

The New-England Standard

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY
WILLIAM W. HOLDEN,
EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

THE CONSTITUTION AND THE UNION OF THE STATES—THEY "MUST BE PRESERVED."
RALEIGH, N. C., WEDNESDAY, APRIL 17, 1844.

VOLUME X.—NUMBER 40.
TERMS—\$3 PER ANNUM,
PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

TERMS
THE NORTH CAROLINA STANDARD
IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY, AT
THREE DOLLARS PER ANNUM, IN ADVANCE.
Those persons who remit by Mail (postage paid) Five Dollars, will be entitled to a receipt for Six Dollars, or two years' subscription to the Standard—one copy two years, or two copies one year.
For four copies, : : : \$10 00
" ten " : : : : 20 00
" twenty " : : : : 35 00
The same rate for six months.
Any person procuring and forwarding five subscribers, with the cash (\$15), will be entitled to the Standard one year free of charge.

ADVERTISEMENTS, not exceeding fourteen lines, will be inserted one time for One Dollar, and twenty-five cents for each subsequent insertion—those of greater length, in proportion. *Count Orders and Judicial Advertisements* will be charged twenty-five per cent. higher than the above rates. A deduction of \$3 1-2 per cent. will be made to those who advertise by the year. If the number of insertions be not marked on them, they will be continued until ordered out. Letters to the Editor must come free of postage, or they may not be attended to.

LETTER OF MR. WALKER,
OF MISSISSIPPI,
Relative to the annexation of Texas: in reply to the call of the people of Carroll county, Kentucky, to communicate his views on that subject.

[CONTINUED.]
The importance of Texas is thus described by Mr. Clay, in his speech of the 3d of April, 1820: "All the accounts concurred in representing Texas to be extremely valuable. Its superficial extent was three or four times greater than that of Florida. The climate was delicious; the soil fertile; the margins of the rivers abounding in living-oak; and the country admitting of easy settlement. It possessed, moreover, if he were not misinformed, one of the finest ports in the Gulf of Mexico. The productions of which it was capable, were suited to our wants. The unfortunate captive of St. Helena wished for ships, commerce, and colonies. We have them all, if we do not wantonly throw them away. The colonies of other countries are separated from them by vast seas, requiring great expense to protect them, and are held subject to a constant risk of their being torn from their grasp. Our colonies, on the contrary, are united to, and form a part of, our continent; and the same Mississippi, from whose rich deposit this best of them (Louisiana) has been formed, will transport on her bosom the brave, the patriotic men from her tributary streams, to defend and preserve the next most valuable—the province of Texas." "He is not disposed to disparage Florida; but its intrinsic value was incomparably less than that of Texas."

In the letter of instructions from Mr. Madison, as Secretary of State, of the 29th July, 1803, he says, "the acquisition of the Floridas is still to be pursued." He adds, the exchange of any part of western Louisiana, which Spain may propose for the cession of the Floridas, "is inadmissible." "An intrinsic value there is no equality." "We are less disposed also to make sacrifices to obtain the Floridas; because their position and the manifest course of events guaranty an early and reasonable acquisition of them." In Mr. Madison's letter, also, as Secretary of State, of the 8th July, 1804, he announces the opposition of Mr. Jefferson "to a perpetual relinquishment of any territory whatever east of the Rio Bravo." In the message of President Houston of the 5th May, 1837, he says that Texas contains "four-fifths of all the live oak now in the world." Cotton will be its great staple, and some sugar and molasses will be produced. The grape, the olive, and indigo, and cocoa, and nearly all the fruits of the tropics will be grown there also. In Texas are valuable mines of gold and silver; the silver mine of San Saba having been examined and found to be among the richest in the world.

