

# THE FREE SOIL BANNER.

EDITED AND PUBLISHED BY W. B. GREER

& L. WALLACE.]

"HE IS THE FREEMAN, WHOM TRUTH MAKES

FREE; AND ALL ARE SLAVES BESIDE."

VOL. I.

PUBLICATION OFFICE OF THE  
BANNER IS ON  
PENNSYLVANIA STREET,  
Three doors north of Washington Street.

Cass's Nicholson Letter.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 24, 1847.

DEAR SIR: I have received your letter, and shall answer it as frankly as it was written.

You ask me whether I am in favor of the acquisition of Mexican Territory, and what are my sentiments with regard to the Wilmot Proviso.

I have so often and so explicitly stated my views of the first question, in the Senate, that it seems almost unnecessary to repeat them here. As you request it, however, I shall briefly give them.

I think, then, that no peace should be granted to Mexico, until a reasonable indemnity is obtained for the injuries which she has done us. The territorial extent of this indemnity is, in the first instance, a subject of Executive consideration. There the constitution has placed it, and there I am willing to leave it; not only because I have full confidence in its judicious exercise, but because, in the ever-varying circumstances of a war, it would be indecent, by a public declaration, to commit the country to any line of indemnity which might otherwise be enlarged, as the obstinate injustice of the enemy prolongs the contest, with its loss of blood and treasure.

It appears to me that the kind of metaphysical magnanimity, which would reject all indemnity at the close of a bloody and expensive war, brought on by a direct attack upon our troops by the enemy, and preceded by a succession of unjust acts for a series of years, is as unworthy of the age in which we live, as it is revolting to the common sense and practice of mankind.

It would conduce but little to our future security, or indeed to our present reputation, to declare that we repudiate all expectation of compensation from the Mexican Government, and are fighting, not for any practical result, but for some vague, perhaps philanthropic object, which escapes my penetration, and must be defined by those who assume this new principle of national inter-communication.

All wars are to be deprecated, as well by the statesman as by the philanthropist. They are great evils; but there are greater evils than these, and submission to injustice is among them.

The nation, which should refuse to defend its rights and its honor, when assailed, would soon have neither to defend, and when driven to war, it is not by professions of disinterestedness and declarations of magnanimity, that its rational objects can be best obtained, or other nations taught a lesson of forbearance—the strongest security for permanent peace.

We are at war with Mexico, its vigorous prosecution is the surest means of its speedy termination, and ample indemnity the surest guaranty against the recurrence of such injustice as provoked it.

The Wilmot Proviso has been before the country some time. It has been repeatedly discussed in Congress, and by the public press. I am strongly impressed with the opinion that a great change has been going on in the public mind upon this subject—in my own as well as others: and that doubts are resolving themselves into convictions that the principle it involves should be kept out of the National Legislature and left to the people of the Confederacy in their respective local governments.

The whole subject is a comprehensive one, and fruitful of important consequences. It would be ill-timed to discuss it here. I shall not assume that responsible task, but shall confine myself to such general views as are necessary to the fair exhibition of my opinions.

We may well regret the existence of Slavery in the Southern States, and wish they had been saved from its introduction. But there it is, and not by the act of the present generation; and we must deal with it as a great practical question, involving the most momentous consequences. We have neither the right nor the power to touch it where it exists; and if we had both, their exercise, by any means heretofore suggested, might lead to results which no wise man would willingly encounter, and which no good man could contemplate without anxiety.

The theory of our Government presupposes that its various members have reserved to themselves the regulation of all subjects relating to what may be termed their internal policy. They are sovereign within their own boundaries, except in those cases where they have surrendered to the General Government a portion of their rights, in order to give effect to the object of the Union, whether these concern For-

ign nations or the several States themselves. Local institutions, if I may so speak, whether they have reference to Slavery or to any other relations, domestic or public, are left to local authority, either original or derivative. Congress has no right to say that there shall be Slavery in New York, or that there shall be no Slavery in Georgia; nor is there any other human power but the people of those States respectively, which can change the relations existing therein; and they can say, if they will, We will have Slavery in the former, and we will abolish it in the latter.

In various respects the Territories differ from the States. Some of their rights are inchoate, and they do not possess the peculiar attributes of sovereignty. Their relation to the General Government is very imperfectly defined by the Constitution; and it will be found, upon examination, that in that instrument the only grant of power concerning them is conveyed in the phrase "Congress shall have the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations, respecting territory and other property belonging to the United States." Certainly this phraseology is very loose, if it were designed to include in the grant the whole power of legislation over persons as well as things. The expression, "the territory and other property," fairly construed relates to the public lands, as such, to arsenals, dockyards, forts, ships, and all the various kinds of property which the United States may and must possess.

But surely the simple authority to dispose of and regulate these, does not extend to the unlimited power of legislation; to the passage of all laws, in the most general acceptance of the word, which, by the way, is carefully excluded from the sentence.

And, indeed, if it were so, it would render unnecessary another provision of the Constitution, which grants to Congress the power to legislate, with the consent of the States, respectively, over all places purchased for the "erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards," etc. This being the "property" of the United States, if the power to make "needful rules and regulations concerning" them includes the general power of legislation, then the grant of authority to regulate the "territory and other property of the United States," is unlimited, wherever subjects are found for its operation, and its exercise need no auxiliary provision. If, on the other hand, it does not include such power of legislation over the "other property" of the United States, then it does not include it over their "territory;" for the same terms which grant the one, grant the other. Territory is here classed with property, and treated as such; and the object was evidently to enable the General Government, as a property-holder,—which, from necessity, it must be,—to manage, preserve and "dispose of" such property as it might possess, and which authority is essential almost to its being. But the lives and persons of our citizens, with the vast variety of objects connected with them, cannot be controlled by an authority which is merely called into existence for the purpose of making rules and regulations for the disposition and management of property.

Such, it appears to me, would be the construction put upon this provision of the Constitution, were this question now first presented for consideration and not controlled by imperious circumstances. The original Ordinance of the Congress of the Confederation, passed in 1787, and which was the only act upon this subject in force at the adoption of the Constitution, provided a complete frame of Government for the country North of the Ohio, while in a Territorial condition, and for its eventual admission in separate States into the Union. And the persuasion, that this Ordinance contained within itself all the necessary means of execution, probably prevented any direct reference to the subject in the Constitution, further than vesting in Congress the right to admit the States formed under it into the Union. However, circumstances arose, which required legislation, as well over the territory North of the Ohio, as over other territory, both within and without the original Union, ceded to the General Government, and, at various times, a more enlarged power has been exercised over the Territories,—meaning thereby the different Territorial Governments, than is conferred by the limited grant referred to. How far an existing necessity may have operated in producing this legislation, and thus extending, by rather a violent implication, powers not directly given, I know not. But certain it is, that the principle of interference should not be carried beyond the necessary implication which produces it. It should be limited to the creation of proper governments for new countries, acquired or settled, and

to the necessary provision for their eventual admission into the Union; leaving, in the meantime, the people inhabiting them, to regulate their internal concerns in their own way. They are just as capable of doing so, as the people of the States; and they can do so, at any rate, as soon as their political independence is recognized by admission into the Union. During this temporary condition, it is hardly expedient to call into exercise a doubtful and invidious authority, which questions the intelligence of a respectable portion of our citizens, and whose limitation, whatever it may be, will be rapidly approaching its termination,—an authority which would give to Congress despotic power, uncontrolled by the Constitution, over most important sections of our common country.—For, if the relation of master and servant may be regulated or annihilated by its legislation, so may the relation of husband and wife, of parent and child, and of any other condition which our institutions and the habits of our society recognize. What would be thought if Congress should undertake to prescribe the terms of marriage in New York, or to regulate the authority of parents over their children in Pennsylvania! And yet it would be as vain to seek one justifying the interference of the National Legislature in the cases referred to in the original States of the Union. I speak here of the inherent power of Congress, and do not touch the question of such contrivances as may be formed with new States when admitted into the Confederacy.

Of all the questions that can agitate us, those which are merely sectional in their character are the most dangerous and the most to be deprecated. The warning voice of him who, from his character, and services and virtue, had the best right to warn us, proclaimed to his countrymen in his Farewell Address,—that monument of wisdom for him, as I hope it will be of safety for them,—how much we had to apprehend from measures peculiarly affecting geographical portions of our country. The grave circumstances in which we are now placed, make these words of safety; for I am satisfied, from all I have seen and heard here, that a successful attempt to engrave the principles of the Wilmot Proviso upon the legislation of this Government, and apply them to new territory, should new territory be acquired, would seriously affect our tranquility. I do not suffer myself to foresee or to foretell the consequences that would ensue; for I trust and believe there is good sense and good feeling enough in the country to avoid them, by avoiding all occasions which might lead to them.

Briefly, then, I am opposed to the exercise of any jurisdiction by Congress over this matter; and I am in favor of leaving to the People of any Territory which may be hereafter acquired, the right to regulate it for themselves, under the general principles of the Constitution. Because:

I do not see in the Constitution any grant of the requisite power to Congress; and I am not disposed to extend a doubtful precedent beyond its necessity,—the establishment of Territorial Governments when needed,—leaving to the inhabitants all the right compatible with the relations they bear to the Confederacy.

