mexico, in vindication of their country's rights and honor, whether their information and observation in that respect was fully sustained, the truth of the proposition that amalgamation is degrading, demoralizing, disease and death? Is it true, that the negro is our equal and our brother? The history of the times clearly shows that our fathers did not regard the negro race as any kin to them, and determined so to lay the foundations of society and government that they should never be of any kin to their posterity. [Immense applause.]

But when you confer upon the African race the privileges of citizenship, and put them upon an equality with white men at the polls, in the jury box, on the bench, in the executive chair, and in the councils of the nation, upon what principle will you deny their equality at the festive board and in the domestic circle?

The Supreme Court of the United States has decided that under the Constitution, a negro is not and cannot be a citizen.

The "Republican" or Abolition party propose to confer an equality with white men at the polls, in the jury box, on the bench, in the executive chair, and in the councils of the nation, upon what principle will you deny their equality at the festive board and in the domestic circle?

The Territory of Utah was organized under one of the acts known as the compromise measures of 1850, and amendments thereof, providing for the purchase of the Territory from the United States within any forty, annual, dockyard, magazine, or any other place or district of country, under the sole and exclusive jurisdiction of the United States. All offenses against the provisions of these acts are required by law to be tried and punished by the United States courts in the States or Territories where the offenders shall be first apprehended or brought for trial.

It will be seen that the plan proposed by Brigham Young and his associates could be "apprehended and brought for trial" to Iowa and Missouri, California or Oregon, or to any other adjacent State or Territory, where a fair trial could be had, and justice administered impartially—where the witness could be protected and the judgment of the court could be carried into execution, without violation or intimidation. I do not propose to introduce any new principle into our jurisprudence, nor to change the modes of proceeding or the rules of practice in our courts. I only propose to place the district of our country embraced within the Territory of Utah under the operation of the same laws and rules of proceeding, that Kansas, Nebraska, Minnesota and other territories were placed before they became organized territories. The whole country embraced within those territories was under the operation of that same system of laws, and the offences committed within the same were punished in the manner now proposed, so long as the country remained "under the sole and exclusive jurisdiction of the United States," but the moment the country was organized into territorial governments, with legitimate, executive and judicial departments, it ceased to

be under the sole and exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, within the meaning of the act of Congress, for the reason that it had passed under another and different jurisdiction. Hence, if we abolish the territorial government of Utah, preserving all existing rights, and place the country under the sole and exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, offenders can be apprehended and brought into the adjacent States or territories for punishment, in the same manner and under the same rules and regulations which obtained and have been uniformly practiced, under like circumstances, since 1700.