In the recent debate in the British Parliament, Lord Brougham said: "The importance of Texas could not be overrated. It was a country of the greatest capabilities, and was in extent full as large as France. It possessed a soil of the finest and most fertile character, and it was capable of producing all tropical produce; and its climate was of a most healthy character. It had access to the gulf, to the river Mississippi, with which it communicated by means of the Red river." The possession of Texas would ensure to us the trade of Santa Fe and all the northern States of Mexico. Above all, Texas is a large and indispensable portion of the valley of the West. That valley once was all our own; but it has been dismembered by a treaty formed when the West held neither of the high executive stations of the government, and was wholly unrepresented in the cabinet at Washington. The Red river and Arkansas, divided and mutilated, now flow, with their numerous tributaries, for many thousand miles, through the territory of a foreign power; and the West has been forced back along the gulf, from the Del Norte to the Sabine. If, then, it be true that the sacrifice of Texas was made with painful reluctance, all those who united in the surrender will rejoice at the reacquisition.

This is no question of the purchase of new territory, but of the re-annexation of that which once was our own. It is not a question of the extension of our limits, but of the restoration of former boundaries. It proposes no new addition to the valley of the Mississippi; but of its reunion and all its waters, once more, under our dominion. If the Creator had separated Texas from the Union by mountain barriers, the Alps or the Andes, these might be plausible objections; but he has planned down the whole valley, including Texas, and united every atom of the soil and every drop of the waters of the mighty whole. He has linked theirs with the great Mississippi, and marked and united the whole for the dominion of one government and the residence of one people; and it is impious in man to attempt to dissolve this great and glorious Union. Texas is a part of Kentucky, a portion of the same great valley. It is a part of New York and Pennsylvania, a part of Maryland and Virginia, and Ohio and all the western States, whilst the Tennessee unites with it the waters of Georgia, Alabama, and Carolina. The Alleghany, commencing its course in New York, and with the Youghiogony, from Maryland, and Monongahela, from Virginia, merging with the beautiful Ohio at the metropolis of western Pennsylvania, embrace the streams of Texas at the mouths of the Arkansas and Red river, whence their waters flow in kindred union to the gulf. And here let me say, that

New York ought to reclaim for the Alleghany its true original name, the Ohio, of which it is a part, and so marked and called by that name in the British maps, prior to 1776, one of which is in the possession of the distinguished representative from the Pittsburgh district of Pennsylvania. The words "Ohio" and "Alleghany," in two different Indian dialects, mean clearly, as designating truly, in both cases, the character of the water of both streams; and hence it is that New York is upon the Ohio, and truly stands at the head of the valley of the West. The treaty which struck Texas from the Union, inflicted a blow upon this mighty valley. And who will say that the West shall remain dismembered and mutilated, and that the ancient boundaries of the republic shall never be restored? Who will desire to check the young eagle of America, now rearing her gaze upon our former limits, and repluming her pinions for her returning flight? What American will say, that the flag of the Union shall never wave again throughout that mighty territory; and that what Jefferson acquired, and Madison refused to surrender, shall never be restored? Who will oppose the re-establishment of our glorious constitution, over the whole of the mighty valley which once was shielded by its benignant sway? Who will wish again to curtail the limits of this great republican empire, and again to dismember the glorious valley of the West? Who will refuse to replant the banner of the republic, upon our former boundary, or surrender the Arkansas and Red river, and retransfer the coast of the gulf? Who will refuse to heal the bleeding wounds of the mutilated West, and re-unite the veins and arteries, dis severed by the dismembered cession of Texas to Spain? To refuse to accept the re-annexation, is to surrender the Territory of Texas, and redismember the valley of the West. Nay, more: under existing circumstances, it is to lower the flag of the Union before the red cross of St. George, and to surrender the Florida pass, the mouth of the Mississippi, the command of the Mexican gulf, and finally Texas itself, into the hands of England.

