

THE RALEIGH STAR.

"North Carolina—Powerful in intellectual, moral and physical resources the land of our fires and home of our affections."

RALEIGH, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1850.

HON. T. L. CLINGMAN'S SPEECH On the Territorial Question, delivered in the House of Representatives, Jan. 22, 1850.

The resolutions having been read—
Mr. CLINGMAN desired to know
whether he understood that the gentle
man from Virginia [Mr. Bayly] desired to
occupy the floor?

Mr. BAYLY said he did not.

Mr. CLINGMAN then addressed the
Committee as follows:

Mr. CLINGMAN said, that the commit-
tee was well aware that he had, on yester-
day, intimated a purpose to discuss the
questions involved in the propositions relat-
ing to the Mexican territory. That subject
was regarded by the whole country as
one of such immense importance that he
offered no apology for debating it. To
prevent misconception, (said he,) I say in
advance that I have great confidence in
the judgment, integrity and patriotism of
the President. I further admit fully the
right of the citizens of each State to settle
for themselves all such domestic questions
as that referred to in the message. But
who are the people entitled to decide, as
well as the time and manner of admission
and boundary of New States, are in them-
selves questions for the judgment of Con-
gress under all the circumstances of each
case. The territory of Louisiana, our first
foreign acquisition, was retained nearly ten
years in that condition before she was al-
lowed to form a State constitution. In the
case of Texas—her people being composed
almost entirely of citizens of the United
States, and having had a State govern-
ment of their own for ten years—she was
admitted at once as a State into the Union.
In the present case there are considerations
of the greatest importance connected direct-
ly and indirectly with our action on this
subject. While adhering to them as
fully as the time limited by our rules will
admit, I ask the attention of the House.

With reference to this matter, I was
placed at a disadvantage before the country
by a publication made some time since.—
It is generally known that there was on the
Saturday evening before the time for the
assembly of the House, a preliminary
meeting or caucus of the Whig members.
The proceedings of such meetings have
usually been kept private. Contrary, how-
ever, to the former usage in this respect,
some individual present furnished to one
of the New York papers what purported to
be a report of the proceedings.

This report being in some respects au-
thentic, was copied into other papers. The
writer gave very fully the speeches of those
persons whose views coincided with his
own; but, though he made a reference to
my position, he did not think proper to
set out what I did say so as to make that
position at all understood. It will be re-
membered by those present on that occa-
sion, that at the very outset of my remarks,
I stated that I had that morning had a full
and free conference with the gentleman
from Georgia, [Mr. Toombs,] who had moved
the resolution; that there was, in rela-
tion to the whole subject embraced in it,
as well as with reference to the mode of ac-
tion proper to be adopted by the South,
an entire agreement between that gentle-
man and myself. In fact, that there was
not as far as I knew, any difference of op-
inion between us, except as to the expedi-
ency of making the issue at that time, and
that I thought it preferable to await legis-
lative action and stand on the defensive pur-
sely. This, among other reasons then given,
induced me to request the withdrawal of the
resolution. It is proper that I should say that
in my interview that morning with the gentle-
man from Georgia, and with his colleague,
[Mr. Stephens,] I gave my reasons at length,
founded chiefly on my recent observation of
the state of public sentiment in the North,
believing that a collision was inevitable,
and that the sooner it came on the better
for all parties; but that to enable us to make
our demonstration in the most imposing
and successful mode, it would be better to
await the organization of the House. I
expressed the fear that if we moved with-
out the concurrence at the outset of a ma-
jority of the Southern members, we might
place ourselves at a disadvantage before
the public, and prevent our uniting
the whole South in such a course of action
as it might be found expedient to adopt.

Looking over the whole ground, how-
ever, I am not at all dissatisfied with the
course which things took. There has been
no such division at the South as would be
at all likely to impair efficient action here-
after. From the tone of the Southern press
as well as from other indications, it is ob-
vious that the South will, at an early day,
be sufficiently united to insure the suc-
cess of whatever measures it may be ne-
cessary to adopt to protect ourselves from
the aggression menaced by the North.—
As to the election of a Speaker, in the
present condition of the House and the
country, I have never considered it of
the slightest moment to either political party,
or to either section of the Union. A
Speaker without a majority of the House
would be of no advantage to the adminis-
tration, nor could any mere arrangement
of committees materially affect now the
action on the slave question.