If the plan proposed be found an effective and adequate remedy for the evils complained of in Utah, no one, no matter what his political creed or partisan associations, need be apprehensive that it will violate any cherished liberty or constitutional right in regard to the government of the Territories. It is a great mistake to suppose that all the Territory or land belonging to the United States must necessarily be governed by the same laws and under the same clause of the Constitution, without reference to the purpose to which it is dedicated or the use to which it is proposed to make of it, while all that portion of country which is or shall be set apart to become new States, must necessarily be governed under and consistent with that clause of the Constitution, which authorizes Congress to admit new States, it does not follow that other territory, not intended to be organized and admitted into the Union of States, must be governed under the same clause of the Constitution, with all the rights of self government and State equality. For instance if we should purchase Vancouver's Island from Great Britain, for the purpose of removing all the Indians from our Pacific territories, and locating them on that island in their permanent homes, with guarantees that it should never be settled or occupied by white men, will it be contended that the purchase should be made and the island governed under the power to admit new States when it was not acquired for that purpose nor intended to be applied to that object? Being acquired for Indian purposes and applied to Indian purposes, is it not reasonable to assume, that the power to acquire was derived from the Indian clause, and the island must necessarily be governed under and consistent with that clause of the Constitution which relates to Indian affairs. Again, suppose we should decide to expedient to buy a small island in the Mediterranean or in the Caribbean sea, by a naval station, can it be said with any force or plausibility that the purchase should be made or the island governed under the power to admit new States? On the contrary, it is not obvious that the right to acquire and govern in that case is derived from the power "to provide and maintain a navy," and must be exercised consistent with that power. So if we purchase land for forts, arsenals, or other military purposes, or set apart and dedicate any territory which we now own for a military reservation, it immediately passes under the military power, and must be governed in harmony with it. So if land be purchased for a Mill, it must be governed under the power to acquire money, if purchased for a Post office, it must be governed under the power to establish post offices and post roads, or, for a custom house, under the power to regulate commerce; or, for a court house, under the judiciary power. In short, the clause of the Constitution under which only land or territory belonging to the United States, must be governed, as indicated by the object for which it is acquired, and the purpose to which it is dedicated. So long, therefore, as the right to acquire and govern in that case is derived from the power "to provide and maintain a navy," and must be exercised consistent with that power. So if we purchase land for forts, arsenals, or other military purposes, or set apart and dedicate any territory which we now own for a military reservation, it immediately passes under the military power, and must be governed in harmony with it. So if land be purchased for a Mill, it must be governed under the power to acquire money, if purchased for a Post office, it must be governed under the power to establish post offices and post roads, or, for a custom house, under the power to regulate commerce; or, for a court house, under the judiciary power. In short, the clause of the Constitution under which only land or territory belonging to the United States, must be governed, as indicated by the object for which it is acquired, and the purpose to which it is dedicated. So long, therefore, as the right to acquire and govern in that case is derived from the power "to provide and maintain a navy," and must be exercised consistent with that power. So if we purchase land for forts, arsenals, or other military purposes, or set apart and dedicate any territory which we now own for a military reservation, it immediately passes under the military power, and must be governed in harmony with it. So if land be purchased for a Mill, it must be governed under the power to acquire money, if purchased for a Post office, it must be governed under the power to establish post offices and post roads, or, for a custom house, under the power to regulate commerce; or, for a court house, under the judiciary power. In short, the clause of the Constitution under which only land or territory belonging to the United States, must be governed, as indicated by the object for which it is acquired, and the purpose to which it is dedicated. So long, therefore, as the right to acquire and govern in that case is derived from the power "to provide and maintain a navy," and must be exercised consistent with that power. So if we purchase land for forts, arsenals, or other military purposes, or set apart and dedicate any territory which we now own for a military reservation, it immediately passes under the military power, and must be governed in harmony with it. So if land be purchased for a Mill, it must be governed under the power to acquire money, if purchased for a Post office, it must be governed under the power to establish post offices and post roads, or, for a custom house, under the power to regulate commerce; or, for a court house, under the judiciary power. In short, the clause of the Constitution under which only land or territory belonging to the United States, must be governed, as indicated by the object for which it is acquired, and the purpose to which it is dedicated. So long, therefore, as the right to acquire and govern in that case is derived from the power "to provide and maintain a navy," and must be exercised consistent with that power. So if we purchase land for forts, arsenals, or other military purposes, or set apart and dedicate any territory which we now own for a military reservation, it immediately passes under the military power, and must be governed in harmony with it. So if land be purchased for a Mill, it must be governed under the power to acquire money, if purchased for a Post office, it must be governed under the power to establish post offices and post roads, or, for a custom house, under the power to regulate commerce; or, for a court house, under the judiciary power. In