As a question of money, no State is much more deeply interested in the reannexation of Texas than your own great commonwealth of Kentucky. There, if Texas becomes part of the Union, will be a great and growing market for her beef and pork, her lard and butter, her flour and corn; and there, within a very short period, would be found a ready sale for more than a million dollars in value, of her balerape and hemp and cotton-bagging. Nor can it be that Kentucky would desire by the refusal of reannexation, to mutilate and dismember the valley of which she is a part; or that Kentucky would curtail the limits of the republic, or diminish its power and strength and glory. It cannot be that Kentucky will wish to see any flag except our own upon the banks of the Sabine and Arkansas and Red river, and within a day's sail of the mouth of the Mississippi, and the outlet of all her own commerce in the Gulf. Many of her own people are within the limits of Texas, and its battle-fields are watered with the blood of many of her sons. It was her own intrepid Milam, who headed the three hundred who, armed with rifles only, captured the fortress of Alamo, defended by heavy artillery and thirteen hundred of the picked troops of Mexico, under one of their best commanders. And will Kentucky refuse to re-embrace so many of her own people? nor permit them, without leaving Texas, to return to the American Union? And if war should ever again revisit our country, Kentucky knows that the steady aim of the western rifleman, and the brave hearts and stout hands within the limits of Texas, are, in the hour of danger, among the surest defenders of the country, and especially of the valley of the West. The question of reannexation, and of the restoration of ancient boundaries, is a much stronger case than the purchase of new territory. It is a stronger case also than the acquisition of Louisiana or Florida; not only upon the ground that these were both an acquisition of new territory, but that they embraced a foreign people, dissimilar to our own, in language, laws, and institutions, and transferred without their knowledge or consent, by the act of a European king. More especially, in a case like this, where the people of Texas occupy a region which was once exclusively their own; and this people, in whom we acknowledge to reside the only sovereignty over the whole and every portion of Texas, desire the reannexation—that we cannot re-establish our former boundaries, and restore to us the whole or any part of the territory which was once our own, is a proposition, the bare statement of which is its best refutation.

Let us examine, now, some of the objections urged against the reannexation of Texas. And here, it is remarkable that the objections to the purchase of Louisiana are the same now made in the case of Texas; yet all now acknowledge the wisdom of that measure; and to have ever opposed it, is now regarded as alike unpatriotic and unwise. And so will it be in the case of Texas. The measure will justify itself by its results; and its opponents will stand in the same position now occupied by those who objected to the purchase of Louisiana. The objections, we have said, were the same, and we will examine them separately. 1st. The extension of territory; and 2d, the question of slavery.

As to the extension of territory, it applied with much greater force to the purchase of Louisiana. That purchase annexed to the Union a territory double the size of that already embraced within its limits; whilst the reannexation of Texas, according to the largest estimates, will add but one-seventh to the extent of our territory. The highest estimate of the area of Texas is but 318,000 square miles, whilst that of the rest of the Union is 2,000,000 square miles. Now, the British territory, on our own continent of North America, exclusive of the West Indies, and north of our northern boundary, is 2,800,000 square miles, being 500,000 more than that of our whole Union, and Texas united. Indeed, we may add both the Californias to Texas, and unite them all to the Union, and still the area of the whole will be less than that of the British North American possessions. And is it an American doctrine that monarchies or despotisms are alone fitted for the government of extensive territories; and that a confederacy of States must be compressed within narrower limits? Of all the forms of government, our confederacy is most specially adapted for an extended territory, and might, without the least danger, but with increased security, and vastly augmented benefits, embrace a continent. Each State, within its own limits, controls all its local concerns, and the general government chiefly those which appertain to commerce and our foreign relations. Indeed, as you augment

the number of States, the bond of union is stronger; for the opposition of any one State is much less dangerous and formidable, in a confederacy of thirty States, than of three. On this subject experience is the best test of truth. Has the Union been endangered by the advance in the number of States from thirteen to twenty-six? Look also at all the new States that have been added to the Union since the adoption of the constitution, and tell me what one of all of them, either in war or peace, has ever failed most faithfully to perform its duties; and what one of them has ever proposed or threatened the existence of the government, or the dissolution of the Union? No rebellion or insurrection has ever raised its banner within their limits, nor have traitorous or union-dissolving conventions, in war or in peace, ever been assembled within the boundary of any of the new States of the West; but in peace, they have nobly and faithfully performed all their duties to the Union; and in war, the spirit of patriots has been an ardent patriotism, and all have rushed to the standard of their common country. From the shores of the Atlantic and the lakes of the North; to those of the Alabama and the Mississippi; from the snows of Canada to the sunny plains of the South—the soil of the Union is watered with the blood of the brave and patriotic citizen soldiers of the West. And is it England would persuade us our territory and population will be too great to permit the reannexation of Texas? Let us see how stands the case with herself and other great powers of the world. The following facts are presented from the most recent geographies:

