

**INQUIRER & CHRONICLE.**



Friday Morning June 12. 1857

"Fearless and Free."

DAVID OVER, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

"The Union of Lakes—the Union of Lands,  
The Union of States none can sever;  
The Union of hearts, and the Union of hands,  
And the flag of our Union forever."

**UNION STATE TICKET.**

FOR GOVERNOR:  
**DAVID WILMOT**,  
of Bradford County.  
CANAL COMMISSIONER:  
**WILLIAM MILLWARD**,  
of Philadelphia.  
SUPREME BENCH:  
**JAMES VEECH**,  
of Fayette County.  
**JOSEPH J. LEWIS**,  
of Chester County.

**Delegate Elections.**

The qualified voters of the American party in the several Boroughs and Townships, and all others who sympathize or desire to cooperate with it at the approaching elections, (except in those Townships or Boroughs where delegates have been already chosen) are hereby requested to meet at the usual places of holding elections, in their respective districts, at one o'clock P.M., on Saturday the 27th day of June inst., and choose two delegates to represent each district in a County Convention, to be held at the Court House in Bedford, on Thursday the 2d day of July next, at one o'clock in the afternoon, to nominate candidates for the Legislature, Prothonotary, Sheriff, Coroner, County Treasurer, Commissioner, Director of the Poor, and Auditor; and to appoint Senatorial Conferees, and to do whatever else may be deemed necessary to secure the triumph of our State, District, and County tickets, at the ensuing elections.

The principles to be vindicated, and the offices to be filled, are important; and it is hoped our friends in every district will turn out to the delegate elections, and choose their best men to represent them, so that the action of the Convention, and the ticket which may be formed, may be every way worthy the good cause, and command a united and enthusiastic support. The Union State ticket is composed of men of pre-eminent ability; under the new Apportionment Bill we can elect both our Senator and Representatives; and with the harmony now existing in our ranks, proper exertion is all that is needed to secure the election of our entire County ticket.

By order of the American County Committee.

FRANCIS JORDAN,  
Chairman.  
June 5. 1857.

**UNION CLUB, No. 1,**  
Will meet at the Court House, on Saturday evening the 13th June, inst. Several addresses may be expected. Let our friends from the Borough and vicinity turn out in goodly numbers.  
June 5, 1857.

In the last *Gazette*, John Cessa & Co., have the following article, in which they attempt to create the impression that we admitted that we had lied in saying that Packer voted for the *Jug Law*:

**Gen. Packer and the Jug Law.**

Mr. Jordan's organ of last week says: "We stated some time since that Packer voted for the late *Jug Law*, and the *Gazette* says it is a lie, as Mr. Packer was not in the Senate at the time. This is correct, he was not in the Senate."

Why, then, after so deliberate a falsehood?—Who but the most depraved of the human species would be guilty of thus falsifying the public records to gratify the appetite for slander? After being compelled to admit their enormity, they perpetrate another in the declaration that he would have voted for it had he been a member!

Now it will be seen from the following article from our paper of the 29th ult., that we said no such thing. That paper professes to great sanctity, and fairness, and no ones but hypocritical scoundrels would garble an extract as they did that. Read our article below again, and remember that all the answer it has received, is the above garbled extract. They cannot and do not deny that Packer, whilst in the Senate, voted for a *Maine Liquor Jug Law*. Here's our article of two weeks ago:

**PACKER AND PROHIBITION.**

The *Gazette* denies that Wm. F. Packer, the Locooco candidate for Governor voted for a Prohibitory Liquor Law. We stated some time ago, that Packer voted for the late *Jug Law*, and the *Gazette* says that it is a lie, as Mr. Packer was not in the Senate at that time. This is correct, he was not in the Senate at that time, and we were only wrong in the assertion as to the time he did vote for a *Jug Law*. Mr. Packer was in the Senate only a couple years before and did vote for a *Maine Liquor Law* on every vote in which the question came before the Senate, and it is fair to presume, that had Packer been in the Senate, two years ago, he would have voted for the *Jug Law*, and also for the present *Liquor Law*. He not only voted for a Prohibitory Liquor Law, when in the Senate but he used his personal influence in its favor! Now the *Gazette* calls on its friends in Bedford County to vote for a *Maine Liquor Law* man for Governor, and abuses Mr. Jordan for voting for the same kind of a law. If the hypocrite of the *Gazette* wishes to prosecute Mr. Jordan for voting for a Prohibitory Liquor Law, is it not the height of hypocrisy and meanness for Absalom to call on free liquor men to vote for Packer when

he also voted for a *Maine Liquor Law*—We wonder what honest Locooco who opposes Prohibition will vote for the *Maine Liquor Law* Candidate, Wm. F. Packer!