Those, Mr. Chairman, who have ob-
served my course heretofore, know well
that I have not sought to produce agita-

tion on this subject. Six years ago, when
I first took a seat on this floor, believing
that the famous twenty first rule had been
gotten up merely as a fancy matter, which
was productive only of ill feeling and irri-
tation between different sections, I both
voted and spoke against it, and was then
regarded as responsible to a great extent
for its defeat. I then stated, during the
discussion, that it without cause we kept
up a state of hostility between the North
and the South, until a practical question ar-
ose like that presented when Missouri
was admitted, (for then I saw the Texas
annexation in the future,) "the greatest pos-
sible mischief might ensue." I went on al-
so, in the course of my argument, to say
that slavery could not be abolished in this
District without a dissolution of the Union.
Two years since, when it had become cer-
tain that we were at the close of the then
existing war to obtain territory, I endeavored
to place the question on ground
where the North might meet us conced-
ing, for the sake of argument, that the Gov-
ernment had complete jurisdiction over
the territory. I endeavored to show, that
while it might be justified in dividing the
territory, it could not exclude us from the
whole without a palpable violation of the
Constitution. I am sorry to say, however,
that my effort, though well meant, did not
produce the slightest effect upon the action
of any one gentleman of my own party from
the North. On this side of the House they
regularly voted that the North should have
the whole of the territory; and went against
any compromise. I regret to be compelled
to say, that instead of showing themselves
in any respect conservative, as I used to
consider them, the northern Whig mem-
bers proved themselves, on this, the great
question, eminently destructive.

To those gentlemen from the North who
aided us in an attempt to settle the ques-
tion in some manner not disgraceful or de-
structive to us, I tender my thanks. In
standing by the rights of the South they
have shown themselves friends of the Con-
stitution and of the Union.

Sir, the force and extent of the present
anti-slavery movement of the North is not
understood by the South. Until within
the last few months I had supposed that even
if California and New Mexico should come
in as free States, the agitation would sub-
side so as to produce no further action. A
few months' travel in the interior of the
North has changed my opinion. Such is
now the condition of public sentiment there,
that the making of the Mexican territory
all free, in any mode, would be regarded as
an anti-slavery triumph, and would accel-
erate the general movement against us. It
is not difficult to perceive how that state of
public sentiment has been produced there.
The old abolition societies have done a good
deal to poison the popular mind. By cir-
culating an immense number of inflama-
tory pamphlets, filled with all manner of
falsehood and calumny against the South,
its institutions, and its men, because there
was no contradiction in that quarter, they
had created a high degree of prejudice
against us. As soon as it became probable
that there would be an acquisition of terri-
tory, the question at once became a great
practical one, and the politicians immedi-
ately took the matter in hand. With a view
to once strengthening their position, they
seized upon all this matter which the aboli-
tion societies (whose aid both parties courted
in the struggle) had furnished from time
to time, and diffused and strengthened it as
much as possible, and thereby created an immense
amount of hostility to southern institutions.
Every thing there contributes to this move-
ment; candidates are brought out by the
caucus system, and if they fail to take that
sectional ground which is deemed strong-
est there, they are at once discarded. The
mode of nominating candidates as well as
of conducting the canvass, is destructive of
anything like independence in the repre-
sentative. They do not, as gentlemen of
ten do in the South and West, take ground
against the popular clamor, and sustain
themselves by direct appeals to the intelli-
gence and reason of their constituents. Al-
most the whole of the northern press co-
operated in the movement. With the ex-
ception of the New York Herald, (which,
with its large circulation, published matter
on both sides,) and a few other liberal pa-
pers, everything favorable to the South has
been carefully excluded from the northern
papers. By these combined efforts a de-
gree of feeling and prejudice has been
gotten up against the South, which is most
intense in all the interior.

I was surprised last winter to hear a
northern Senator say, that in the town in
which he lived it would excite great aston-
ishment if it were known that a northern
lady would, at the time of the meeting of
the two Houses, walk up to the Capitol
with a Southern Senator; that they had been
taught to consider southerners generally as
being so coarse and ruffianly in manner that
a lady would not trust herself in such a
presence. This anecdote, sir, does not
present too strong a picture of the condition
of sentiment in portions of the interior of
the northern country. How far gentlemen
on this floor are to be influenced in their ac-
tion by such a state of opinion, I leave them
to decide.

