The Dred Scott Case. The lengthy report which we published yesterday of the opinion pronounced in the Dred Scott Case, has a claim to general perusal. It has been very long, since the Supreme Court has been offered a legitimate and inevitable opportunity for an explanation of the basis of the political divisions of the day and we can but foresee that this decision will create, everywhere, a profound sensation. For this reason we are presenting the very learned Chief Justice nearly at the beginning of our columns, we now propose, without reference to the facts of the case before the court, to set out its just conclusions, which are constitutional law at which the majority of the judges appear to have arrived. In performing this task we shall not follow the precise order of the argument as it proceeded from the bench, but the legal succession of the propositions which illustrate the constitutional question.

These propositions seem to be as follows:

1. That no free negro, whether he be the descendant of ancestors who were free at that time, or he be the descendant of free negroes who came into any State of the United States before the passage of the act of 1790, or his ancestors were admitted here before the year 1790, can, even though he be born within the limits of a free state, be recognized by the law as a citizen of such state, nor is he entitled to the privileges which are extended by the law to citizens of that state to those who are citizens of the United States.

2. That any of the States of this confederacy may, if they see proper, confer upon a free negro the privileges of a citizen of the State, either by the process of local custom and usage, or by direct enactment, but the free negro upon whom this right is conferred does not thereby become a citizen of the United States, nor is he entitled to the privileges which are extended by the law to citizens of that State to those who are citizens of the United States.

3. That Congress has no power under the Constitution to say that citizens of the United States shall not hold slaves as property in any territory of the United States, or to declare that said citizens may reside or enter into any territory which may be designated by Congress as a slave territory.

Such are the main questions decided by a judgment which is destined to become the point of support and attack in the political controversies of the day. The question is what shall be the attitude of the federal government toward the slave labor of the country. If it is acquiesced in, it will afford a peaceful solution to the only question which remains to be solved, viz., the question of the future of the free negro of the country. As actual inhabitants, in the exercise of their rights, it will determine whether they will present the States which are of the United States for the admission of the United States for admittance to the Union of the free or slave States.

Our hope and our firm belief is, however, that the patriotic and conservative masses of the North are determined to regard this judgment as the law of the land and government. If they have no less right than any other to defend the integrity of the Union from violence, it will be our duty to defend the integrity of the Union from violence. This is the issue of the future greatness of the country. As actual inhabitants, in the exercise of their rights, it will determine whether they will present the States which are of the United States for the admission into the Union of the free or slave States.