British empire—area, 8,100,000 square miles; population 200,000,000.
Russian empire—area, 7,500,000 square miles; population 75,000,000.
Chinese empire—area, 5,500,000 square miles; population 250,000,000.
Brazil—area, 3,000,000 square miles; population 6,000,000.
United States (including Texas)—area, 2,318,000 square miles; population 19,000,000.
Here is one monarchy, (the British empire,) nearly four times as large as the United States, including Texas; and one monarchy and three despotisms combined, largely more than ten times our area, also including Texas; and to assert, under these circumstances, that our government is to be overthrown or endangered by an addition of one-seventh to its area, is to adopt the exploded argument of kings and despots against our system of confederated States.

President Monroe, a citizen of one of the old thirteen States, in his message of 1823, thus speaks of the effects of the purchase of Louisiana: "This expansion of our population, and accession of new States to our Union, have had the happiest effect on all its highest interests. That it has eminently augmented our resources, and added to our strength and respectability as a power, is admitted by all. It is manifest, that by enlarging the basis of our system, and increasing the number of States, the system itself has been greatly strengthened in both its branches. Consolidation and disunion have thereby been rendered equally impracticable. Each government, confiding in its own strength, has less to apprehend from the other; and in consequence, each enjoying a greater freedom of action, is rendered more efficient for all the purposes for which it was instituted." It is the system of confederate States, united, but not consolidated, and incorporating the great principle which led to the adoption of the constitution—of reciprocal free trade between all the States—that adapt such a government to the extent of a continent. The greater the extent of territory, the more enlarged is the power, and the more augmented the blessings of such a government. In war it will be more certain of success, and therefore wars will be less frequent; and in peace, it will be more respected abroad, and enjoy greater advantages at home, and the less unfavorable will be the influence on its prosperity, of the hostile policy of foreign nations. It may then have a home market, which, as the new and exchangeable products of various soils and climates are augmented, will place its industry less within the controlling influence of foreign powers. Especially is this important to the great manufacturing interest, that is its home market, which is almost its only market, should be enlarged and extended by the accession of new territory, and an augmented population, embraced within the boundaries of the Union, and therefore constituting a part of the domestic market. By the census of 1840, the total product of the mining and the manufactures of the Union, was \$282,194,985; and of this vast amount, by the treasury report, but \$9,469,962 was exported, and found a market abroad. Almost its only market was the home market, thus demonstrating the vast importance to that great interest of an accession of territory and population at home.

Nor is it only the mining and manufacturing interests that would feel the influence of such a new and rapidly augmenting home market; but agriculture, commerce, and navigation, the products of the forest and fisheries, the freighting and ship-building interests, would all feel a new impulse; and the great internal communications, by railroads and canals, engaged in transporting our own exchangeable products, would find a great enlargement of their business and profits, and lead onward to the completion of the present and the construction of new improvements—thus identifying more closely all our great interests, bringing nearer and nearer to each other the remotest portions of the mighty whole, multiplying their trade and intercourse, breaking down the barriers of local and sectional prejudice, and scouting the thought of disunion from the American heart, and leaving the very term obsolete. Indeed, if we measure distance by the time in which it is traversed, this Union, with Texas reannexed, is much smaller in territory than the Union was at the adoption of the constitution. Then, the journey from the capital to the then remotest corner of the republic could not be traversed in less than a month; while now, much less than one-half that time will take us to the mouth of the Del Norte, the extreme southwestern limit of Texas. Such are the conquests which stem has already effected, upon the water and upon the land; and when we consider the wonderful advances which they are still making, we must begin to calculate a journey upon land, by steam, from the Atlantic to the Del Norte, by hours, and not by weeks or months. And he who, under such circumstances, would still say that Texas was too large or distant for reannexation to the Union, must have been sleeping since the application of steam to locomotion.