2. Because I believe this measure, if adopted, would weaken, if not impair, the union of the States; and would sow the seeds of future discord, which would grow up and ripen into an abundant harvest of calamity.

3. Because I believe a general conviction that such a proposition would succeed, would lead to an immediate withholding of the supplies, and thus to a dishonorable termination of the war. I think no dispassionate observer at the seat of government can doubt this result.

4. If, however, in this I am under a misapprehension, I am under none in the practical operation of this restriction, if adopted by Congress, upon a treaty of peace making any acquisition of Mexican territory. Such a treaty would be rejected just as certainly, as presented to the Senate. More than one-third of that body would vote against it, viewing such principle as an exclusion of the citizens of the slaveholding States from a participation in the benefits acquired by the treasure and exertions of all, and which should be common to all. I am repeating,—neither advancing nor defending these views. That branch of the subject does not lie in my way, and I shall not turn aside to seek it.

In this aspect of the matter, the people of the United States must choose between this restriction and the extension of the territorial limits. They cannot have both, and which they will surrender must depend upon the representatives first, and then if these fail them, upon themselves.

5. But after all it seems to be generally conceded, that this restriction, if carried into effect, could not operate upon any State to be formed from newly acquired territory. The well known attributes of sovereignty, recognized by us as belonging to State Governments, would sweep before them any

such barrier, and would leave the people to express and exert their will at pleasure. Is the object, then, of temporary exclusion for so short a period as the duration of the territorial governments, worth the price at which it would be purchased?—worth the discord it would engender, the trial to which it would expose our Union, and the evils that would be the certain consequence, let that trial result as it might? As to the course, which has been intimated rather than proposed, of engraving such a restriction upon any treaty of acquisition, I persuade myself it would find but little favor in any portion of this country. Such an arrangement would render Mexico a party, having a right to interfere in our internal institutions in questions left by the Constitution to the State Governments, and would inflict a serious blow upon our fundamental principles. Few indeed, I trust there are among us, who would thus grant to a foreign power the right to inquire into the constitution and conduct of the sovereign States of the Union; and if there are any I am not among them, and never shall be. To the people of this country, under God, now and hereafter, are its destinies committed, and we want no foreign power to interrogate us, treaty in hand, and to say,—why have you done this, or why have you left this undone? Our own dignity and the principles of national independence, unite to repel such a proposition.

But there is another important consideration, which ought not to be lost sight of in the investigation of this subject. The question that presents itself, is not a question of the increase but of the diffusion of Slavery. Whether its sphere be stationary or progressive, its amount will be the same. The rejection of this restriction will not add one to the class of servitude, nor will its adoption give freedom to a single being who is now placed therein. The same numbers will be spread over greater territory; and so far as compression, with less abundance of the necessities of life, is an evil, so far will that evil be mitigated by transporting Slaves to a new country and giving them a larger space to occupy.

I say this in the event of the extension of slavery over any new acquisition. But can it go there? This may well be doubted. All the descriptions which reach us of the condition of the California and New Mexico, to the acquisition of which our efforts seem at present directed, unite in representing those countries as agricultural regions, similar in their products to our middle States, and generally unfit for the production of the great staples, which can alone render slave-labor valuable. If we are not grossly deceived,—and it is difficult to conceive how we can be,—the inhabitants of those regions, whether they depend upon their ploughs or their herds cannot be slaveholders—Involuntary labor, requiring the investment of large capital, can only be profitable when employed in the production of a few favored articles, confined by nature to special districts, and paying larger returns than the usual agricultural products spread over more considerable portions of the earth.

In the able letter of Mr. Buchanan upon this subject, not long since given the public, he presents similar considerations with great force. "Neither," says the distinguished writer, "the soil, the climate, nor the productions of California, South of thirty-six degrees thirty minutes, nor indeed any portion of it North or South, is adapted to slave-labor; and besides, every facility would be there afforded for the slave to escape from his master. Such property would be entirely insecure in any part of California. It is morally impossible, therefore, that a majority of the emigrants to that portion of the territory South of thirty-six degrees thirty minutes, which will be chiefly composed of our citizens, will ever re-establish slavery within its limits.

In regard to New Mexico, east of the Rio Grande, the question has already been settled by the admission of Texas into the Union.

"Should we acquire territory beyond the Rio Grande and east of the Rocky Mountains, it is still more impossible that a majority of the people would consent to re-establish slavery. They are themselves a colored population, and among them, the negro does not belong to a degraded race."

With this last remark Mr. Walker fully coincides in his letter written in 1844 upon the annexation of Texas, and which everywhere produced so favorable an impression upon the public mind, as to have conducted very materially to the accomplishment of that great measure. "Beyond the Del Norte," says Mr. Walker, "slavery will not pass; not only because forbidden by law, but because the colored race there preponderates in the ratio of ten to one over the whites; and holding as they do, the government and most of the offices in their possession, they will not permit the enslavement of any portion of the colored race, which makes and executes the laws of the country."

The question, it will therefore be seen on examination, does not regard the exclusion of slavery from a region where

it now exists, but a prohibition against introduction where it does not exist, and where, from the feelings of the inhabitants and the laws of nature, "it is morally impossible," as Mr. Buchanan says, that it can never be re-established itself.

It augurs well for the permanency of our Confederation, that, during more than half a century, which has elapsed since the establishment of this government, many serious questions, and some of the highest importance, have agitated the public mind, and more than once, threatened the gravest consequences, but they have all in succession passed away, leaving our institutions unscathed, and our country advancing in numbers, power, and wealth, and in all the other elements of national prosperity, with rapidity unknown in ancient or modern days. In times of political excitement when difficult and delicate questions present themselves for solution, there is one ark of safety for us—and that is, an honest appeal to the fundamental principles of our Union, and a stern determination to abide their dictates. This course of proceeding has carried us in safety through many a trouble, and will carry us safely through many more, should many more assail us. The Wilmot Proviso seeks to take from its legitimate tribunal a question of domestic policy, having no relation to the Union, as such, and to transfer it to another, created by the people for a special purpose, and foreign to the subject-matter involved in this issue. By going back to our true principles, we go back to the road of peace and safety. Leave to the people, who will be affected by this question, to adjust it upon their own responsibility, and in their own manner, and we shall render another tribute to the original principles of our Government and furnish another guarantee for its permanency and prosperity.

I am, sir, respectfully,  
Your obedient servant,

LEWIS CASS.  
A. O. P. NICHOLSON, Esq., Nashville.