The great principle upon which the
northern movement rests, which is already
adopted by northern politicians, and to

which they all seem likely to be driven by
the force of the popular current there, is
the question is unsettled till the next Con-
gressional election, is this: That the Gov-
ernment of the United States must do noth-
ing to sanction slavery; that it must there-
fore exclude it from the Territories; that it
must abolish it in the District of Columbia,
forts, and arsenals, and wherever it has ju-
risdiction. Some, too, carrying the princi-
ple to its extent, insist that the coasting
slave trade, and that between the States,
should also be abolished, and that slave
labor should not be tolerated in a public
Office in the United States, such as custom-
houses, post offices, and the like. As
these things all obviously rest on the same
general dogma, it is clear that the yielding
of one or more points would not check, but
would merely accelerate, the general move-
ment to the end of the series. Before
this end was reached they probably ap-
pend, as a corollary, the principle that the
President should not appoint a slaveholder
to office. It is, sir, my deliberate judgment
that in the present temper of the public
mind at the North, if the territorial ques-
tion remains open till the next election, few
if any gentlemen will get here from the
free States that are not pledged to the full
extent of the abolition platform. It is, there-
fore, obviously, the interest of all of us to
settle this question at the present session.

That the general principle above stated
is at war with the whole spirit of the Con-
stitution of the United States, which sanc-
tions slavery in several of its provisions,
I need not argue here. Taking, however,
a practical view of the matter in controver-
sy, look for a moment at the territorial
question, the great issue in the struggle: I
will do northern gentlemen on this floor
the justice to admit that they have argued
themselves into the belief that they are right
in claiming the whole of the territory for free
soil. Let me state, for a moment, the converse
or opposite of their proposition. Suppose
it were to be claimed that no one should
be allowed to go into this public territory,
unless he carried one or more slaves with
him, it might then be said, just as gentle-
men now tell us, that it would be perfectly
fair, because it placed every man who
might be inclined to go there on an equal
footing, and might by means of having thus
a homogeneous population, advance the
general interest. Northern men would at
once, I suppose, object to this arrangement.
Then we should say to them, if you do
not like this restriction, let it be settled,
then, that every citizen of the United States
may go into the common territory and
carry slaves or not, just as he pleases.—
This would seem to be a perfectly equita-
ble and fair arrangement. Northern men,
however, object to this, and say that they
are not willing to live in a territory where
others own slaves. Then we of the
South say to them, that we will consent
to divide the territory, and limit our posses-
sion with slaves to a part of it, and allow them
to go to will over the whole. Even to
this they object, and insist that they will
not allow us to occupy one foot of the terri-
tory. Remember, sir, that this very
territory was acquired by conquest, and
that while the South, according to its popu-
lation, would have been required to fur-
nish only one-third of the troops, it in point
of fact did furnish two-thirds of the men that
made the conquest, and the North deficient
in what was comparatively in the struggle,
now says that its conscience, or its cupidity,
will not permit us to have the smallest
portion of that territory. Why, sir, this
is the most impudent proposition that was
ever maintained by any respectable body of
men.

Sir, I give the North full credit for its
feelings in favor of liberty. I can well suppose
that northern gentlemen would resist, in
the most emphatic manner, the attempt
to make any man who is now free a slave;
but regard them as too intelligent to believe
that humanity, either to the slave or to the
master, requires that they should be pent up
in a territory which, after a time, will be
insufficient for their subsistence, and where
they must perish from want, or from the col-
lisions that would occur between the races.
Nor can I suppose that they think it would
be injurious to New Mexico and California
for our people to go and settle among them.
Prominent northern statesmen, both in this
House and in the Senate, have described
the population of those Territories, and have
represented it as being but only inferior to
those Indian tribes that we know most of, viz:
the Cherokees and Choctaws, but as being
far below the Flat Heads, Black Feet and
Snake Indians. I cannot, therefore, suppose
that they really believe that those terri-
tories would be injured by having in-
fused into them such a state of society as
produces such persons as George Wash-
ington, John Marshall, and thousands of
other of our great and virtuous men, living
and dead. Your opposition to our right
will be regarded as resting on the lust for
political power of your politicians, or on
the rapacity of your people.