**BEDFORD MINERAL SPRINGS.**

The new hotel building at the Springs is nearly completed. The Company have also put up two large bath houses, and have ornamented and improved the grounds. There have been over one hundred mechanics and laborers constantly employed at the Springs for several months past, in building and making improvements. When all is completed, it will be the handsomest, as it is the healthiest, summer resort in the Union. The hotel will be opened for the reception of visitors on the 16th of June, and will continue open till the first of October. The Springs will be under the general superintendence of Mr. Willard, formerly of Washington City, and recently of the Burnett House, Cincinnati; his character as a caterer, is a guarantee that his guests will be well provided for. The Bar-keepers and Clerks are all gentlemen, of pleasing address and obliging manners. Col. P. Gosler, the President of the Company, is well known as a gentleman of extensive business qualifications, under whose care and superintendence all the improvements have been made. The Company have been very fortunate in its selection of President.

The Bedford Springs, from the medicinal qualities of its waters, and the salubrity of the mountain air, presents strong claims to the patronage of the public. Every thing promises one of the most thronged and brilliant seasons we have ever had.

**STRUCK BY LIGHTNING.**—During the severe storm on last Tuesday afternoon, the Cupola of the Court House was struck by lightning. One of the heavy beams inside was shattered to splinters, another was cracked, a small portion of the roof of the Cupola torn off, and part of the work on the outside loosened and damaged. Small portions of the main roof of the Court House was also torn off. A portion of the lightning descended by the spouting, which it tore loose, and a portion down the chimney, into the Prothonotary's office, and tore the tin from the stove pipe hole in the chimney. Fortunately Maj. Washabaugh had closed the office a short time before, and no one was in any part of the Court House at the time. Several persons on the pavements near, were looking towards the Court House, and were quite stunned. The Court House bell was uninjured, although the beams were only two or three feet from it. It is quite fortunate that the new town clock which is now at Hopewell, awaiting transportation here, was not up, or the probability is that it would have been ruined. It is thought \$100 will fully repair all damages.

**LANCASTER CONVENTION.**

The Convention of anti-union Americans, that portion composed of the old native element, met on the 3d inst., at Lancaster, and put in nomination the following ticket: For Governor, Isaac Hazellhurst, of Philadelphia, Supreme Judges, Jacob Broom, of Philadelphia, and J. E. Brady, of Allegheny, and for Canal Commissioner, John F. Linderman, of Berks County. Only nine Counties were represented, most of the Delegates being from Philadelphia. This will not injure the election of Mr. Wilmot, as nearly all those who favored the Convention would have voted for Packer, had they not taken up a candidate of their own; they will now vote for Hazellhurst. Besides nearly all the free Liquor Locoocoos in the State, and they are very strong in the Eastern Counties, will vote for Hazellhurst in preference to Packer, who, when he was in the Senate a few years ago, voted for a *Maine Liquor Jug Law*. We consider the selection of this ticket the best thing that could have been done for Wilmot, and the death blow to Packer.

**SALE OF THE MAIN LINE.**

According to promise we this week publish Letter No. 1. on this subject. Read it, and it will inform you how much State Tax has been paid into the State Treasury every year for the last twelve years, and it will show you also where these taxes, amounting in the aggregate to more than seventeen millions of dollars, have gone to, and to what uses they have been appropriated, and why it is our State debt yet remains forty millions and upwards, notwithstanding all our taxes paid. We will publish Letter No. 2. next week, and expect to continue the publication every week of others still more interesting, until our readers can fully understand the whole matter. In order to appreciate the writer's treatment of the subject properly it is necessary to begin at the beginning, and read the letters regularly in their order. This one prepares the way for others.

We call attention to the advertisement of Mr. Isaac Mengel, Jr. He is an excellent mechanic, and his Cabinet Ware, for neatness of style and durability, cannot be surpassed out of the cities.

**WOOD'S HAIR RESTORATIVE.**—This medicine is advertised in another part of this paper. It is recommended highly.—Read the advertisement.

**SANFORD'S LIVER REMEDY.**—This is said to be a certain cure for many complaints. Read the advertisement.

**BEDFORD BOROUGH.**

John Cessa & Co., make a great fuss about changes that have been made in Bedford Borough, within the last couple of years. If any change has been made, it has been by death, and Americans moving out and Locoocos moving in, and a half dozen traitors who were bought with petty offices, and promises of office. Now, John has been writing all the editorials that have appeared in the *Gazette* for several weeks past, and with all his flourish of trumpets we dare him to name ONE MAN that has left the Americans that voted the *Union American ticket* last fall. Point to one man, if you can. There has not been one man that voted with us that has left since then.