**The Herald on Van Buren.**

The Herald has commenced running its old files of electioneering documents against Mr. Van Buren. Master Van Buren, we say, oddly as it sounds at the present day to call a presidential nominee anything but a *General*. Well, it has fished up his vote upon an Act for prohibiting Deputy Postmasters from receiving and transmitting, &c., certain matter in and through the mails, which was, on the 2d of June, 1836, engrossed and read a third time, by the casting vote of Mr. Van Buren, then Vice President, and President of the Senate. Now the truth is, even this vote has hardly ever been soberly considered by even strong anti-slavery men. They very properly recollect, that the vote was not on a final passage, and that it would have been an unwarrantable exercise of the one man power, had Mr. Van Buren, by his own vote, taken the subject from the consideration of the Senate, where it was disposed of in a much more impressive and democratic manner on the 8th of June, 1836. On that day, on motion of Mr. Calhoun, the bill was taken up for a final action, when it was rejected by a good majority of six Senatorial votes. Had Mr. Van Buren killed it by his single casting vote, the impressive lesson taught the Slave Power by the final, decisive vote, would never have been on record. A man of Mr. Van Buren's sagacity, could not but have foreseen the result, and no man, we venture to say, was better satisfied than he, with the large majority against its passage. So much for this trap, in reference to the Slave Power by the final, decisive vote, would never have been on record. A man of Mr. Van Buren's sagacity, could not but have foreseen the result, and no man, we venture to say, was better satisfied than he, with the large majority against its passage. So much for this trap, in reference to the Slave Power by the final, decisive vote, would never have been on record. A man of Mr. Van Buren's sagacity, could not but have foreseen the result, and no man, we venture to say, was better satisfied than he, with the large majority against its passage. So much for this trap, in reference to the Slave Power by the final, decisive vote, would never have been on record. A man of Mr. Van Buren's sagacity, could not but have foreseen the result, and no man, we venture to say, was better satisfied than he, with the large majority against its passage. So much for this trap, in reference to the Slave Power by the final, decisive vote, would never have been on record. A man of Mr. Van Buren's sagacity, could not but have foreseen the result, and no man, we venture to say, was better satisfied than he, with the large majority against its passage. So much for this trap, in reference to the Slave Power by the final, decisive vote, would never have been on record. A man of Mr. Van Buren's sagacity, could not but have foreseen the result, and no man, we venture to say, was better satisfied than he, with the large majority against its passage. So much for this trap, in reference to the Slave Power by the final, decisive vote, would never have been on record. A man of Mr. Van Buren's sagacity, could not but have foreseen the result, and no man, we venture to say, was better satisfied than he, with the large majority against its passage. So much for this trap, in reference to the Slave Power by the final, decisive vote, would never have been on record. A man of Mr. Van Buren's sagacity, could not but have foreseen the result, and no man, we venture to say, was better satisfied than he, with the large majority against its passage. So much for this trap, in reference to the Slave Power by the final, decisive vote, would never have been on record. A man of Mr. Van Buren's sagacity, could not but have foreseen the result, and no man, we venture to say, was better satisfied than he, with the large majority against its passage. So much for this trap, in reference to the Slave Power by the final, decisive vote, would never have been on record. A man of Mr. Van Buren's sagacity, could not but have foreseen the result, and no man, we venture to say, was better satisfied than he, with the large majority against its passage. So much for this trap, in reference to the Slave Power by the final, decisive vote, would never have been on record. A man of Mr. Van Buren's sagacity, could not but have foreseen the result, and no man, we venture to say, was better satisfied than he, with the large majority against its passage. So much for this trap, in reference to the Slave Power by the final, decisive vote, would never have been on record. A man of Mr. Van Buren's sagacity, could not but have foreseen the result, and no man, we venture to say, was better satisfied than he, with the large majority against its passage. So much for this trap, in reference to the Slave Power by the final, decisive vote, would never have been on record. A man of Mr. Van Buren's sagacity, could not but have foreseen the result, and no man, we venture to say, was better satisfied than he, with the large majority against its passage. So much for this trap, in reference to the Slave Power by the final, decisive vote, would never have been on record. A man of Mr. Van Buren's sagacity, could not but have foreseen the result, and no man, we venture to say, was better satisfied than he, with the large majority against its passage. So much for this trap, in reference to the Slave Power by the final, decisive vote, would never have been on record. A man of Mr. Van Buren's sagacity, could not but have foreseen the result, and no man, we venture to say, was better satisfied than he, with the large majority against its passage. So much for this trap, in reference to the Slave Power by the final, decisive vote, would never have been on record. A man of Mr. Van Buren's sagacity, could not but have foreseen the result, and no man, we venture to say, was better satisfied than he, with the large majority against its passage. So much for this trap, in reference to the Slave Power by the final, decisive vote, would never have been on record. A man of Mr. Van Buren's sagacity, could not but have foreseen the result, and no man, we venture to say, was better satisfied than he, with the large majority against its passage. So much for this trap, in reference to the Slave Power by the final, decisive vote, would never have been on record. A man of Mr. Van Buren's sagacity, could not but have foreseen the result, and no man, we venture to say, was better satisfied than he, with the large majority against its passage. So much for this trap, in reference to the Slave Power by the final, decisive vote, would never have been on record. A man of Mr. Van Buren's sagacity, could not but have foreseen the result, and no man, we venture to say, was better satisfied than he, with the large majority against its passage. So much for this trap, in reference to the Slave Power by the final, decisive vote, would never have been on record. A man of Mr. Van Buren's sagacity, could not but have foreseen the result, and no man, we venture to say, was better satisfied than he, with the large majority against its passage. So much for this trap, in reference to the Slave Power by the final, decisive vote, would never have been on record. A man of Mr. Van Buren's sagacity, could not but have foreseen the result, and no man, we venture to say, was better satisfied than he, with the large majority against its passage. So much for this trap, in reference to the Slave Power by the final, decisive vote, would never have been on record. A man of Mr. Van Buren's sagacity, could not but have foreseen the result, and no man, we venture to say, was better satisfied than he, with the large majority against its passage. So much for this trap, in reference to the Slave Power by the final, decisive vote, would never have been on record. A man of Mr.

# FREE SOIL BANNER.



FOR PRESIDENT,  
MARTIN VAN BUREN,  
OF NEW YORK.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT.  
CHARLES F. ADAMS,  
OF MASSACHUSETTS.

## Editorial Electors.

HENRY L. ELLSWORTH, of Tippecanoe Co  
JOHN H. BRADLEY, of Bartholomew Co.

## CONTINGENT SENATORIAL ELECTORS.

E. DEMING, of Tippecanoe Co.  
S. S. HARDING, of Ripley Co.

## District Electors.

1st Dist.—NATHAN LITTLE,  
2d " JOHN R. CRAVENS, of Jefferson Co.  
3d " JAMES H. CRAVENS, of Ripley Co.  
4th " GEO. W. JULIAN, of Wayne Co.  
5th " OVID BUTLER, of Marion.  
6th " MILTON SHORT, of Lawrence Co.  
7th " ALBERT G. COFFIN, of Park Co.  
8th " SAMUEL A. HUFF, of Tippecanoe Co.  
9th " JOSEPH L. JERNEGAN, of St. Joseph, Co.  
10th " LEWIS BEECHER, of Allen Co.

## CONTINGENT DISTRICT ELECTORS.

2d District—John Brazzleton.  
3d " John P. Milliken.  
5th " J. H. Jordan.  
6th " E. J. Summer.  
7th " Abiathur Crane.  
9th " John U. Pettit.  
10th " Daniel Worth.

## State Central Committee.

CALVIN FLETCHER, A. A. ACKLEY,  
B. S. NOBLE, J. H. JORDAN,  
JAMES SULGROVE, PHILIP SPONABLE.

## FREE SOIL MASS MEETINGS.

The public are informed that arrangements are made to hold Free Soil Meetings at the following times and places:

APPOINTMENTS FOR SEPTEMBER.  
On the 13th at Manchester, in Dearborn Co.  
On the 14th at Greensburg, Decatur Co.  
On the 16th at Connorsville, Fayette Co.  
On the 18th at Richwood, Wayne Co.  
On the 20th at Winchester.  
On the 23d at Fort Wayne.  
On the 25th at Lima.  
On the 27th at South Bend.  
On the 29th at Logansport.  
On the 30th at Lafayette.

APPOINTMENTS FOR OCTOBER.  
On the 3d at Terre Haute.  
On the 5th at Princeton.  
On the 6th at Evansville.  
On the 9th at New Albany.  
On the 10th at Jeffersonville.  
On the 11th at Madison.  
On the 12th at Indianapolis.  
On the 13th at Elkhart.  
On the 15th at Greenesville.  
On the 18th at Crawfordsville.  
On the 19th at Frankfort.  
On the 20th at Lebanon.  
On the 21st at Noblesville.  
On the 23d at Knightstown.  
On the 25th at Rushville.  
On the 26th at Shelbyville.  
On the 27th at Edinburgh.  
On the 28th at Franklin.  
On the 30th at Martinsville.  
On the 31st at Danville.  
On the 1st at Indianapolis.

(Speaking to commence, on each day, precisely at 1 o'clock P. M.)

All persons, without regard to parties, are invited to attend. The Free Soil Electors, and other gentlemen, will address the public, at the times and places above specified, on the principles of the Free Democracy.

CALVIN FLETCHER,  
Chairman of Central Committee.

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1848.

Gen. Joseph Lane has accepted the appointment of Governor of Oregon.

Will our friends send up the proceedings of Free Soil meetings in various parts of the State, and confer a favor on the editors?

Subscriptions from clubs are coming up from various parts of our State. That is as it should be. Keep sending them on; they are always welcome. If Free Soil men are active in our behalf, five thousand names can yet be sent in. Try it, and see if we are mistaken.

Charles F. Adams has written a letter accepting the nomination of the Buffalo Convention. The letter is all that his friends could wish. It breathes the spirit of his departed sire, and gives assurance that in the son of the "old man eloquent," freedom does not look in vain for an ardent and able supporter.

A communication from some thing in this city, calling itself "Riverolo," appears in the Danville Advertiser. Among other things it says: "It is strongly suspected that Messrs. Greer & Wallace have been defeated in their aspirations." Buzz away, little fly!

## Defrees' Argument against Free Soil.

In the Journal, of the 30th of August, an effusion made its appearance under the high sounding title of "Considerations for Free Soilers." It was written in the nature of resolutions, to be adopted at the Free Soil Ratification Meeting.

The reader will observe that these "Considerations" are no more than mere statements—some true, and others false. We propose taking them to pieces, one by one, candidly admitting such as are true, and unsparingly exposing whatever is erroneous. They are as follows:

1st. That the Whig and Democratic parties have divided the people upon all the leading public measures of government, since the first four years of Jackson's administration.

The above requires no denial. It is proof of history.

2d. That, during the latter part of this period, the conquest and annexation of foreign territory and the extension of slavery have been issues between these two great parties.

The truth of this second, we think a little debateable. As it is a matter we care nothing about, however, we hand it over to Chapman. If he admits that the Democrats voted for the extension of slavery, why—very good.

3d. That in the Presidential contest of 1844, the Democratic party was favorable to the annexation of Texas and the extension of slavery, and the Whig party was opposed to these measures; and they were likely to lead the country into a bloody and expensive war with Mexico—because we had territory enough without Texas—because the extension of slavery was a great moral and political evil, the bad effects of which, while confined within its constitutional limits, the whole country had already experienced—and, because its extension was likely to array the North against the South, and thereby jeopardize the peace and safety of the Union.

With regard to the third, we have only to say that our party was born in 1848—had nothing to do with the errors and enormities of 1844, and is, therefore, neither responsible for the war with Mexico, the national debt, nor the consequent extension of "that great moral and political evil," slavery.