The idea that the conquered people
should be permitted to give law to the con-
querors, is so preposterously absurd, that I
do not intend to argue it. Doubtless these
people would be willing, not only to ex-
clude slaveholders, but all other Americans,
if, by a simple vote, they were allowed to
do so. I may remark further, that but for
the anti-slavery agitation, our southern

slaveholders would have carried their ne-
groes into the mines of California in such
numbers, that I have no doubt but that the
majority there would have made it a slave-
holding State. We have been deprived of
all chance of this by the northern move-
ments, and by the action of this House,
which has, by northern votes, repeatedly,
from time to time, passed the Wilmot pro-
viso, so as in effect to exclude our institu-
tions without the actual passage of a law
for that purpose. It is a mere farce, there-
fore, without giving our people time to go
into the country, if they do so, to allow
the individuals there, by a vote, to exclude
a whole class of our citizens. This would
imply that the territory belonged to the peo-
ple there exclusively, and not to all the peo-
ple of the United States.

Compared with this great question, the
abolition of slavery in the District of Colum-
bia is of little relative moment. One
effect, however, of the anti-slavery agitation
here is worthy of a passing notice. With-
in the last two years, since the matter has
become serious, it has seemed not improb-
able that the seat of Government might be
removed from the District. As this would
be extremely prejudicial to the interests
of the citizens here, many of them have
so far changed in their feelings, as to be
willing to allow slavery to be abolished,
yielding to the force of the pressure from
the North; besides, so many of their slaves
are from time to time taken away by the
abolitionists, as to satisfy them that such
property here is almost worthless. A
great impression was made on them by
the coming in last year of a northern ship,
and its carrying away seventy slaves at once.
Seeing that there was no chance for Con-
gress to pass any adequate law for their
protection, as most of the States have done,
they seem to be forced to consent to some
extent to the northern movement. Sir, it
is most surprising that the people of the
southern States should have borne, with
so little complaint, the loss of their slaves
incurred by the action of the free States.
The Constitution of the United States
provided for the delivery of all such fugi-
tives, and Congress passed an act to carry
it into effect; but recently, most, if not
all of the northern States, have completely
defeated their provisions, by forbidding any
one of their citizens to aid in the execu-
tion of the law, under the penalty of fine
and imprisonment for as long a term usually
as five years. There is probably no one
legal mind in any one of the free States
which can regard these laws as constitu-
tional. For though the States are not
bound to legislate affirmatively in support
of the constitution of the United States, yet
it is clear that they have no right to pass
laws to obstruct the execution of constitu-
tional provisions. Private citizens are
not usually bound to be active in execution
of the law; but if two or more combine to
prevent the execution of any law, they are
subject to indictment for conspiracy in all
countries where the common law doctrines
prevail. If the several States could right-
fully legislate to defeat the action of Con-
gress, they might thereby completely nullify
most of its laws. In this particular instance
such has been the result; for though the
master is allowed to go and get his negro,
if he can, yet, in point of fact, it is well
known that the free negroes, abolitionists,
and other disorderly persons acting under
the countenance and authority of the State
laws, are able usually to overpower the
master and prevent his recapture.

The extent of the loss to the South may
be understood from the fact, that the num-
ber of runaway slaves now in the North
is stated as being thirty thousand—worth at
present prices, little short of fifteen millions
of dollars. Suppose that amount of prop-
erty was taken away from the North by the
Southern States acting against the Con-
stitution what complaint would there not be!—
what memorials, remonstrances, and legis-
lative resolutions would come down upon
us! How would this Hall be filled with
lobby members, coming here to press their
claims upon Congress! Why, sir, many
of the border counties in the slaveholding
States have been obliged to give up their
slaves almost entirely. It was stated in
newspapers the other day, that a few coun-
ties named in Maryland, had, by the efforts
of the abolitionists within six months, upon
computation, lost one hundred thousand
dollars worth of slaves. A gentleman from
the highest standing, from Delaware, assured
me the other day that that little State lost,
each year, at least that value of such prop-
erty in the same way. A hundred thousand
dollars is a heavy tax to be levied on a
single congressional district by the aboli-
tionists.

Suppose a proportional burden was in-
flicted on the northern States. How would
Massachusetts bear the loss annually of
one million one hundred thousand dollars,
not only inflicted without law, but against
an express provision of the Constitution!—
We may infer from the complaint she had
made of a slight inconvenience imposed
on her by that regulation of South Caroli-
na which prevented ship-captains from
carrying free negro servants to Charles-
ton.

This whole action on the part of the
North is not only in violation of the Con-
stitution, but seems to be purely wanton,
or originating in malice towards the South.