**WASHINGTON HOTEL.**

We call the attention of our readers to the advertisement of this excellent Hotel, in our advertising columns. Mrs. Cook is a landlady of superior qualifications, and takes pleasure in rendering every comfort to her guests.

The Hotel is under the general superintendence of Mr. Samuel Shoemaker, who has had several years experience in hotel keeping. We take pleasure in bearing testimony to his business qualifications as a Landlord and his character as a gentleman.

**BROADTOP COAL LANDS.**

We call attention to an advertisement in to-day's paper, of valuable Coal Lands, by Messrs. Lemuel Evans and Louis Anderson. These lands are in the heart of the Broad-top coal and iron region, and among the best there. Speculators will do well to examine the lands and attend the sale.

John Cessa & Co., have a long article, in the last *Gazette*, under the head of "Fr. Jordan, Esq.," in which that gentleman, is abused at a round rate. Such men cannot injure him, however, in this community. John wrote the article, and he cannot forget the seat in the Senate, that he can't get!

**IMPROVEMENT.**—C. Loyer, Esq., has erected at the front of his residence, a handsome portico of cut stone, surmounted by an iron railing of exquisite style and finish. Mr. Loyer is a gentleman of taste and public spirit.

Notice is hereby given that the Annual examination of classes at the Allegheny Male & Female Seminary will take place on Friday June 19th commencing at 8 o'clock A. M.

The exhibition will be held on the evening of the same day commencing at 7 P. M.

Let our friends attend the Club meeting to-morrow night.

**THE HYPOCRISY OF DEMOCRACY.**

Parson Brownlow, who has gained a world wide fame as a newspaper publisher, says some very severe things, but while they are severe, they always have the virtue of being true.

"Disguise it as they may, the hypocrisy of Democracy, added to their pernicious principles, constitutes the most dangerous, and destructive elements that was ever arrayed against the morality, peace and harmony of civilized society. The iniquity of wicked men and devils, never has invented and carried on anything like it. The utter depravity and wickedness of the whole scheme of modern Democracy, is every day becoming more apparent, and is being more and more appreciated by honest and moral men. Yet thousands and tens of thousands, of as good and honest men as any in the land, belong to this Anti-American, wicked, pernicious, and corrupt organization. They are deceived, deluded and humbugged. Thousands of this class have withdrawn from it and look upon it with horror and disgust. Others have gone into the den, from the ranks of the Whig and American parties, who were notoriously corrupt, had no regard for principles, and were alone in pursuit of spoils. Honest men in their ranks can only escape now, upon a plea of political insanity. This plea would be received by an enlightened and charitable public.—Every honest man will admit that those who have remained in the ranks of the party, while the organization was warring upon American and Protestant principles, could not be in their right minds.

The leaders of this bogus Democratic party, affect to have a holy horror for a "Know Nothing," and advise the common people to shun them, as they would land pirates! The same demagogues, however walk "cheek by jaw" with an ignorant, drunken, riotous Irishman, as unlearned in our country's institutions and politics, as an uninitiated son of Congo would be, and not blush at their companionship! They will permit a raw son of Erin, reeling with rot-gut whiskey, and black with bruises gotten in some breach of the peace or John Chinaman, too ostentatious in his education to know anything so intensely and radically terrestrial as modern Democracy is, to go with them to the polls and to their tables, and into their parlors walk "cheek by jaw" with an ignorant, drunken, riotous Irishman, as unlearned in our country's institutions and politics, as an uninitiated son of Congo would be, and not blush at their companionship! They will permit a raw son of Erin, reeling with rot-gut whiskey, and black with bruises gotten in some breach of the peace or John Chinaman, too ostentatious in his education to know anything so intensely and radically terrestrial as modern Democracy is, to go with them to the polls and to their tables, and into their parlors walk "cheek by jaw" with an ignorant, drunken, riotous Irishman, as unlearned in our country's institutions and politics, as an uninitiated son of Congo would be, and not blush at their companionship!

They will permit a raw son of Erin, reeling with rot-gut whiskey, and black with bruises gotten in some breach of the peace or John Chinaman, too ostentatious in his education to know anything so intensely and radically terrestrial as modern Democracy is, to go with them to the polls and to their tables, and into their parlors walk "cheek by jaw" with an ignorant, drunken, riotous Irishman, as unlearned in our country's institutions and politics, as an uninitiated son of Congo would be, and not blush at their companionship!

M'Lean and Catron held that as there was no appeal from the judgment of the Circuit Court on the plea in abatement, the

question of jurisdiction was not before the Court. Taney, Wayne, Daniel and Curtis held, *per contra*, that, as the Courts of the United States were of limited jurisdiction, the question of jurisdiction was always in order. Grier, Nelson and Campbell were silent on this point.