But if Texas is too large for incorporation into the Union, why is not Oregon also, which is near-

ly double the size of Texas? and if Texas is too remote, why is not Oregon also, when ten days will take us to the mouth of the Del Norte, whereas three months by land, and five months by sea, must be required for the journey to the mouth of the Columbia. Texas, also, is a part of the valley of the Mississippi, watered by the same streams, and united with it by nature, as one and indivisible; whereas Oregon is separated from us by mountain barriers, and pours its waters into another and distant ocean. And if Oregon, although disputed, and occupied by a foreign power, is, as I believe it to be, in truth and justice, all our own, Texas was once, and for many years, within our limits, and may now again become our own by the free and unanimous consent, already given, of all by whom it is owned and occupied. I have not thus contrasted Texas and Oregon with a view to oppose the occupation of Oregon; but I have always been the ardent friend of that measure. I advocated it in a speech published long before I became a member of the Senate, and now, since the death of the patriotic and lamented Linn, I am the oldest surviving member of the special committee of the Senate which has pressed upon that body, for so many years, the immediate occupation of the whole Territory of Oregon. There, upon the shores of the distant Pacific, if my vote can accomplish it, shall be planted the banner of the Union; and, with my consent, never shall be surrendered a single point of its coast, an atom of its soil, or a drop of all its waters. But while I am against the surrender of any portion of Oregon, I am also against the surrender of the territory of Texas; for, disguise it as we may, it is a case of *resurrender*, when it once was all our own, and now again is ours, by the free consent of those to whom it belongs, already given, and waiting only the ceremony of a formal acceptance. Let not those, then, who advocate the occupation of Oregon, tell us that Texas is too distant, or too inaccessible, or too extensive for American occupancy. Let the friends of Oregon reflect, also, that Texas, at the head of the Arkansas, is contiguous to Oregon, and within twenty miles of the pass which commands the entrance through all that territory, and the occupation of which pass by a foreign power, would separate the people and Territory of Oregon from the rest of the Union, and leave them an easy prey to the army of an invader. In truth, Texas is nearly as indispensable for the safe and permanent occupation of Oregon, as it is for the security of New Orleans and the Gulf.

The only remaining objection is the question of slavery. And here we have a question which is to curtail the limits of the republic—to threaten its existence—to aim a deadly blow at all its great and vital interests—to court alliances with foreign and hostile powers—to recall our commerce and expel our manufactures from bays and rivers that once were all our own—to strike down the flag of the Union, as it advances towards our ancient boundary—to surrender a mighty territory, and invite to its occupancy the deadliest foe that the only foe this government has ever encountered? Is anti-slavery to do all this? And is it so to endanger New Orleans, and the valley and commerce and outlet of the West, that we would hold them, not by our own strength, but by the slender tenure of the will and of the mercy of Great Britain? If anti-slavery can effect all this, may God, in his infinite mercy, save and perpetuate this Union; for the efforts of man would be feeble and impotent. The avowed object of this party is the immediate abolition of slavery. For this, they traverse sea and land; for this, they hold conventions in the capital of England; and there they brood over schemes of abolition, in association with British societies; there they join in denunciations of their countrymen, until their hearts are filled with treason; and they return home, Americans in name, but Englishmen in feelings and principles. Let us all, then, feel and know, whether we live North or South, that this party, if not vanquished, must overthrow the government, and dissolve the Union. This party propose the immediate abolition of slavery throughout the Union. If this were practicable, let us look at the consequences. By the returns of the last census, the products of the slaveholding States, in 1840, amounted in value to \$404,429,638. These products, then, of the South, must have alone enabled it to furnish a home market for all the surplus manufactures of the North, as also a market for the products of its forests and fisheries; and giving a mighty impulse to all its commercial and navigating interests. Now, nearly all these agricultural products of the South which accomplish all these great purposes, is the result of slave labor; and, strike down these products by the immediate abolition of slavery, and the markets of the South, for want of the means to purchase, will be lost to the people of the North; and North and South will be involved in one common ruin. Yes, in the harbors of the North (at Philadelphia, New York, and Boston) the vessels would rot at their wharves for want of exchangeable products to carry; the building of ships would cease, and the grass would grow in many a street now enlivened by an active and progressive industry. In the interior, the railroads and canals would languish for want of business; and the factories and manufacturing towns and cities, decaying and deserted, would stand as blasted monuments of the folly of man. One universal bankruptcy would overspread the country, together with all the demoralization and crime which ever accompany such a catastrophe; and the notices at every corner would point only to sales on execution, by the constable, the sheriff, the marshal, and the auctioneer; whilst the beggars would ask us in the streets, not for money, but for bread. Dark as the picture may be, it could not exceed the gloomy reality. Such would be the effects in the North; whilst in the South, no human heart can conceive, nor pen describe, the dreadful consequences. Let us look at another result to the North. The slaves being emancipated, not by the South, but by the North, would fly there for safety and protection; and three millions of free blacks would be thrown at once, as if by a convulsion of nature, upon the States of the North. They would come there to their friends of the North, who had given them freedom, to give them a habitation, food, and clothing; and, not having it to give many of them would perish from want and exposure; whilst the wretched remainder would be left to live as they could, by theft or charity. They would still be a degraded caste, free only in name, without the reality of freedom. A few might earn a wretched and precarious subsistence, by competing with the white laborers of the North, and reducing their wages to the lowest point in the sliding scale of starvation and misery; whilst the poor-house and