It is obvious that they do not want our
slaves among them; because they not only
make no adequate provision for their com-
fort, but, in fact, in many of the States,
have forbidden free negroes to come among
them on pain of imprisonment, &c. I
cannot be a desire to liberate slaves, be-
cause they have never, to my knowledge,
attempted to steal negroes from Cuba or
Brazil. It is true, however, that having
the right now to come among us both by
land and water, they have greater advan-
tages and immunities. For if they went
into a foreign country, they would incur
the risk of being shot or hanged, as robbers
and pirates usually are.

Sir, if any evils have grown out of the ex-
istence of slavery, they have not at least af-
fected the North. During the days of the
slave trade, which (as I formerly had oc-
casion to remark) was continued down to
1808 by New England votes in the con-
vention, the northern ship-owners realized
large profits by purchasing negroes on the
coast of Africa at thirty or forty dollars
per head, and selling them to southern
planters for several hundred dollars. The
bringing in of these slaves caused large
tracts of the southern country, too unhealthy
to have been cleared by white men, to be
brought under profitable cultivation. The
price of cotton has thereby been brought
down from fifty to ten and even five cents
per pound.—An immense amount of cap-
ital and labor is employed profitably in its
manufacture at the North. In England,
also, not less than six hundred millions of
dollars is thus invested, and a vast popu-
lation exists by being employed in the
manufacture. It is ascertained that at least
five millions of white persons, in Europe
and this country, get their employment, are
fed, and exist, on the manufacture of cotton
alone. The cheap southern production of
the raw material not only is the means
of thus giving subsistence to a great por-
tion of the population of this country and
Europe, but is clothing the world at a cheap
rate. In addition to cotton, rice, sugar, cof-
fee, tobacco, and various tropical produc-
tions are supplied at a cheap rate for north-
ern consumption. On the other hand, our
slaves seldom come in competition with
northern labor, and are good consumers of
its productions.—While the North has de-
rived these great advantages, the negroes
themselves have not been sufferers. Their
condition not only compares most advan-
tageously with that of the laboring popu-
lation of the world, but is in advance of
the position they have been able at any time
to occupy at home. The researches of Gliddon
and other antiquarians, show that four thou-
sand years ago in Africa they were slaves,
and as black as they now are. Since then,
in that country where they were placed by
Providence, and were from their peculiar
constitution, they enjoy the best health,
they have exhibited only as savages. They
are there continually made slaves of by
the men of more intelligent and enterpris-
ing races. Nor have they ever gotten out
of the tropical parts of Africa, except when
they were carried as merchandise. It re-
mains to be proved, however, yet to the
world, that the negro any more than a horse,
can permanently exist, in a state of freedom,
out of the tropical regions. Their decay
at the North, as well as other circumstan-
ces which I have not time to detail, are ad-
verse to the proposition. And yet, sir, the
journalists of the North, while they deny
that the French and the Germans, the most
enlightened of the continental nations of
Europe, are capable of freedom, stoutly
maintain that the negro is,—the negro who
has never any where when left to himself,
gotten up to the respectable state of barba-
rism which all the other races have attained
not even excepting our Indians in Mexico
and Peru.

While the people of the Northern States
and the negroes have been benefited, I am
not prepared to admit that the South (if
injured at all) has suffered as generally sup-
posed. The influx of foreign emigrants, and
some other circumstances to which I will
presently advert, have in some respects put
the North greatly ahead. But if you deduct
the foreign population which goes chiefly
to the North—the little we get not being
equal to that portion of our own people
who go to the northwestern States—if you
deduct this, I say, it will be found that the
white population of all the slaveholding
States has increased faster than that of the
free States. Owing to the comfortable con-
dition of our population, if there had been
no emigration from abroad, the descendants of
our portion of the American white family
would be more numerous than the northern.
Nor is it true, that we are the poorer;
on the contrary, if we are to take the valuations
of property in the different States as as-
sessed by the public officers, it appears that
the slaveholding States are much richer
in proportion to their population than the
free. Even if you exclude the negroes
as property, and count them in the popu-
lation, it appears that the citizens of Vir-
ginia—the oldest of the slave States—are
richer per head than the citizens of any one
of the free States. It will also appear that
the slaveholding States have vastly less
pauperism and crime than the northern
States. Looking, therefore, at all these
different elements, viz: greater increase of
population, more wealth and less poverty
and crime, we have reason to regard our

people as prosperous and happy.
Sir, I have not, for want of time, gone
into details on these points, but contented
myself with the statement of those general
views which every candid inquirer will, I
am satisfied, find to be true. I do not seek
to make comparisons that might be regard-
ed as vitious, unless by way of defence
against habitual attacks on us; but regard
it as right to say on this occasion, that
whether considered with reference to the
physical comfort of the people or a high
state of public and private morals, elevated
sense of honor, and of all generous emo-
tions, I have no reason to believe that a
higher state of civilization either now ex-
ists elsewhere, or has existed at any time
in the past, than is presented by the southern
States of the Union.