4th. That just at this critical juncture, when it required the union and co-operation of every opponent of annexation and extension of slavery, to defeat the Democratic party, and to secure the triumph of the Whig party, a third party arose in the canvass with James G. Birney as their candidate, which so divided the opponents of annexation and slave extension, as to result in the triumph of the Democratic party. The Whig party, in the extension of Texas, the extension of slavery, a two years' war with Mexico, the sacrifice of twenty thousand American soldiers, a National Debt of about one hundred and fifty millions of dollars, and the agitation of the question of slavery, which is shaking the Union to its very foundation.

In the above there is but one point, we think, requiring denial. That the agitation of the question of slavery is a consequence of the annexation of Texas, is true, beyond controversy. But the assertion that it is shaking the foundation of the Union is a coinage of Defrees' brain. We of the North have no idea of sundering links which have been golden ones to the whole continent; much less have the politicians of the South. Their personal security militates against it first; their monetary interests next.

The fifth consideration is rather curiously constructed. Read it:

5th. That in this condition is found the policy of the present administration, and the excitement of the public mind in 1848, on the eve of another Presidential election.

Now, we don't know what may be the condition of Mr. Polk's policy: but if it is of a nature with its results, we incline to think it must be rather miserable. The condition of the country, which we suppose Mr. Defrees meant, is not as a lover would like. A tremendous debt of untold millions will drain its treasury and barricade its progression. Interest and instalments will hereafter swallow every dollar which ought, otherwise, to be appropriated to the improvement of rivers, harbors, and the increase of our navy. Certainly the future is cheerless enough. It demands the oversight and care of a more experienced head than Gen. Taylor's.

The preceding five statements of Mr.

Defrees, while unimportant as affecting our party, are graphic descriptions of the positions of the Whig party before its dissolution at Philadelphia. What Whig can read them without regretting, from the depth of his heart, that terrible stumble!

Did ever party stand on nobler ground? With principles of the purest patriotism, was not its past conduct of the most unimpeachable consistency? And what party ever had nobler men at its head? Clay, Webster, Clayton, Corwin, McLean, and Greeley!—whose blood does not thrill at the mention of their names? But where is that glorious old party now? Broken, disunited, disorganized, witness them abandoning their darling measures, and hanging their fate on the fortunes of an old man, who has declared no sentiments and avowed no principles. They are fighting, 'tis true—fighting with desperation—fighting as becomes them, and as men conscious that their doom is sealed. It is their last battle, however. Who does not feel that their glory is gone, and their sun set forever!

6th. That the Whig and Democratic parties principally divide the people as in 1844—Gen. Zachary Taylor the candidate of the one, and Gen. Lewis Cass that of the other.

We won't quarrel over the above consideration. It is nothing but a fancy, which will, we think, be dissipated in November.

The seventh, however, we think the most important of the ten. It is as follows:

7th. That the principal issues between these two

## The Veto as an Issue.

We cannot suffer this great question to be passed over in silence. Circumstances have latterly given it a degree of importance which it never before assumed.

By the admission of every candid Whig and Democrat, all the great issues which once divided their parties have been done away, either by the force of circumstances, or by the action of conventions, with the exception of the one which the Whigs have attempted to build upon the veto power. Will the reader follow us while we briefly examine the position of both parties upon this question?

The Whigs declare that it is a power given the Executive in imitation of European prerogatives; that its existence is incompatible with the pure republicanism of our constitution; and that it should never be exercised except in cases of violation of the constitution, or hasty legislation.

The Democrats defend the power, and justify its exercise at the discretion of the President. Antagonism to Whiggery now, is, as ever, is their position. This is the apparent difference; turn we and look at the real.

Gen. Taylor, according to the assertions of his partisans, has satisfactorily declared his views upon the subject; and as they have been adopted by the Whig party generally, we will give them a moments consideration. Turn to the General's Allison letter wherein he states—"The power given by the constitution to the Executive to interpose his veto is a high conservative power; but in my opinion, should never be exercised except in cases of clear violation of the constitution or manifest haste and want of consideration by Congress." Read the sentence again, reader, and tell us what it amounts to? Can you infer from it that General Taylor is utterly opposed to its exercise? Does he not say it is a high conservative power? Besides, is the remark equivalent either to a belief that the veto should never be used, or a positive declaration, on his part, that he will never exercise it if elected? *Hasty legislation, violation of the constitution!*—who does the old Hero make the judge of such cases, Congress or the people? No! himself alone. Measures most important to the prosperity of the people are, therefore, as much subject to his discretion, as was the National Bank to John Tyler's. Not a sentence in the whole letter ties his hands; on the contrary, he is left full liberty to cut and carve at his pleasure. If he is elected, and a bill for the Improvement of Rivers and Harbors should pass both Houses of Congress, who can say that he stands solemnly pledged to give it his sanction? If a bill containing the principles of the Wilmot Proviso, should be equally fortunate in Congress, is the General any more obligated by the letter, from which we have quoted, to abstain from the exercise of his veto? No! On the other hand, he allows himself a wide sea of discretion to play in. Governed by his own caprices, he can set his heel upon the popular will, and afterwards justify himself under John Tyler's celebrated plea of *conscientious scruples*.

According to Gen. Taylor, then, the veto is no more or less than a mighty constitutional discretionary power. Is there any real difference between his opinions thus expressed, and that of the Democracy? Do they put chains upon the action of their Executive? Do they, resolving themselves into a great dictatorial committee, strip Gen. Cass of all discretionary right upon questions of public policy? No! How insignificant then, is their difference of opinion.

It is an absolute presidential prerogative, shuns Gen. Taylor; as the constitution clothes him with the power, let our Executive use his veto whenever he pleases, echoes back the Democracy.

Let the Old Hunkers of both parties bring their hair splitters to the consideration of this subject, and make out, if they can, a sufficiently distinct difference between the opinions of Gen. Taylor and the Democrats. Let it be told in their ears that Indiana has spoken in favor of Free Soil to the amount of 30,000 votes, and that the masses sympathise with their movement, and you will find no more doughfaces; their votes will, from that time, appear of record on the side of right and freedom. A change will also take place in their minds, and for the better. This much, at least, we can and will accomplish; and even this will be moral and political triumph.

We have already given an exposition of Whig sentiments in relation to its exercise. It has been a favorite subject with their speakers and editors. They have poured vials full of bitter abuse over the graves of the dead, and upon the fame of the living statesmen, who, in the course of their respective administrations, have found it necessary, and, therefore, dared use this tremendous power. Did they all this with a view to check the exercise of, or strike the power itself entirely from the constitution? If so, we believe nine-tenths of that great party have been misled. They certainly do not see that to check or alter the veto, they must batter down the constitution itself. In all their ranks we do not believe they have a Danton bold and reckless enough to hawk at that sacred instrument so seriously. We, therefore, can see but one result to all their opposition—the constitution will remain unchanged and still vest the power so long as it exists.

What then becomes of this mighty ques-

tion of the old Hunker Whigs? Does it really constitute a dividing issue between the Whig and Democratic parties? Is it not preposterous to declare such a division of opinion, a sufficient foundation for two great parties, composed of the voting population of the whole nation, to stand upon?

We appeal to the common sense of men, and ask their candid, impartial decision.—Are we not right?

## Prospects in our State.

The result of our recent election has been to give the Democrats a majority of four in the Senate and fourteen in the House—eighteen on joint ballot. This would seem to give the Cass party a United States Senator during the next session of our Legislature. We think, however, that this is anything but a matter reduced to certainty. Seven Democratic and four Whig members are pledged not to vote for a Cass or Taylor man.

This force will be much increased by the growth of the free soil sentiment before our next Legislature. If Mr. Hannegan; or any other man, holding the opinions of Mr. Cass, in relation to the Wilmot Proviso, is the Democratic candidate, he will be defeated. We believe that the free soil party will have in their hands the controlling power, and we have no hesitation in saying that they will use it. The only man who can represent us in the U. S. Senate, is a man who is an open and acknowledged opponent to the extension of Slavery, or to the non-interference doctrines of Cass. If such a man is not chosen, the election will not take place until the next winter. Thus much relative to the election of a Senator.

If we are asked, Who will get the Electoral vote of Indiana? we answer, without a moments hesitation, that, if the vote were cast to-morrow for electors, Cass would carry the State by many thousands. Taylor men do not, for a moment, believe that there is the remotest prospect of carrying the State for Rough and Ready. The only choice left, then, is, to give the State to Cass or Van Buren—the one a Slavery-extensionist, the other a Free Soil man.

Which would the Whigs—the masses of whom we believe to be honest Wilmot Proviso men—prefer seeing receive the electoral vote of Indiana? The union of the Whig free soil men with our party, is the only hope of defeating Cass in this State. Taylor's cause is hopeless. Van Buren is the representative of free soil, which our Whig brethren tell us, they consider a paramount principle. What can they lose by leaving a cause already hopeless? Nothing; but they may and can give our State for Free Soil, when otherwise it would go for Cass and the extension of Slavery. If the Whig party would come up to the support of Free Soil, thousands of the Democratic party would also come and fight with them, shoulder to shoulder. Van Buren is their first choice—their sympathies are with him—the sympathies of the Whig party are with the cause we advocate. The Whigs, by dropping the regular ticket, can save the State; otherwise it is lost—lost to freedom and humanity.