Three Judges—Taney, Wayne and Daniel—held that, although the Court below had no jurisdiction and the case must be dismissed on that ground, it was still competent for the Supreme Court to give an opinion on the merits of the case, and on all the questions therein involved. M'Lean and Curtis dissented from this view. In their opinion, any doctrines laid down under such circumstances must be regarded as extra-judicial. They based their right of going into the merits on the assumption that the Court below had jurisdiction, a view in which they were sustained by Catron and Grier. Nelson and Campbell, as they had avoided any expression of opinion on the question of jurisdiction, did the same on this point of judicial propriety; but Nelson, by confining himself, in his opinion, to the single point of the revival of Scott's condition of slavery by his return to Missouri, seemed to concur in the view of judicial propriety taken by M'Lean and Curtis.

Three Judges—Taney, Wayne, and Daniel—held that a negro of African descent was incapable of being a citizen of the United States, or even of suing in a Federal Court. From this doctrine M'Lean and Curtis expressly dissented, while Nelson, Grier, Campbell and Catron avoided any expression of opinion upon it.

Taney, Wayne, Daniel and Campbell held that the Constitution conferred no power on Congress to legislate for the Territories, the power to make all needful rules and regulations being confined solely to the disposition of the lands as property, and even that authority being limited to the Territories belonging to the United States (i. e. the territory north-west of the Ohio) when the Constitution was made. They, however, seemed to admit a certain power of legislation in Congress, based on the fact of acquisition and growing out of the necessity of the case. M'Lean, Catron and Curtis held, on the other hand, that under the authority to make needful rules and regulations, as well as by the necessity of the case, Congress had a full power of legislation for the Territories, limited only by the general restraints upon its legislative power contained in the Constitution. Nelson expressed no opinion on this point; nor did Grier, except the implication in favor of the first view by his joining in pronouncing the Missouri prohibition of 1820 unconstitutional, though on what particular ground he held it to be so does not appear.

Taney, Wayne and Daniel held that the Ordinance of 1787, though good and binding under the Confederation, expired with the Confederation, and that the act of Congress passed to confirm it was void because Congress had no power to legislate for the Territories. M'Lean, Catron and Curtis held, *per contra*, that the re-enactment of the Ordinance of 1787 was a valid exercise of the power of Congress; while Campbell admitted—and in this Catron concurred with him (Daniel *contra*, the others silent)—that the Ordinance of 1787, having been agreed to by Virginia, became thereby a part of the compact of session permanently binding on the parties, and was so regarded by the Convention that framed the Constitution.

Five Judges, a majority of the Court—Taney, Wayne, Daniel, Campbell and Grier—held that the Missouri prohibition of 1820 was unconstitutional and void, while Catron argued that it was void because it conflicted with the French treaty for the cession of Louisiana. M'Lean and Curtis held the prohibition constitutional and valid. Nelson silent.

Five Judges—Taney, Wayne, Daniel, Campbell and Catron—a majority of the Court, held that slaves were property in a general sense, as much so as cattle, or at least were so recognized by the Constitution of the United States; and as such might be carried into territories, notwithstanding any Congressional prohibition. M'Lean and Curtis held *per contra*, that slaves are recognized property only locally and by the laws of particular States, being out of those States not property, nor even slaves, except in the single case of fugitives. Grier and Nelson silent.

It was held by seven Judges (M'Lean and Curtis dissenting) that the record showed on the part of Scott a disability to maintain his suit. Of these Judges, Taney, Wayne and Daniel held that the fact set forth in the plea in abatement in the Court below, and admitted in the demurrer, "that the plaintiff was a negro of African descent, whose ancestors were of pure African blood, and who were brought into this country and sold as slaves," showed him not to be a citizen of the United States, and therefore disqualified to sue in a United States Court; and that the suit ought, on that ground, to be remanded to be dismissed for want of jurisdiction. Grier and Campbell (making with the other three a majority of the Court) concurred in this remanding for dismissal, and such was the judgment of the Court. Both Grier and Campbell based themselves, however, not on the plea in abatement, but on the fact apparent, as they thought, in the agreed statement of facts which made a part of the record, that Scott was a slave, and on that ground disqualified to sue, and they both seemed to think that the more regular course would be to confirm the judgment of the Court below. Such a confirmation of the judgment below Nelson and Catron held to be the only proper course, thus siding, so far as the question of jurisdiction was concerned, with Curtis and M'Lean, while even Grier (making up, with the other four, a majority of the Court) went so far as to admit that the record showed a *prima facie* case of jurisdiction.

