The decision in the Supreme Court.—The decision just made in the Dred Scott case, an  
orber of Constitutional law in the United States, is probably the most important that ever  
emanated from that highest tribunal of our country. It declares the Missouri Compromise Act  
of 1850 unconstitutional—that act which drew a slave line and a free line across Territorial  
States, prohibiting slavery colonization north of 36 30'. This line Congress in 1850 refused to  
extend to the Pacific ocean, and in 1852 repealed the act. We cannot, of course, on the inseparable  
data from the natural deduction, rely on this case, which has so far reached us, undertake to  
divine its full force and bearings. The points of the decision cannot be entirely and accurately  
complemented until the full reports of the opinion  
shall await with considerable interest, and while  
desiring to avoid any hasty or unadvised remark, we cannot, in the meantime, refrain from  
expressing our gratification that this important  
question of the Constitution shall at last be adjusted; one which is in accordance with the great  
principle of popular sovereignty in regard to slave  
very in the Territories, and which the newer  
light which time and circumstance have brought  
to the subject, have been effectue  
t in establishing by the repeal of the Kansas  
Nebraska bill of all legislative control over that  
body over slavery in the Territories. At present  
we can only give such other facts in the case as are  

It appears that the owners of the slave Dred Scott, who brings the action, carried him to Rock  
Island, in Illinois, and Fort Snelling, north of the  
Missouri line, and resided there for 11 years,  
and then claimed he was legally free. Then the  
status of slavery was raised, and the Missouri  
sustain the action. Judges Taney of Md.; Campbell  
Doll, of Ala.; Atchison, of Tenn.; Wayne of Ga.  
that Section 123 should be adopted by the  
Missouri decisions and thereby join the majority,  
which are based on the ground of the  
sections of Missouri, where recent decisions reverse  
old decisions. He is free in Illinois, and, as  
old slave of slavery when recently declared free in  
abandoned by Mr. Scott and Mr. C.  
Ohio, and of the jurisdictions of the court, with  
the constitutionality of the Missouri compromise  
that the amendment is not known upon what spe 
primary authority, that the Constitution does not reach directly, if at all, that a master may  
slave to a free State, even in transitu, and hold  
slave in slavery; his sole right to be a slave is not  
taken to the State whenever he departs from  
The decision, we are glad to say, seems to be  
pleased in most quarters. There are sincere  
ed and judicial Cowper, and some of those who  
know no law except that of their own volition. If  
Tribune says that the Missouri compromise is  
but on the other hand the New York Times, we  

No popular revolution will follow this decr  
part of the Constitution and of the United States.  
It will be accepted as the authori 
constituted and regarded  
by all parties to the Constitution, and regarded  
the people as the law of the land. No issue will  
reflected by the public mind in regard to this  
the issues which must inevitably  
will render the matter a matter of fact,  
progress, or more  
useful in their results, no one who knows anything  
people can for a moment believe.