We suggest these things for candid consideration.

But, perhaps, it is said that we should, being at present in the minority, join with the Whigs. Well, if, within one month from this time, Gen. Taylor will come out openly and tell the world that he is in favor of the Wilmot Proviso—opposed to the extension of Slavery, and will pledge himself to veto any bill passed for that unholy purpose, the Free Soil Party will give him Indiana by a triumphant majority. We battle for principles, not men.—But nothing of the kind will be said. The old Soldier's lips are hermetically sealed by the Slave power.

Let the Old Hunkers of both parties bring their hair splitters to the consideration of this subject, and make out, if they can, a sufficiently distinct difference between the opinions of Gen. Taylor and the Democrats. Let it be told in their ears that Indiana has spoken in favor of Free Soil to the amount of 30,000 votes, and that the masses sympathise with their movement, and you will find no more doughfaces; their votes will, from that time, appear of record on the side of right and freedom. A change will also take place in their minds, and for the better. This much, at least, we can and will accomplish; and even this will be moral and political triumph.

We learn from the Cincinnati Gazette, that a Free Soil Club has been organized at Lafayette, Louisiana. Several meetings were held by the members. The Mayor issued his proclamation, warning them to beware of infringements of the Black Code.

The New Orleans Commercial Bulletin says, it is the intention of the Free Soilers of Louisiana to run a Van Buren ticket in that State.

Hurrah! This is cheering. It comes like a flash of light from the South!

## Naturalized Citizens.

Men who have sought our country from foreign lands, have a deeper interest in the success of the free soil movement than, perhaps, even our native citizens. They have, in common, the same patriotism, the same love of country; but, in addition, they have friends daily escaping from the thrall of European bondage, and arriving in this country, to enjoy the inestimable rights of freemen. They come to add to the amount of free labor in our country; for the masses of them are industrious laboring men.

Do you wish your brethren, when they arrive on our shores, to have the privilege of settling in any part of this great country—to seek a home, if they see proper, in our territories, where they can secure the rewards of honest industry and feel that labor is honorable? If so, then we say, you must keep the territories free, for let them have Slavery fastened upon them, and labor at once becomes a degraded thing.

Think you that a man who has a soul to feel, will emigrate to a land for the purpose of earning his bread by the sweat of his brow, when he sees advertised in the papers such things as these: "For sale:—A good Shoemaker; also, at the same time and place, a good Carpenter, and three common laborers," &c! No! Place Slavery over our territories that are now free, and, from the fact that labor is made degrading, you stop the doors of emigration, and preclude honest laborers from making homes in their fertile valleys. Should this be so? The Free Soil party say NEVER.

We seek to elevate the masses. Ours is the only true democracy. Freedom is our watchword. We say Free Labor is the strength—the glory, of our country, and should never be debased by any influence. Our doctrine is, that every free man who wishes it, shall go into our territories, feeling that he will not be looked down upon by the planters, and sneered at by the blacks themselves.

We say to all, examine these things for yourselves. You come from foreign lands, but you love the country of your adoption. What is best for that country and for yourselves as freemen? Form your own opinions. Reason and think for yourselves; and, as you honestly come to conclusions, act.

Mr. BUTLER, a Democratic Senator from South Carolina, in a speech on the Oregon bill, said:

"Sir, pass your law excluding slavery from New Mexico and California, I would advise my constituents from California to go out there with their slave property, and with their arms in their hands, to protect their rights in those territories. I would recommend them to go out there armed to the teeth to defend themselves. You may call this nullification, or whatever you please; but this is what I should do. Gentlemen propose to admit Irish, Scotch, Germans, Dutch, all the refuse population of Europe, if they choose to go and settle in these territories, but a Gentleman from the South, with his negroes, is to be excluded."

Do you hear that? How do our adopted citizens like the distinction made

## Objections.

The Cass men oppose Gen. Taylor because, they say, he is opposed to the Wilmot Proviso principle. They devote their principal articles, and great portions of their papers to show this as an objectionable feature in the Whig Hunker candidate, and having shown this, they arrive at the conclusion that Cass is preferable to Taylor. We do not feel inclined to admit their conclusions. We believe that their candidate is just as objectionable as Gen. Taylor; and we think that the war between the Cass men and the Taylor men in their recriminations, is just about as amusing as the quarrel between the kettle and the pot, when each called the other black, forgetting all about its own color. If the fact that Gen. Taylor is against the Wilmot Proviso is objectionable, is not Cass equally as much so? It seems hypocritical to us to hear men object to Taylor, and give as a reason that he is in favor of the extension of slavery, and then turn round and huzzah for Cass, when they are aware of the same objection applying to him. We have the same objection to both the Old Hunker candidates, and the question seems to address itself to us in this wise. Do you think that it would be good policy, independent of the moral question, to make territory now free into slave territory? Would it be for the best interest of our common country?—Would you, for instance, wish slavery extended into the State of Indiana? Certainly not, because it would destroy our prosperity—its obvious tendency would be to create a competition between free labor and slave labor, injurious to the mass of laboring people—the price of real estate would go down to one half its present value. These things are made evident propositions by comparing Ohio and Kentucky, or Indiana and Tennessee.—Well, we have acquired territory which is every whit as free as our own State—it belongs to our common country—not to any section, but the whole country. What is our duty to that country and to posterity? To do what will be best for the whole country, independent of any sectional interest. If we believe that slavery is a curse wherever it is established, will we permit that curse to blight a portion of our country, merely because it will be for the pecuniary interest of a few persons? Would that be patriotism, or an extended love of country? But if we take the views of Gen. Cass we must say, we will let our country go. If a few persons in the territory say we will have slavery, we have no right to interfere. If they see proper to mar the beauty and cripple the energies of a large portion of our domain, we, the people to whom it belongs, have no right to say we will preserve our own soil, and our country, even at the expense of the pockets of a few slaveholders. Away with such contemptible notions of the rights and powers of freemen! But you who go for Cass and still profess to be Free Soil men, by electing Cass you gain a candidate pledged to oppose your own opinions.—By electing Van Buren, one pledged to carry them out. Choose between them after examination, and without prejudice. Act for your country, not for party. Remember the question is not who is the nominee, but whose administration will be best for my country.

THE PEOPLE ARE THINKING—THEY ARE ACTING.—The free soil movement is gaining ground with a rapidity that astonishes even its most sanguine supporters, and makes the knees of Old Hunkerism tremble and smite together. All hail to the party of Freedom! If her steps continue at the same pace until the 7th of November next, Cass, Taylor and Slavery-extension will be among things looked for, but not found. The hand writing has been seen upon the wall. They are weighed and found wanting.

Indiana is shaking off her lethargy; papers are being established. Seven Free Soil papers are battling within her borders. Meetings are appointed, and the people anxious to hear and decide for themselves. If the Free Soilers don't stop, we will soon have to take back our admission, that the State would go for Cass, and affirm on the contrary that Van Buren will carry it. We will always be glad to take anything back, when convinced that we are wrong.

Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, and all New England are on fire. The feeling has been pent up, but with the force of a volcano it has now broken forth, and the shout of freemen is now for free soil, free labor, and free men.

We notice that R. D. Owen and JESSE D. BRIGHT are to speak at Liberty, and on the next day at Centreville. Mr. Bright, being a slaveholder, and in favor of introducing slavery into New Mexico and California, is a very fit advocate of the election of Gen. Cass.—*Journal*.

Very good, Mr. Defrees! According to your own argument, you are as *unfit* an advocate of Gen. Taylor as Mr. Bright is a *fit* one of Gen. Cass. For both the Generals are slavery extensionists; whereas, unlike Mr. Bright, you are neither a slaveholder, nor in favor of introducing slavery into New Mexico and California.

## Reasons why Gen. Taylor should be elected.

The Hon. R. W. Thompson, in an Old Hunker speech at the *Great Whig Rally* (?) which came off in this city, on the 31st of last month, gave divers reasons why Gen. Taylor should be removed from the army to the Presidency. Among many of the same brood, we caught the seven following:—

### HE SHOULD BE PROMOTED

I. Because he was nominated by the Philadelphia Convention—that is, by the Southern Slavery-Extensionists, who, in that Convention, so deliberately cut the throats of Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, John McLean, John M. Clayton, &c.

II. Because he won the victories of Palo Alto, Resaca de la Palma, Monterey, and Buena Vista.

III. Because he wears old clothes, and unlike Gen. Cass, is a boor in manners.—(This latter fact we take the liberty of denying.)

IV. Because, when he left Point Isabel for Fort Brown, he declared he would fight the Mexicans wherever he met them.

V. Because he has an old horse, called 'Old Whitey'—a horse which, Mr. Thompson says, bore the brave old General through his hottest battles, is braver than his master, because the General duked a cannon ball that "Old Whitey" didn't, and which (believe it who will!) is actually said to have a white mane and a white tail!