M'Lean and Catron held that as there was no appeal from the judgment of the Circuit Court on the plea in abatement, the

question of jurisdiction was not before the Court. Taney, Wayne, Daniel and Curtis held, *per contra*, that, as the Courts of the United States were of limited jurisdiction, the question of jurisdiction was always in order. Grier, Nelson and Campbell were silent on this point.

Three Judges—Taney, Wayne and Daniel—held that, although the Court below had no jurisdiction and the case must be dismissed on that ground, it was still competent for the Supreme Court to give an opinion on the merits of the case, and on all the questions therein involved. M'Lean and Curtis dissented from this view. In their opinion, any doctrines laid down under such circumstances must be regarded as extra-judicial. They based their right of going into the merits on the assumption that the Court below had jurisdiction, a view in which they were sustained by Catron and Grier. Nelson and Campbell, as they had avoided any expression of opinion on the question of jurisdiction, did the same on this point of judicial propriety; but Nelson, by confining himself, in his opinion, to the single point of the revival of Scott's condition of slavery by his return to Missouri, seemed to concur in the view of judicial propriety taken by M'Lean and Curtis.

Three Judges—Taney, Wayne, and Daniel—held that a negro of African descent was incapable of being a citizen of the United States, or even of suing in a Federal Court. From this doctrine M'Lean and Curtis expressly dissented, while Nelson, Grier, Campbell and Catron avoided any expression of opinion upon it.

Taney, Wayne, Daniel and Campbell held that the Constitution conferred no power on Congress to legislate for the Territories, the power to make all needful rules and regulations being confined solely to the disposition of the lands as property, and even that authority being limited to the Territories belonging to the United States (i. e. the territory north-west of the Ohio) when the Constitution was made. They, however, seemed to admit a certain power of legislation in Congress, based on the fact of acquisition and growing out of the necessity of the case. M'Lean, Catron and Curtis held, on the other hand, that under the authority to make needful rules and regulations, as well as by the necessity of the case, Congress had a full power of legislation for the Territories, limited only by the general restraints upon its legislative power contained in the Constitution. Nelson expressed no opinion on this point; nor did Grier, except the implication in favor of the first view by his joining in pronouncing the Missouri prohibition of 1820 unconstitutional, though on what particular ground he held it to be so does not appear.

Taney, Wayne and Daniel held that the Ordinance of 1787, though good and binding under the Confederation, expired with the Confederation, and that the act of Congress passed to confirm it was void because Congress had no power to legislate for the Territories. M'Lean, Catron and Curtis held, *per contra*, that the re-enactment of the Ordinance of 1787 was a valid exercise of the power of Congress; while Campbell admitted—and in this Catron concurred with him (Daniel *contra*, the others silent)—that the Ordinance of 1787, having been agreed to by Virginia, became thereby a part of the compact of session permanently binding on the parties, and was so regarded by the Convention that framed the Constitution.

Five Judges, a majority of the Court—Taney, Wayne, Daniel, Campbell and Grier—held that the Missouri prohibition of 1820 was unconstitutional and void, while Catron argued that it was void because it conflicted with the French treaty for the cession of Louisiana. M'Lean and Curtis held the prohibition constitutional and valid. Nelson silent.

Five Judges—Taney, Wayne, Daniel, Campbell and Catron—a majority of the Court, held that slaves were property in a general sense, as much so as cattle, or at least were so recognized by the Constitution of the United States; and as such might be carried into territories, notwithstanding any Congressional prohibition. M'Lean and Curtis held *per contra*, that slaves are recognized property only locally and by the laws of particular States, being out of those States not property, nor even slaves, except in the single case of fugitives. Grier and Nelson silent.

It was held by seven Judges (M'Lean and Curtis dissenting) that the record showed on the part of Scott a disability to maintain his suit. Of these Judges, Taney, Wayne and Daniel held that the fact set forth in the plea in abatement in the Court below, and admitted in the demurrer, "that the plaintiff was a negro of African descent, whose ancestors were of pure African blood, and who were brought into this country and sold as slaves," showed him not to be a citizen of the United States, and therefore disqualified to sue in a United States Court; and that the suit ought, on that ground, to be remanded to be dismissed for want of jurisdiction. Grier and Campbell (making with the other three a majority of the Court) concurred in this remanding for dismissal, and such was the judgment of the Court. Both Grier and Campbell based themselves, however, not on the plea in abatement, but on the fact apparent, as they thought, in the agreed statement of facts which made a part of the record, that Scott was a slave, and on that ground disqualified to sue, and they both seemed to think that the more regular course would be to confirm the judgment of the Court below. Such a confirmation of the judgment below Nelson and Catron held to be the only proper course, thus siding, so far as the question of jurisdiction was concerned, with Curtis and M'Lean, while even Grier (making up, with the other four, a majority of the Court) went so far as to admit that the record showed a *prima facie* case of jurisdiction.