short, the clause of the Constitution under which only land or territory belonging to the United States, must be governed, as indicated by the object for which it is acquired, and the purpose to which it is dedicated. So long, therefore, as the right to acquire and govern in that case is derived from the power "to provide and maintain a navy," and must be exercised consistent with that power. So if we purchase land for forts, arsenals, or other military purposes, or set apart and dedicate any territory which we now own for a military reservation, it immediately passes under the military power, and must be governed in harmony with it. So if land be purchased for a Mill, it must be governed under the power to acquire money, if purchased for a Post office, it must be governed under the power to establish post offices and post roads, or, for a custom house, under the power to regulate commerce; or, for a court house, under the judiciary power. In short, the clause of the Constitution under which only land or territory belonging to the United States, must be governed, as indicated by the object for which it is acquired, and the purpose to which it is dedicated. So long, therefore, as the right to acquire and govern in that case is derived from the power "to provide and maintain a navy," and must be exercised consistent with that power. So if we purchase land for forts, arsenals, or other military purposes, or set apart and dedicate any territory which we now own for a military reservation, it immediately passes under the military power, and must be governed in harmony with it. So if land be purchased for a Mill, it must be governed under the power to acquire money, if purchased for a Post office, it must be governed under the power to establish post offices and post roads, or, for a custom house, under the power to regulate commerce; or, for a court house, under the judiciary power. In short, the clause of the Constitution under which only land or territory belonging to the United States, must be governed, as indicated by the object for which it is acquired, and the purpose to which it is dedicated. So long, therefore, as the right to acquire and govern in that case is derived from the power "to provide and maintain a navy," and must be exercised consistent with that power. So if we purchase land for forts, arsenals, or other military purposes, or set apart and dedicate any territory which we now own for a military reservation, it immediately passes under the military power, and must be governed in harmony with it. So if land be purchased for a Mill, it must be governed under the power to acquire money, if purchased for a Post office, it must be governed under the power to establish post offices and post roads, or, for a custom house, under the power to regulate commerce; or, for a court house, under the judiciary power. In short, the clause of the Constitution under which only land or territory belonging to the United States, must be governed, as indicated by the object for which it is acquired, and the purpose to which it is dedicated. So long, therefore, as the right to acquire and govern in that case is derived from the power "to provide and maintain a navy," and must be exercised consistent with that power. So if we purchase land for forts, arsenals, or other military purposes, or set apart and dedicate any territory which we now own for a military reservation, it immediately passes under the military power, and must be governed in harmony with it. So if land be purchased for a Mill, it must be governed under the power to acquire money, if purchased for a Post office, it must be governed under the power to establish post offices and post roads, or, for a custom house, under the power to regulate commerce; or, for a court house, under the judiciary power. In short, the clause of the Constitution under which only land or territory belonging to the United States, must be governed, as indicated by the object for which it is acquired, and the purpose to which it is dedicated. So long, therefore, as the right to acquire and govern in that case is derived from the power "to provide and maintain a navy," and must be exercised consistent with that power. So if we purchase land for forts, arsenals, or other military purposes, or set apart and dedicate any territory which we now own for a military reservation, it immediately passes under the military power, and must be governed in harmony with it. So if land be purchased for a Mill, it must be governed under the power to acquire money, if purchased for a Post office, it must be governed under the power to establish post offices and post roads, or, for a custom house, under the power to regulate commerce; or, for a court house, under the judiciary power. In short, the clause of the Constitution under which only land or territory belonging to the United States, must be governed, as indicated by the object for which it is acquired, and the purpose to which it is dedicated. So long, therefore, as the right to acquire and govern in that case is derived from the power "to provide and maintain a navy," and must be exercised consistent with that power. So if we purchase land for forts, arsenals, or other military purposes, or set apart and dedicate any territory which we now own for a military reservation, it immediately passes under the military power, and must be governed in harmony with it. So if land be purchased for a Mill, it must be governed under the power to acquire money, if purchased for a Post office, it must be governed under the power to establish post offices and post roads, or, for a custom house, under the power to regulate commerce; or, for a court house, under the judiciary power. In short, the clause of the Constitution under which only land or territory belonging to the United States, must be governed, as indicated by the object for which it is acquired, and the purpose to which it is dedicated. So long, therefore, as the right to acquire and govern in that case is derived from the power "to provide and maintain a navy," and must be exercised consistent with that power. So if we purchase land for forts, arsenals, or other military purposes, or set apart and dedicate any territory which we now own for a military reservation, it immediately passes under the military power, and must be governed in harmony with it. So if land be purchased for a Mill, it must be governed under the power to acquire money, if purchased for a Post office, it must be governed under the power to establish post offices and post roads, or, for a custom house, under the power to regulate commerce; or, for a court house, under