VI. Because he honestly admitted that he knew nothing about politics or government; and that he would, therefore, leave the administration with Providence—that is, to take care of itself.

VII. Because he positively declared that if he has any principles, the world and people whose President he is to be, shan't know anything about them.

Sensible men! these are beautiful arguments why a man should be elected President of this Republic, are they not?

If Mr. Thompson will call at our office he can have a pair of boots free of charge.

## Another Letter from Gen. Taylor—Acceptance of the Charleston Nomination.

The following we take from the *Charleston Mercury*, of the 22d ult. It is the official correspondence between the chairman of the late Taylor meeting in Charleston, and Gen. Taylor:

### Mr. Pringle to Gen. Taylor.

CHARLESTON, July 26, 1848.

SIR: In conformity with the desire of my fellow-citizens, I have the honor here-with to transmit to you a newspaper containing an account of a very large meeting of the Democratic citizens of Charleston, S. C., held for the purpose of selecting you as their candidate for the Presidency of the United States. Over this meeting the agreeable duty of presiding was assigned to me. The preamble and resolutions adopted at it so fully explain the views of my fellow-citizens, as to need no comment from me. Permit me however, on my part to add, that with a confidence in that honesty and independence of purpose, which you have exhibited in every position in which it has been your lot to serve your country, I entertain the fullest conviction, that, should it be our good fortune to see you elected to that high station, you will so administer the laws of our country, that each section of it will be protected in the right which it was intended by the framers of the Constitution should be guaranteed to all, by that noble instrument, which can only prove inadequate when it is perverted by designing or misguided politicians.

I am, sir, with high consideration and respect, your obedient servant,

W. M. BULL PRINGLE.

To Gen. Z. TAYLOR.

### Gen. Taylor's Reply.

BATON ROUGE, La., Aug 9, 1848.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of the 26th ultimo, officially announcing to me my nomination for the Presidency by a large meeting of the Democratic citizens of Charleston, S. C., held at that city on the 26th ult., and over which you were the presiding officer.

This deliberate expression of the friendly feeling existing toward me among a large and respectable portion of the citizens of your distinguished State, has been received by me with emotions of profound gratitude; and though it be a poor return for such a high and unmerited honor, I beg them to accept my heartfelt thanks.

Concluding that this nomination, like all others which I have had the honor of receiving from assemblies of my fellow citizens in various parts of the Union, has been generously offered me, without pledges or conditions, it is thankfully accepted; and though it be a poor return for such a high and unmerited honor, I beg them to accept my heartfelt thanks.

With the assurances of my high esteem, I have the honor to be, your obedient servant,

Z. TAYLOR.

To W. B. PRINGLE, Esq.

LEVENWORTH, a story of the Mississippi and the prairies, by J. D. Nourse, published by G. W. Noble, of Louisville, has been laid on our table by Messrs. Hood & Noble. It is a neatly got up volume, and abounds in thrilling narrative and glowing description. It can be had at the book store of Hood & Noble.

"We come!"—spake the first in tones which froze the auditor's blood—"We

## Gen. Taylor—Still Another Letter.

The *Charleston Evening News* publishes the following extract of a letter from Gen. TAYLOR to a friend in Charleston. The letter is without date, but by its reference to the Philadelphia Convention, it will be seen that it was written recently.

"I never had any aspirations for the presidency, nor have I now, farther than the wishes of my friends are concerned in the matter; nor would I have it on any other terms than I stated when the subject was first agitated, which is, that my acceptance must be without pledges of being tampered in any way, so that I could be the President of the whole *Nation* and not of a *Party*.

"I have accepted the nomination of the Philadelphia convention, as well as the nomination of many primary assemblies gotten up in various sections of the Union, in some instances, irrespective of party; and would have accepted the nomination of the Baltimore Convention, had it been tendered on the same terms. I am now fully, if not fairly, before the country as a candidate for the Chief Magistracy; and if it should be my good or bad fortune to be elected, I trust my course will be such for the most part, as regards the management of our National affairs, as will meet the approbation of my fellow-citizens. Should they fail to do so, they will, I flatter myself, have the charity to attribute my errors to the head and not to the heart. Very respectfully, your friend,

Z. TAYLOR."

## Gen. Taylor's Letters.

Bronson Letter, August 10, 1847. Letter of Acceptance, July 15, 1848.

"I need hardly add, "Looking to the composition of the Convention, and the broadest basis of the patriotic constituency, I feel deeply grateful, so unfortunately divided for the honor conferred upon me, and for the distinguished confidence imparted in the gift of the American people. I cordially accept that nomination."

Allison Letter, April 22, 1848. McConkey Letter.

"I have laid it down as a principle not to give my vote, until I have an opportunity to consider it between the political parties of the country."

What do you think of them?

## The spirit of our Communications.

The following extract will serve as a specimen of a number of our late communications:

"GENTLEMEN:—I send you the names of twenty subscribers for the Free Soil Banner with the subscription money enclosed. We will forward other names in a few days.

"The topic to which your Press is now devoted has but recently attracted public attention among our people; but wherever canvassed, commands favor. Good men and true have declared for it, and before the November Polls, we trust to be able to make more than a show of empty hands.

Yours, truly,

"JOHN U. PETTIT.

"Messrs. GREER & WALLACE."

For the Banner.

## Gen. Taylor's Last Dream.

The man of war and the just fledgling politician lay lost in slumber.

Visions multitudinous passed rapidly through his brain. Satiated with military renown—tired of battle-fields, his ambition played, even in his dreams, with that scarcely less dazzling bubble—political glory.

As Napoleon thought as the Emperor of France, grandly and sublimely, so the hero of Buena Vista dreamed as a candidate for the Presidency of America.

He saw the Ides of November come and go; and, despite himself, his great, stern heart, which had beat untroublingly amid the thunder of Palo Alto, throbbed quickly and excitedly.

He thought he sat on a broken artillery wheel, amid the smoke-wreaths, and the dead and dying of Buena Vista. He heard a fife—it was whistling a favorite funeral dirge. He heard a drum—it sounded hollow and solemn beneath the common-time beat of death. He looked; and his heart grew still, as a long, black-robed train wound slowly round the head of a ravine, and approached him from Saltillo. At its head he saw four men, draped from head to foot, and seemingly guarding a tall, slow-motioned body, which stalked along solemnly and deliberately between them, completely enveloped in the folds of an immense black velvet pall.

Nearer they came. The great candidate watched them in silence.

Directly, he thought, they stood beside him—they, the four men, that great, pall-enveloped, mysterious *something*, and that awe-inspiring funeral train, which, to his eye of dreams, seemed interminable as it stretched away over plain and plateau.

Then the fife hushed its dirge—the drum ceased its measured beat.

Then the four guards in garbs of mourning, threw up the dark cowl which had concealed their features, and lo! there before him, in his dream, stood Henry Clay, John McLean, Daniel Webster, and John M. Clayton.

"We come!"—spake the first in tones which froze the auditor's blood—"We

## PROSPECTUS

OF THE

# FREE SOIL BANNER.

EDITORS

William B. Greer and Lewis Wallace.

The first No. of the Banner will be issued on Friday, August 25th, 1848, and will be published regularly every week, until the 25th of November. It will be printed on an Imperial sheet, and furnished to subscribers at the following rates:—

One copy . . . . . \$0 50  
10 copies to one address . . . . . 4 00  
20 copies " " . . . . . 7 00

The object of the paper is to disseminate and advocate the doctrines set forth in the resolutions of the Buffalo Convention, and to aid in doing all that can be done during the campaign towards electing

N. B. No paper will be sent without the money. *Address*, post paid, W. B. GREER.

Five thousand names should be sent in, and that many can, and will be obtained, if the friends of Free Soil make proper efforts.

NAMES.	RESIDENCES.	NO. COPIES.
--------	-------------	-------------

come, deputed by the people of the United States, bearing you the *corpse* of the great Whig party, which sickened at Philadelphia, and died of inanition, on the 7th of November."

The hair of the warrior arose on his head—his heart stood still, petrified.

Slowly, then, he thought, the mighty pall-bearers rolled back the great velvet pall from the *corpse*, and there, Great God! there, with sunken eyes, nerveless ears, manless neck, and drooping tail—there, a thing of death now, but formerly the pride and glory of his life—there, alas! stood OLD WHITEY!

He screamed—screamed involuntarily,—"OLD WHITEY, THE CORPSE OF THE GREAT WHIG PARTY!"—he shouted, in imagination, then fell prone upon the earth.

That night, he thought, he and the lamented *corpse* were buried in the same grave, clasped in each other's arms.

He woke up, just as Dan Webster had ceased chanting.

"Nothing'll rock, if they'll let 'em sleep on, in the grave where the faithful have buried 'em,"

\* \* \*

For the Banner.