M'Lean and Catron held that as there was no appeal from the judgment of the Circuit Court on the plea in abatement, the

question of jurisdiction was not before the Court. Taney, Wayne, Daniel and Curtis held, *per contra*, that, as the Courts of the United States were of limited jurisdiction, the question of jurisdiction was always in order. Grier, Nelson and Campbell were silent on this point.

Three Judges—Taney, Wayne and Daniel—held that, although the Court below had no jurisdiction and the case must be dismissed on that ground, it was still competent for the Supreme Court to give an opinion on the merits of the case, and on all the questions therein involved. M'Lean and Curtis dissented from this view. In their opinion, any doctrines laid down under such circumstances must be regarded as extra-judicial. They based their right of going into the merits on the assumption that the Court below had jurisdiction, a view in which they were sustained by Catron and Grier. Nelson and Campbell, as they had avoided any expression of opinion on the question of jurisdiction, did the same on this point of judicial propriety; but Nelson, by confining himself, in his opinion, to the single point of the revival of Scott's condition of slavery by his return to Missouri, seemed to concur in the view of judicial propriety taken by M'Lean and Curtis.

Three Judges—Taney, Wayne, and Daniel—held that a negro of African descent was incapable of being a citizen of the United States, or even of suing in a Federal Court. From this doctrine M'Lean and Curtis expressly dissented, while Nelson, Grier, Campbell and Catron avoided any expression of opinion upon it.

Taney, Wayne, Daniel and Campbell held that the Constitution conferred no power on Congress to legislate for the Territories, the power to make all needful rules and regulations being confined solely to the disposition of the lands as property, and even that authority being limited to the Territories belonging to the United States (i. e. the territory north-west of the Ohio) when the Constitution was made. They, however, seemed to admit a certain power of legislation in Congress, based on the fact of acquisition and growing out of the necessity of the case. M'Lean, Catron and Curtis held, on the other hand, that under the authority to make needful rules and regulations, as well as by the necessity of the case, Congress had a full power of legislation for the Territories, limited only by the general restraints upon its legislative power contained in the Constitution. Nelson expressed no opinion on this point; nor did Grier, except the implication in favor of the first view by his joining in pronouncing the Missouri prohibition of 1820 unconstitutional, though on what particular ground he held it to be so does not appear.

Taney, Wayne and Daniel held that the Ordinance of 1787, though good and binding under the Confederation, expired with the Confederation, and that the act of Congress passed to confirm it was void because Congress had no power to legislate for the Territories. M'Lean, Catron and Curtis held, *per contra*, that the re-enactment of the Ordinance of 1787 was a valid exercise of the power of Congress; while Campbell admitted—and in this Catron concurred with him (Daniel *contra*, the others silent)—that the Ordinance of 1787, having been agreed to by Virginia, became thereby a part of the compact of session permanently binding on the parties, and was so regarded by the Convention that framed the Constitution.

Five Judges, a majority of the Court—Taney, Wayne, Daniel, Campbell and Grier—held that the Missouri prohibition of 1820 was unconstitutional and void, while Catron argued that it was void because it conflicted with the French treaty for the cession of Louisiana. M'Lean and Curtis held the prohibition constitutional and valid. Nelson silent.

Five Judges—Taney, Wayne, Daniel, Campbell and Catron—a majority of the Court, held that slaves were property in a general sense, as much so as cattle, or at least were so recognized by the Constitution of the United States; and as such might be carried into territories, notwithstanding any Congressional prohibition. M'Lean and Curtis held *per contra*, that slaves are recognized property only locally and by the laws of particular States, being out of those States not property, nor even slaves, except in the single case of fugitives. Grier and Nelson silent.

It was held by seven Judges (M'Lean and Curtis dissenting) that the record showed on the part of Scott a disability to maintain his suit. Of these Judges, Taney, Wayne and Daniel held that the fact set forth in the plea in abatement in the Court below, and admitted in the demurrer, "that the plaintiff was a negro of African descent, whose ancestors were of pure African blood, and who were brought into this country and sold as slaves," showed him not to be a citizen of the United States, and therefore disqualified to sue in a United States Court; and that the suit ought, on that ground, to be remanded to be dismissed for want of jurisdiction. Grier and Campbell (making with the other three a majority of the Court) concurred in this remanding for dismissal, and such was the judgment of the Court. Both Grier and Campbell based themselves, however, not on the plea in abatement, but on the fact apparent, as they thought, in the agreed statement of facts which made a part of the record, that Scott was a slave, and on that ground disqualified to sue, and they both seemed to think that the more regular course would be to confirm the judgment of the Court below. Such a confirmation of the judgment below Nelson and Catron held to be the only proper course, thus siding, so far as the question of jurisdiction was concerned, with Curtis and M'Lean, while even Grier (making up, with the other four, a majority of the Court) went so far as to admit that the record showed a *prima facie* case of jurisdiction.