the jail, the asylums of the deaf and dumb, the blind, the idiot and insane, would be filled to overflowing; if, indeed, any asylum could be afforded to the millions of the negro race whom wretchedness and crime would drive to despair and madness.

That these are sad realities, is proved by the census of 1840. Annex in an appendix a table, compiled by me entirely from the official returns of the census of 1840, except as to prisons and paupers, which are obtained from city and State returns, and the results are as follows:

1st. The number of deaf and dumb, blind, idiots, and insane, of the negro race in the non-slaveholding States, is one out of every 96; in the slaveholding States, it is one out of every 67, or seven to one in favor of the slaves in this respect, as compared with the free blacks.

2d. The number of white, deaf and dumb, blind, idiots, and insane, in the non-slaveholding States, is one in every 561, being nearly six to one against the free blacks in the same States.

3d. The number of negroes who are deaf and dumb, blind, idiots, and insane, paupers, and in prison in the non-slaveholding States, is one out of every 154; or twenty-two to one against the free blacks, as compared with the slaves.

4th. Taking the two extremes of north and south, in Maine, the number of negroes returned as deaf and dumb, blind, insane, and idiots, by the census of 1840, is one out of every twelve, and in slaveholding Florida, by the same returns, is one of every eleven hundred and five; or ninety-two to one, in favor of the slaves of Florida, as compared with the free blacks of Maine.

By the report of the secretary of state of Massachusetts (of the 1st November, 1843) to the legislature, there were then in the county jails, and houses of correction in that State, 4,020 whites, and 364 negroes; and adding the previous returns of the State prison, 255 whites and 82 blacks; making in all 4,275 whites, and 396 free blacks; being one out of every one hundred and seventy of the white, and one out of every twenty-one of the free black population; and by the official returns of the census of 1840, and their own official returns to their own legislature, one out of every thirteen of the free blacks of Massachusetts was either deaf and dumb, blind, idiot, or insane, or in prison—thus proving a degree of debasement and misery, on the part of the colored race, in that truly great State, which is appalling. In the last official report to the legislature of the warden of the penitentiary of eastern Pennsylvania, he says: "The whole number of prisoners received from the opening of the institution, (October 25, 1829,) to January 1st, 1843, is 1,623; of these, 1,004 were white males, 533 colored males; 27 white females, and 58 colored females; or one out of every 647 of the white, and one out of every sixty-four of the negro population; and of the white female convicts, one out of every 16,288; and of the colored female convicts, one out of every 349 in one prison, showing a degree of guilt and debasement on the part of the colored females, revolting and unparalleled. When such is the debasement of the colored females, far exceeding even that of the white females in the most corrupt cities of Europe, extending, too, throughout one-half the limits of a great State, we may begin to form some idea of the dreadful condition of the free blacks, and how much worse it is than that of the slaves, whom we are asked to liberate and consent to a similar condition of guilt and misery. Where, too, are these examples? The first is in the great State of Massachusetts, that, for 64 years, has never had a slave, and whose free black population, being 5,463 in 1790, and but 8,669 at present, is nearly the same free negro population, and their descendants, whom for more than half a century she has strived, but strived in vain, to elevate in rank and comfort and morals. The other example is the eastern half of the great State of Pennsylvania, including Philadelphia, and the Quakers of the State, who, with an industry and humanity that never tired, and a charity that spared not time or money, have exerted every effort to improve the morals and better the condition of their free black population. But where are the great results? Let the census and the reports of the prisons answer. Worse—incomparably worse, than the condition of the slaves, and demonstrating that the free black, in the midst of his friends in the North, is sinking lower every day in the scale of want and crime and misery. The regular physicians' report and review, published in 1840, says the "facts, then, show an increasing disproportionate number of colored prisoners in the eastern penitentiary." In contrasting the condition, for the same year, of the penitentiaries of all the non-slaveholding States, as compared with all the slaveholding States in which returns are made, I find the number of free blacks is fifty-four to one, as compared with the slaves, in proportion to population, who are incarcerated in these prisons. There are no paupers among the slaves, whilst in the non-slaveholding States great is the number of colored paupers.