## The Free Soil Cass Party, or the Non-Interference Party.

We often hear the non-interference principles of Cass's Nicholson letter highly extolled, by many who profess to be in favor of free territories. If we understand that letter rightly, the proposition is that Congress has no right and ought not to legislate upon the subject of slavery in the territories, and that the people of the territories have a right, at all times, to control the whole matter. Now, since that newly discovered constitutional test has found such favor in the eyes of the Cass party, why did not some delegate to the Baltimore Convention propose to embody this sentiment in the Democratic platform. Again, during the last session of Congress, when so many propositions were made by men of all parties, to organize the territories, why did not some friend of the *Free Soil Cass party*, propose this favorite scheme of Mr. Cass?—

Did they think that its passage would render the further continuance of the Cass organization unnecessary, or did they fear that the prompt rejection of the measure by his friends, would show too plainly that they had no confidence in it? Let us hear what the Cass organ has to say to this matter.

B.

For the Banner.

## The Texas Compromise.

President Polk, in his protest to the House of Representatives upon the occasion of the passage of the Oregon bill, speaks of the Texas compromise. As the joint-resolution for the admission of Texas was passed under the auspices of the Whig President, John Tyler, perhaps our friend Defrees, of the Journal, can give us some information as to its terms. It is to be hoped that John will try his hand at it, for he ought to be gifted in appreciating such compromises. Probably some such compromise was made by him when he went to the convention a McLean delegate, but came home some weeks *too late*, regretting that he had ever said that, "a regard to Whig principles forbids the nomination of Gen. Taylor."

If John of the Journal fails to enlighten us, it is to be hoped that some of the men, or boys of the Sentinel will explain the matter. It is certain that Mr. Polk ought to have some friend there, who, for the loaves and fishes, can translate the meaning of their master. Come on, explain the "Texas Compromise." I pause for a reply.

B.

For the Free Soil Banner.

## Party vs. Patriotism.

A crisis has now arrived in the affairs of our country, which demands of every citizen intelligent and independent action: independent of any mere selfish or partisan interest. The great contest with the slave power is now to be decided. The principle of despotism is now contending with the principles of Freedom, for the mastery in the administration of our government. We must now determine, whether this government, established and con-

## NEW GOODS.

THE subscriber has just returned from the Eastern Cities, and is now opening at his Store, corner of Washington and Meridian Streets, Sign of the Saw, a very extensive assortment of articles from the Hardware line, which have been purchased at reduced prices, and will be disposed of at lower rates than ever before at this place. Call and examine before buying.

3 ALEXANDER GRAYDON.

**SPEECH OF J. H. CRAVENS,**  
At the Great Van Buren and Adams  
Ratification Meeting in Fifth Street  
Market, Cincinnati, August 24.

[Reported for the *Herald* by J. V. Smith.]

Mr. President, and Gentlemen of this Assembly—*I* find myself in rather strange harness to night. All my life until the meeting of the Philadelphia Convention, I have been a Whig—I was a whig until the dissolution of the party at Philadelphia. I grew with its growth, strengthened with its strength, and, unfortunately, as a Whig, died with its death. I have lashed Martin Van Buren up and down through the length and breadth of Indiana, with a cat of nine-tails. I did so because he was ruled by the slave power. I have been asked, how can you make a speech for Van Buren? Well, I don't know. That is what I am going to try now. If you will give me your attention, I will tell you why it is our duty to organize ourselves in the free States, against the encroachments of the slave power, and for self-defence. (Here Mr. C. passed to a rapid but masterly review of the whole history of the slave power, as connected with the Federal Government, commencing with the concessions demanded on the one hand and granted on the other, at the adoption of the constitution—the sanction of the slave trade for twenty years—the result of the Louisiana purchase—the admission of Missouri—the purchase of Florida—the subsequent and consequent war with the Indians for the security of Georgian slaveholders—the admission of Texas—the yielding up of a portion of Oregon—the inter-state slave trade, and finally, as the acme and complement of guilt, the Mexican war, and the imperious demand that the territory acquired thereby shall be yielded up for the purposes of slavery extension.) For the purpose of succoring the Presidential nomination, Gen. Cass comes out and says that Congress has no right in the legislation of territories, but that it should be left to the people of the territories themselves, to govern their own internal concerns. By the way, why did not this occur to Lewis Cass while he was drawing a fat salary as territorial Governor of Michigan? It never occurred to him that it was all unconstitutional. Gen. Cass says that the people of the territories have a right to govern their own concerns—to rule themselves. If so, they have a right to annex themselves where they please—to England—for instance, and then all you would have to do, would be to send Gen. Taylor down there again and reconquer them. And still allowing this new doctrine to be legitimate, you would have nothing but a fee simple in the soil—no right to legislate over your territory after it was acquired. And thus they would force upon you the conclusion that you have been engaged in a foreign war at an immense expense of money and 25,000 lives, and now at its conclusion, you have not even the meagre return of the right to rule the territory acquired by that war.

As to the Philadelphia Convention I am loth to speak of it, for it embraced many of my old political friends, and I feel the force of old associations sticking to me, but then again I think of *revenge* for Henry Clay! The man, who for the last 25 years has been passing before the gaze of the civilized nations of the earth like a blazing meteor—the very greatest of all the great men of our country. The Philadelphia Convention attempted to cast him into the ocean of oblivion, because in his great Lexington Speech he declared his utter opposition to the acquisition of territory for the purpose of making slave states. After that Convention, I wondered where I should go! I heard of your Columbus Convention, but that was a Liberty Convention, and though its measures and principles and actions were all right, still my old prejudices clung to me. Then I heard of the Buffalo Convention, and we called a District convention for the purpose of nominating delegates to attend it. I found it easy to start the pebble down hill, the people were all going one way. Your speaker was one of these delegates, and assisted in nominating Martin Van Buren. I went first for the nomination of Judge McLean, but as your speaker, Mr. Lewis, has told you, he would not allow his name to be used. Then I went for John P. Hale. I could not yet vote for Van Buren—my old party predilections would not leave me. But, my friends, I reflected that the great St. Paul was once Saul of Tarsus. (Laughter.) I have been asked, "how can you go for Van Buren when you admit that he once said he was opposed to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia?" I ask that Taylor or Cass man this question, are you in favor of such abolition? If so, then I put the question to them, is Gen. Cass or Gen. Taylor in favor of the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia? If not, then your objection to Mr. Van Buren is, on that account, hypocritical, and wholly unworthy of an honest man!

Again. The Cass and Taylormen ask me, "how can you support Van Buren in the face of the fact, that while V. President he gave his casting vote in favor of the bill allowing Southern Postmasters to abstract from the mails, papers and documents which the South said were inflammatory, and calculated to excite the slaves to insurrection, and make them cut their master's throats?" Congress was made to believe that there was actual danger. I do not pretend to say that Southern Slaveholders were really afraid of insurrection. I think any man who will hold another in slavery has just and abundant cause of fear and apprehension; but I say that the South insisted that inflammatory documents were circulated, and threatened them with imminent danger.—Under these circumstances, Martin Van Buren gave his casting vote in favor of a second reading (mark this) of the bill. Now, I contend that if Mr. Van Buren really thought the South was honest in the complaint, and was convinced that there was danger to the lives of the people of the Southern States, by the flooding of that country with incendiary publications through the mails, it was proper that the postmasters should be allowed to look into the matter, and say that the lives of our Southern friends were not jeopardized by their *peculiar and patriarchal* institutions. (Laughter.)

Now, in return, I ask your Cass and Taylor men whether you or your *candidates* are in favor of allowing publications to go through the mails that would incite the slaves to cut their masters' throats? If not, then this objection, like the other, is disengenuous and hypocritical. (Laughter and applause.)

The Taylor men tell us that a candidate for the Presidency should not make pledges—they are now opposed to all *pledges and platforms*, or declarations of principles, and so now they go for "King log." These Taylor men remind me of the fable of the fox, which I read when a boy. The fox had the tallest and handsomest tail in the forest, and was forever bragging of his handsome and beautiful tail, but, unfortunately, Reynard got his tail in a *trap*, and to save his carcass, had to bite it off! He spent the balance of his life in laboring to convince the foxes that the prettiest thing in all God's creation was a fox *without a tail!* (Laughter.) Just so with the Taylor men. Oh yes—they are heartily sick and tired of all platforms and pledges, and now devote their time in endeavoring to prove there is nothing so beautiful as a party without a proclamation of principles, and a candidate for the highest office, without pledges!

The Whig Convention at Philadelphia got their tails into a *Southern trap*, and were under the necessity of dispensing with their principles and platform, and nominate a no-party man for the Presidency, in order to save the southern limb of the party, and then hastily adjourned, *sine die*, which I suppose means, *never to meet again*. (Laughter.)

But we are told that Gen. Taylor won't veto any bill that Congress may pass embodying the Wilmot Proviso. Well, now, I think that the Taylor party is peculiarly obnoxious to the same charge which it makes against Cass. They accuse Cass of having two lives written, the one for Southern circulation, the other for Northern readers. How is it with Gen. Taylor?—All over the South he is claimed as *their* man. The Southern papers advocate his election on the ground that he is a Louisiana slaveholder, and that his habits, associations, interests, and feelings are all with the South. This may be called his Southern life. Now, on the other hand—don't Tom Corwin and other prominent Taylor men in the North assert that their candidate is no friend to slavery extension, and that if elected he can be depended upon for Northern interests—that he will never veto the Wilmot Proviso, &c? Now these letters, and speeches, and newspaper articles, proclaiming and asserting one thing in one section of the Union, and the reverse in an opposite section, amount to the same thing, as though they were published in volumes as the *lives* of General Taylor. Gentlemen, you cannot doubt that both Cass and Taylor are in favor of slavery extension. This is a charge which is not susceptible of direct and what might be called *legal* proof. We are reduced to a secondary kind of evidence. One fact that I may adduce is that all the Senators in Congress who are for Taylor, are against the Wilmot Proviso, with the exception of Delaware, which we are getting in the habit of calling a free State. These Senators, with this exception, are opposed to the extension of the Wilmot Proviso south of 36-30.