M'Lean and Catron held that as there was no appeal from the judgment of the Circuit Court on the plea in abatement, the

question of jurisdiction was not before the Court. Taney, Wayne, Daniel and Curtis held, *per contra*, that, as the Courts of the United States were of limited jurisdiction, the question of jurisdiction was always in order. Grier, Nelson and Campbell were silent on this point.

Three Judges—Taney, Wayne and Daniel—held that, although the Court below had no jurisdiction and the case must be dismissed on that ground, it was still competent for the Supreme Court to give an opinion on the merits of the case, and on all the questions therein involved. M'Lean and Curtis dissented from this view. In their opinion, any doctrines laid down under such circumstances must be regarded as extra-judicial. They based their right of going into the merits on the assumption that the Court below had jurisdiction, a view in which they were sustained by Catron and Grier. Nelson and Campbell, as they had avoided any expression of opinion on the question of jurisdiction, did the same on this point of judicial propriety; but Nelson, by confining himself, in his opinion, to the single point of the revival of Scott's condition of slavery by his return to Missouri, seemed to concur in the view of judicial propriety taken by M'Lean and Curtis.

Three Judges—Taney, Wayne, and Daniel—held that a negro of African descent was incapable of being a citizen of the United States, or even of suing in a Federal Court. From this doctrine M'Lean and Curtis expressly dissented, while Nelson, Grier, Campbell and Catron avoided any expression of opinion upon it.

Taney, Wayne, Daniel and Campbell held that the Constitution conferred no power on Congress to legislate for the Territories, the power to make all needful rules and regulations being confined solely to the disposition of the lands as property, and even that authority being limited to the Territories belonging to the United States (i. e. the territory north-west of the Ohio) when the Constitution was made. They, however, seemed to admit a certain power of legislation in Congress, based on the fact of acquisition and growing out of the necessity of the case. M'Lean, Catron and Curtis held, on the other hand, that under the authority to make needful rules and regulations, as well as by the necessity of the case, Congress had a full power of legislation for the Territories, limited only by the general restraints upon its legislative power contained in the Constitution. Nelson expressed no opinion on this point; nor did Grier, except the implication in favor of the first view by his joining in pronouncing the Missouri prohibition of 1820 unconstitutional, though on what particular ground he held it to be so does not appear.

Taney, Wayne and Daniel held that the Ordinance of 1787, though good and binding under the Confederation, expired with the Confederation, and that the act of Congress passed to confirm it was void because Congress had no power to legislate for the Territories. M'Lean, Catron and Curtis held, *per contra*, that the re-enactment of the Ordinance of 1787 was a valid exercise of the power of Congress; while Campbell admitted—and in this Catron concurred with him (Daniel *contra*, the others silent)—that the Ordinance of 1787, having been agreed to by Virginia, became thereby a part of the compact of session permanently binding on the parties, and was so regarded by the Convention that framed the Constitution.

Five Judges, a majority of the Court—Taney, Wayne, Daniel, Campbell and Grier—held that the Missouri prohibition of 1820 was unconstitutional and void, while Catron argued that it was void because it conflicted with the French treaty for the cession of Louisiana. M'Lean and Curtis held the prohibition constitutional and valid. Nelson silent.

Five Judges—Taney, Wayne, Daniel, Campbell and Catron—a majority of the Court, held that slaves were property in a general sense, as much so as cattle, or at least were so recognized by the Constitution of the United States; and as such might be carried into territories, notwithstanding any Congressional prohibition. M'Lean and Curtis held *per contra*, that slaves are recognized property only locally and by the laws of particular States, being out of those States not property, nor even slaves, except in the single case of fugitives. Grier and Nelson silent.

It was held by seven Judges (M'Lean and Curtis dissenting) that the record showed on the part of Scott a disability to maintain his suit. Of these Judges, Taney, Wayne and Daniel held that the fact set forth in the plea in abatement in the Court below, and admitted in the demurrer, "that the plaintiff was a negro of African descent, whose ancestors were of pure African blood, and who were brought into this country and sold as slaves," showed him not to be a citizen of the United States, and therefore disqualified to sue in a United States Court; and that the suit ought, on that ground, to be remanded to be dismissed for want of jurisdiction. Grier and Campbell (making with the other three a majority of the Court) concurred in this remanding for dismissal, and such was the judgment of the Court. Both Grier and Campbell based themselves, however, not on the plea in abatement, but on the fact apparent, as they thought, in the agreed statement of facts which made a part of the record, that Scott was a slave, and on that ground disqualified to sue, and they both seemed to think that the more regular course would be to confirm the judgment of the Court below. Such a confirmation of the judgment below Nelson and Catron held to be the only proper course, thus siding, so far as the question of jurisdiction was concerned, with Curtis and M'Lean, while even Grier (making up, with the other four, a majority of the Court) went so far as to admit that the record showed a *prima facie* case of jurisdiction.