When we look to foreign countries, these
views are confirmed and sustained. Brazil,
with a population of two slaves to one
freeman, is the most prosperous of the
South American States, and the only one
which has a stable political system. Cuba
is greatly in advance of the other West
India islands, though St Domingo and Ja-
maica once equaled her before the eman-
cipation of their slaves. Besides the ex-
pense of maintaining her Government at
home, Cuba pays Spain a revenue of nearly
fourteen millions. This is a greater
sum for her population than two hundred mil-
lions would be for the United States.—
Could our people, in addition to the ex-
pense of our State governments, pay six
times as much as the Federal Government
has ever yet raised by impost and taxes?—
That Cuba should be able to bear this bur-
den and still prosper, is evidence of the high
productiveness of the system.

In spite, however, of these great facts,
which ought to strike all impartial minds,
the course of the North has been constantly
aggressive on this question. The ordi-
nance of 1787, adopted contemporaneously
with the Constitution, made the territory
north of the Ohio free, and left that South
of the river slaveholding, giving the North
more than half of all the existing territory.
When Louisiana was acquired, slavery
could legally exist in every part of it. The
State of Missouri having formed a republi-
can constitution, proposed to come into
the Union, but the North resisted her applica-
tion. Through her constitution recognizing
slavery was precisely like those of a
majority of the old States, yet they, against
all constitutional principle, because they
had the power in one branch of Congress,
obstinately refused her admission, until it
was provided by act of Congress that no
other slave State should exist north of 36°
30'. By that means, after leaving the South
only territory for a single State (Arkansas),
they acquired enough in extent to make
ten or fifteen large States. Now, encour-
aged by their former success, and having
become relatively stronger, they claim the
whole of the territory!

Should we give way, what is to be the
result? California, Oregon, New Mexico,
Deseret and Minnesota, will come into
the Union in less than five years, giving the
North a clear majority of ten or fifteen votes
in the Senate. The census of the coming
year will, under the new apportionment,
give them nearly two to one in this House.
With immense controlling majorities in both
branches, will they not at once by act of
Congress abolish slavery in the States? Mr
Adams, who in his day, controlled northern
opinion on this question, said that there were
twenty provisions of the Constitution which
under certain circumstances, would give Con-
gress the power. Would not this majority find
the power, as easily as they have done in
their State Legislatures, where they have
complete away, to nullify the provision of
the Constitution for the protection of fugitive
slaves? Have not prominent northern poli-
ticians of the highest positions and the
greatest influence, whose names are well
known to all gentlemen on this floor already
declared that there is nothing in the Con-
stitution of the United States which obstructs
or ought to obstruct the abolition of slavery,
by Congress, in the States? Supposing, how-
ever, this should not occur in twenty years
or less, without new acquisitions of terri-
tory they would get the power, by the con-
ing in of new free States, to amend the
Constitution for that purpose. But I have
no doubt, sir, that other acquisitions of
territory will be made. Probably, after the
next Presidential election we shall get that
part of Mexico which lies along the Gulf,
as far as Vera Cruz; and from which, though
well suited to the profitable employment of
slave labor, we should be excluded, never-
theless, by the adoption of the principle
that slavery should not be extended in area.
Conceding, however, that I am wrong in
both these suppositions, and that Congress
would neither violate the Constitution nor
annul it thus: what are we to expect? Sla-
very is to be kept, they say, where it now
is; and we are to be surrounded with free
States. These States not only prohibit the
introduction of slaves but also of free ne-
groes into their borders. Of course the
whole negro population is to be hereafter
confined to the territory of the present
slave States. That population in twenty-
five years will amount to seven or
eight millions and in fifty years to fifteen
millions. However dense the population
might become the negroes will not be gotten
away, but the wealthier portion of the