the judiciary power. In short, the clause of the Constitution under which only land or territory belonging to the United States, must be governed, as indicated by the object for which it is acquired, and the purpose to which it is dedicated. So long, therefore, as the right to acquire and govern in that case is derived from the power "to provide and maintain a navy," and must be exercised consistent with that power. So if we purchase land for forts, arsenals, or other military purposes, or set apart and dedicate any territory which we now own for a military reservation, it immediately passes under the military power, and must be governed in harmony with it. So if land be purchased for a Mill, it must be governed under the power to acquire money, if purchased for a Post office, it must be governed under the power to establish post offices and post roads, or, for a custom house, under the power to regulate commerce; or, for a court house, under the judiciary power. In short, the clause of the Constitution under which only land or territory belonging to the United States, must be governed, as indicated by the object for which it is acquired, and the purpose to which it is dedicated. So long, therefore, as the right to acquire and govern in that case is derived from the power "to provide and maintain a navy," and must be exercised consistent with that power. So if we purchase land for forts, arsenals, or other military purposes, or set apart and dedicate any territory which we now own for a military reservation, it immediately passes under the military power, and must be governed in harmony with it. So if land be purchased for a Mill, it must be governed under the power to acquire money, if purchased for a Post office, it must be governed under the power to establish post offices and post roads, or, for a custom house, under the power to regulate commerce; or, for a court house, under the judiciary power. In short, the clause of the Constitution under which only land or territory belonging to the United States, must be governed, as indicated by the object for which it is acquired, and the purpose to which it is dedicated. So long, therefore, as the right to acquire and govern in that case is derived from the power "to provide and maintain a navy," and must be exercised consistent with that power. So if we purchase land for forts, arsenals, or other military purposes, or set apart and dedicate any territory which we now own for a military reservation, it immediately passes under the military power, and must be governed in harmony with it. So if land be purchased for a Mill, it must be governed under the power to acquire money, if purchased for a Post office, it must be governed under the power to establish post offices and post roads, or, for a custom house, under the power to regulate commerce; or, for a court house, under the judiciary power. In short, the clause of the Constitution under which only land or territory belonging to the United States, must be governed, as indicated by the object for which it is acquired, and the purpose to which it is dedicated. So long, therefore, as the right to acquire and govern in that case is derived from the power "to provide and maintain a navy," and must be exercised consistent with that power. So if we purchase land for forts, arsenals, or other military purposes, or set apart and dedicate any territory which we now own for a military reservation, it immediately passes under the military power, and must be governed in harmony with it. So if land be purchased for a Mill, it must be governed under the power to acquire money, if purchased for a Post office, it must be governed under the power to establish post offices and post roads, or, for a custom house, under the power to regulate commerce; or, for a court house, under the judiciary power. In short, the clause of the Constitution under which only land or territory belonging to the United States, must be governed, as indicated by the object for which it is acquired, and the purpose to which it is dedicated. So long, therefore, as the right to acquire and govern in that case is derived from the power "to provide and maintain a navy," and must be exercised consistent with that power. So if we purchase land for forts, arsenals, or other military purposes, or set apart and dedicate any territory which we now own for a military reservation, it immediately passes under the military power, and must be governed in harmony with it. So if land be purchased for a Mill, it must be governed under the power to acquire money, if purchased for a Post office, it must be governed under the power to establish post offices and post roads, or, for a custom house, under the power to regulate commerce; or, for a court house, under the judiciary power. In short, the clause of the Constitution under which only land or territory belonging to the United States, must be governed, as indicated by the object for which it is acquired, and the purpose to which it is dedicated. So long, therefore, as the right to acquire and govern in that case is derived from the power "to provide and maintain a navy," and must be exercised consistent with that power. So if we purchase land for forts, arsenals, or other military purposes, or set apart and dedicate any territory which we now own for a military reservation, it immediately passes under the military power, and must be governed in harmony with it. So if land be purchased for a Mill, it must be governed under the power to acquire money, if purchased for a Post office, it must be governed under the power to establish post offices and post roads, or, for a custom house, under the power to regulate commerce; or, for a court house, under the judiciary power. In short, the clause of the Constitution under which only land or territory belonging to the United States, must be governed, as indicated by the object for which it is acquired, and the purpose to which it is dedicated. So long, therefore, as the right to acquire and govern in that case is derived from the power "to provide and maintain a navy," and must be exercised consistent with that power. So if we purchase land for forts, arsenals, or other military purposes, or set apart and dedicate any territory which we now own for a military reservation, it immediately passes under the military power, and must be governed in harmony with it. So if land be purchased for a Mill, it must be governed under the power to acquire money, if purchased for a Post office, it must be governed under the power to establish post offices and post roads, or, for a custom house, under the power to regulate commerce; or, for a