M'Lean and Catron held that as there was no appeal from the judgment of the Circuit Court on the plea in abatement, the

**LOCOOCO HOSTILITY TO THE SALE OF THE MAIN LINE.**

The Locooco leaders appreciate the loss that their party would sustain by a sale of the Main Line of our State Works, and they are consequently putting forth every effort to defeat the sale, notwithstanding the almost unanimous wish of the people, and the act of the Legislature providing for a sale. We learn that Henry D. Foster and Charles R. Buckalew, two leading Locos of the State, have been engaged as counsel by the party; to obstruct the intension of the law, and to endeavor to retain the works in the hands of that corrupt, plundering organization. It has been proven, over and over again, that these works are an annual, absolute loss to the State of from one to two millions of dollars, which run goes into the pockets of corrupt hangers-on about the works, who are pensioned on the State for the purpose of doing the dirty work of the party; and yet, in the face of this, these Locoocos have the hardihood, in the light of day, to persist in factious efforts to prevent the State from getting rid of the incubus. If any other party were to be guilty of such a high-handed attack on the interest of the State, for the benefit of thieving pensioners, it would be booted from existence; but Locoocoism is so notoriously based on the "adhesive power of public plunder," that such conduct on the part of its members is looked upon as but consistent with its vitality, and is borne with tameness and patience. This is truly a wonderful world we live in; and not the least of its wonders is the fact that a party like Locoocoism can find honest men giving it their support.—*Lebanon Courier*.

**LOVE.**—An instance has been related by a trader, of an Indian squaw, whose husband was so passionately enamored of her that, sitting one day opposite to her in his wig-wag, gazing on her supposed beauty, he suddenly started up, and seizing her by the nose with his teeth, while she, without opposition or renunciation, permitted it, bit off. On her desiring afterwards to know the cause of such treatment, he said he thought her too beautiful, that he was apprehensive some other might love her, but that now, though he could still love her as much as before, yet others might not. At the same time acknowledging that he never had the least cause for jealousy.

**HERE'S WHERE YOU GET YOUR GOOD AND CHEAP HARDWARE.**—This is the common expression of all those who desire anything in this line. Capt. Arnold is a mechanic, a Carpenter, of thirty years standing, and one of the best that ever shovled a plane in Bedford, and he knows from experience which is the best kind of edge tools, and also of other hardware. He lays in his stock himself, and does not bring on any of your worthless articles. For cheapness he cannot be surpassed in the place, and if any ones want hardware they should call on him. He warrants what he sells. His store, one door East of the Rising Sun House.  
May 22, 1857.

**HEBMAN'S TINWARE** can't be beat.—His shop is a few doors West of the old Globe Hotel. He is an old and good mechanic, and makes all his work himself, and sells cheaper than anybody else. All who want tinware will save money by calling on him. He follows no other business, and pays all his attention to making and selling good, substantial, and cheap work.  
May 22, 1857.

It has become an established fact that Dr. Sanford's Investigator will cure Liver Complaint, Jaundice and General Debility. Many people, personally known to us, whose word cannot be doubted, have given their certificates to prove this, and with such a mass of evidence who can doubt.

It is truly the invalid's friend, and will give relief when all other remedies fail, and in some instances that have come under our observation it seemed the means of snatching its victim from the grave, we wish all our readers who need medicine would try one bottle, for it will surely give relief. For sale by Dr. Harry—  
May 25.

"WOODLAND CREAM"—*A Formula for beautifying the Hair.*—highly perfumed, superior to any French article imported, and for half the price. For dressing Ladies' Hair it has no equal, giving it a bright glossy appearance.—It causes Gontem's Hair to curl in the most natural manner. It removes dandruff, always giving the hair the appearance of being fresh shampooed. Price only fifty cents. None genuine unless signed  
FETRIDGE & CO., Proprietors of the "Balm of a Thousand Flowers."  
For sale by all Druggists. (26002.)

Flour in Baltimore, \$7.50 and \$7.62, Wheat, \$1.80 and \$1.90, Rye \$1.15, Corn, 50 cts. Flour in Philadelphia, from \$7.50 to \$8.50, according to quality.