From the Belgian statistics, compiled by Mr. Quetelet, the distinguished secretary of the Royal Academy of Brussels, it appears that in Belgium the number of deaf and dumb was one out of every 1,539; in Italy, one out of every 1,539; and in Europe, one out of every 1,474. Of the blind, one out of every 1,009 in Belgium; one out of every 800 in Prussia; one out of every 1,666 in Saxony; and no further returns, as to the blind, are given.—[Belgian Annuaire, 1836, pages 213, 215, 217.] But the table shows an average in Europe of one out of every 1,474 of deaf and dumb, and of about one out of every 1,000 of blind; whereas our census shows, of the deaf and dumb whites of the Union, one out of every 2,193; and of the blacks in the non-slaveholding States, one out of every 656; also, of the blind, one out of every 2,821 of the whites of the Union, and one out of every 516 of the blacks in the non-slaveholding States. Thus we have not only shown the condition of the blacks of the non-slaveholding States to be far worse than that of the slaves of the South, but also far worse than the condition of the people of Europe, deplorable as that may be. It has been heretofore shown that the free blacks in the non-slaveholding States were becoming, in an augmented proportion, more debased in morals as they increased in numbers; and the proposition is true in other respects. Thus, by the census of 1830, the number of deaf and dumb of the free blacks of the non-slaveholding States, was one out of every 996; and of blind, one out of every 893; whereas we have seen, by the census of 1840, the number of free blacks, deaf

and dumb, in the non-slaveholding States, was one out of every 656; and of blind, one out of every 516. In the last ten years, then, the alarming fact is proved, that the proportionate number of free black deaf and dumb, and also of blind, has increased about fifty per cent. No statement as to the insane or idiots is given in the census of 1830.

Let us now examine the future increase of free blacks in the States adjoining the slaveholding States, if Texas is not reannexed to the Union. By the census of 1790, the number of free blacks in the States (adding New York) adjoining the slaveholding States, was 13,953. In the States (adding New York) adjacent to the slaveholding States, the number of free black, by the census of 1840, was 148,107; being an aggregate increase of nearly eleven to one in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. Now, by the census and table above given, the aggregate number of free blacks who were deaf and dumb, blind, idiot or insane, paupers, or in prison, in the non-slaveholding States, was 26,542, or one in every six of the whole number. Now if the free black population should increase in the same ratio, in the aggregate in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, from 1840 to 1890, as it did from 1790 to 1840, the aggregate free black population in these six States would be, in 1890, 1,600,000; in 1865, 800,000; in 1853, 400,000, and the aggregate number in these six States of free blacks, according to the present proportion, who would then be deaf and dumb, blind, idiot or insane, paupers or in prison would be, in 1890, 266,666; in 1865, 133,333; and in 1853, 66,666; being, as we have seen, one-sixth of the whole number. Now, if the annual cost of supporting these free blacks in these asylums, and other houses, including the interest on the sums expended in their erection, and for annual repairs, and the money disbursed for the arrest, trial, conviction, and transportation of the criminals, amounted to fifty dollars for each, the annual tax on the people of these States on account of these free blacks would be, in 1890, \$13,333,200; in 1865, \$6,666,600; and in 1853, \$3,333,300.

Does, then, humanity require that we should render the blacks more debased and miserable, by this process of abolition, with greater temptations to crime, with more of real guilt and less of actual comforts? As the free blacks are thrown more and more upon the cities of the North, and compete more there with the white laborer, the condition of the blacks becomes worse and more perilous every day, until we have already seen, the masses of Cincinnati and Philadelphia rise to expel the negro race beyond their limits. Immediate abolition, whilst it deprived the South of the means to purchase the products and manufactures of the North and West, would fill those States with an inundation of free black population, that would be absolutely intolerable. Immediate abolition, then, has but few advocates; but if emancipation were not immediate, but only gradual, whilst slavery existed to any great extent in the slaveholding States bordering upon the States of the North and West, this expulsion, by gradual abolition, of the free blacks into the States immediately north of them, would be very considerable, and rapidly augmenting every year. If this process of gradual abolition only doubled the number of free blacks, to be thrown upon the States of the North and West, then, a reference to the table before presented, proves that the number of free black in New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, would be, in 1890, 3,200,000; in 1865, 1,600,000; and in 1853, 800,000; and that the annual expenses to the people of these six States, on account of the free blacks would be, in 1890, \$6,666,600; in 1865, \$3,333,300; and in 1853, \$1,666,600.

It was in view, no doubt, of these facts, that Mr. Davis, of New York, declared, upon the floor of Congress, on the 29th December, 1843, that "the abolition of slavery in the southern States must be followed by a deluge of black population to the North, filling our jails and poor houses, and bringing destruction upon the laboring portion of our people." Dr. Duncan also, of Cincinnati, Ohio, in his speech in Congress on the 6th January, 1844, declared the result of abolition would be to inundate the North with free blacks, described by him as "paupers, beggars, thieves, assassins, and desperadoes; all, or nearly all, penniless and destitute, without skill, means, industry, or perseverance to obtain a livelihood; each possessing and cherishing revenge for supposed or real wrongs. No man's friends, person, family, or property, would be safe by day and night. It now requires the whole energies of the law and the whole vigilance of the police of all our principal cities to restrain and keep in subordination the few straggling free negroes which now infest them." If such be the case now, what will be the result when, by abolition, gradual or immediate, the number of these free negroes shall be doubled and quadrupled, and decupled, in the more northern of the slaveholding States, before slavery had receded from their limits, and nearly the whole of which free black population would be thrown on the adjacent non-slaveholding States. Much, if not all of this great evil, will be prevented by the re-annexation of Texas. Since the purchase of Louisiana and Florida, and the settlement of Alabama and Mississippi, there have been carried into this region, as the census demonstrates, from the States of Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and Kentucky, half a million of slaves, including their descendants, that otherwise would now be within the limits of those four States. Such has been the result as to have diminished, in two of these States nearest to the North, the number of their slaves far below what they were at the census of 1840, and to have reduced them at the census of 1840, to the small number of 2,605. Now, if we double the rate of diminution, as we certainly will by the reannexation of Texas, slavery will disappear from Delaware in ten years, and from Maryland in twenty, and have greatly diminished in Virginia and Kentucky. As, then by the reannexation, slavery advances in Texas, it must recede to the same extent from the more northern of the slaveholding States; and consequently, the evil to the northern States, from the expulsion into them of free blacks, by abolition, gradual or immediate, would thereby be greatly mitigated, if not entirely prevented. In the District of Columbia, by the drain to the new States and Territories of the South and Southwest, the slaves have been reduced from 6,119 in 1830, to 4,694 in 1840; and if, by the reannexation, slavery receded in a double ratio, then it would disappear altogether from the District in twelve years; and that question, which now occupies so much of the time of Congress, and threatens so seriously the harmony, if not the existence of the union, would be at rest by the reannexation