We must infer Taylor's position from what his friends do say, inasmuch as he will not condescend to tell us himself. Not thus was it with Henry Clay—his manly and open position was, and is, that Congress has the constitutional power to prevent the further extension of slavery anywhere.—Our fathers formed the constitution, not for the abridgement of rights, or to render insecure the privileges of citizens, but to secure the people free the blessings of liberty. In the language of our great platform: "Congress has no more right to make a *slave* than to make a *king*."

We love this Union—we revere the institutions of our country; but it is maddening to reflect that while all the balance of the world are clamoring for freedom, and we hear the echoing shouts across the water of *Liberty, Liberty, Liberty*, the response borne back from the "Model Republic" is *Slavery! Slavery! Slavery!!!* Is it not extraordinary that we, here in America, are divided into THREE PARTIES on the question of freedom? One is an open foe who meets us in a fair fight, the other seeks to circumvent us by stratagem; hence the greater need of guarding against the Whig candidate.—*Ohio Free Soil Banner*.

*From the Morning Herald.*  
**The Buffalo Convention.**  
They come from the mountain, they come from the plain. Their motto, "Free Labor, Free Soil, and Free men." They sweep to the rally like clouds to the storm, from hill-top and valley they gather and form.

They cry, "to the rescue!" their march is begun. Their number is legion, their hearts are but one, Their cause is their Country, they war for the Right, and the minions of slavery turn pale at the sight.

At the voice of Jehovah the ocean waves stayed, Its billows rolled back and the mandate obeyed; Thus the tyrant is checked—he beholds with surprise. The slave power recoil when stern freeman arise.

They speak, and that voice shall awaken mankind From the sleep that has rested so long on the mind; No party shall bind us, we are free from this hour. We bow not in meekness to slaveholding power!

Then monster oppression's shrink back to thy den, For the shackles have burst from the spirits of men. They spread their broad pinions, as proudly they soar, Thy efforts are vain—thou canst bind them no more.

Where slavery now rears its broad front to the day, Let them hug the foul fiend to their hearts as they may. But there they must stop—for we sternly proclaim, No slave shall plow our free soil with his chain, Marion County, Aug. 12, 1848.

**Why we support Mr. Van Buren.**

We are often asked the question, How can you, who have always been a Whig, and never scratched a Whig ticket, support Mr. Van Buren for President?

We answer. Our object in entering into an organization of any kind, is to give success to principles which we deem important. We share our part of the toil and sacrifices of a political struggle, simply and solely for this purpose.

There are to be settled in the present Presidential struggle, certain principles vital to the preservation of this Union, the liberties of the people, and the prosperity of the whole country. Foremost among these stands the question, whether the National Government has power to govern its own territories, and preserve them free from the curse of slavery; and whether it shall now exercise that power.

We say these questions stand foremost.

Not that they are more important, or as much so indeed, in themselves, as

that of Constitutional action for the Free Soil Senator, or prevent an election.

[Cheers.] We will send a Free Soil Senator or *none*. We tell these politicians that want offices—come over to the Free Soil side *now*, and secure your tickets, for hereafter there will be

such a tremendous crowd, there will be

no time to *make changes*. [Uproarious applause.]

I understand that a man from my own State, (the speaker alluded to Hon. Caleb Smith,) made a

speech here the other evening and asserted that Martin Van Buren was not to be *trusted!* Now I ask any—

the bitterest opponents of V. B. even—if he ever *cheated his friends?* [Loud and unanimous responses of no, no.]

He gave us *Whigs Jesse* in past campaigns, and, therefore, I know it is hard to come round—but my friends I am not afraid to trust Martin Van Buren when *I am on the same side!* [Laughter.]

A word about the Buffalo Convention.

I thought previous to its session

that I could not agree with those who would meet there—that the Convention would break up without agreeing on either men or principles. But when I got there I found there assembled

statesmen, men of liberal souls, who were willing to give us a platform upon which all could stand—that platform was unanimously acceded to.

All pledged themselves heartily for it—Gentlemen, if you will insist upon it that Martin Van Buren is not to be forgiven for past acts, which in your judgment are wrong, you are more severe than the Almighty!! You will remember the parable of the woman that was caught in a thing not altogether right, to whose accusers the Lord replied: "Let him that is guiltless cast the first stone." For my own part, I remember my own kneeling to the Slave power, and I am charitable to others. I would ask these Taylor and Cass politicians, who are free from all short comings in this particular, to stand out as the accusers of Martin Van Buren.

I once voted for an *available* man, as Whig Elector, in '40. I voted for

Tyler; but, so help me God, I will never vote again for *availability*.

**Taylor and Cass.**

It is charged upon the Free Soil party, that they exhibit a special enmity

to the Whigs, that the articles in their papers, and the speeches at their meetings, are, for the most part, directed against General Taylor.

Any one who will reflect for a moment, will see that there is no unfairness in this, but that it is the dictate of sound principle.

General Cass is unequivocally and openly pledged to *vero* any law embracing the principles of the Jefferson Proviso; there is no mistaking his position on this question. He talks, besides, of *diffusing* slavery, of transporting slaves into new territory; evidently intending, thereby, that New Mexico and California shall be surrendered to the slaveholders. No sincere friend of free territory can possibly vote for General C., supposing him to be the representative of his views.

But with General Taylor the case is widely different; his friends in the North and South differ entirely as to his views; the one holding that he is in favor of Slavery, the other that he is opposed to it; and as he declines to tell us "what he will or will not do" in the premises, some sincere friends of free soil may, unless his position is fully exposed, be betrayed into his support.

One is an open foe who meets us in a fair fight, the other seeks to circumvent us by stratagem; hence the greater need of guarding against the Whig candidate.

We must infer Taylor's position from what his friends do say, inasmuch as he will not condescend to tell us himself.

Not thus was it with Henry Clay—his manly and open position was, and is, that Congress has the constitutional power to prevent the further extension of slavery anywhere.—Our fathers formed the constitution, not for the abridgement of rights, or to render insecure the privileges of citizens, but to secure the people free the blessings of liberty.

In the language of our great platform: "Congress has no more right to make a *slave* than to make a *king*."

We love this Union—we revere the institutions of our country; but it is maddening to reflect that while all the balance of the world are clamoring for freedom, and we hear the echoing shouts across the water of *Liberty, Liberty, Liberty*, the response borne back from the "Model Republic" is *Slavery! Slavery! Slavery!!!*

Is it not extraordinary that we, here in America, are divided into THREE PARTIES on the question of freedom? One is an open foe who meets us in a fair fight, the other seeks to circumvent us by stratagem; hence the greater need of guarding against the Whig candidate.

should consider ourselves unworthy of the cause in which we are engaged, if there were any sacrifices except principle, too dear for us to make for its success. For our part, we rejoice in the opportunity to make sacrifices in such a cause.

We support Mr. Van Buren, then, because by doing it we give success to the principles which we love. We meet the issues distinctly presented to us by slaveholders themselves. We have no dough face for our leader, who, to get the nomination for President, repudiated the ordinance which has given prosperity to the land of his growth and greatness, and the principles and doings of himself and our fathers who have gone before us. Nor have we for our leader one who refuses to *trust the people* with his sentiments, at the same time he asks them to *trust him* with power; one whom, from his very position, must intend to cheat either those living South, or those living North of Mason's and Dixon's line; one, to advocate the election of whom, a person from the free States must spend a good share of his time endeavoring to prove that those living south of that line are the ones to be cheated, while he feels *conscious in his own heart* that what he is trying to prove is not true.

But we have for our leader one who, on this great, leading subject, occupies our position, embodies our sentiments, and from a prior consistent course of action upon it for many years, and under trying circumstances, as well as from his present bold and self-sacrificing stand, *shows that he is to be trusted*—that the cause of Free Soil throughout all our vast domains, will be safe in his hands.—*O. Standard.*

**HON. E. D. CULVER.**  
**His opinions—Read them.**

Mr. Culver of New York has written a letter to the Washington County Journal relative to his position, and his reasons for not supporting Old Zack.

We give the following extracts:

The signs of the times indicate a general fusion of parties, a deep breaking up, and the establishment of new lines and landmarks. It is doubtful whether Northern or Southern Whigs, or Northern or Southern Democrats ever go to the polls with each other after 1848.

My opinion is, this iron heel has ground our necks long enough. With me, this "Free Soil" question is and shall be paramount to all others. Banks, Tariffs, Land Proceeds, are subordinate questions, because all are moulded, created, annulled and modified by the dictates of Slavery. Dispose of that, and all the others will be permanently adjusted.

The great question then recurs: What is the duty of "Free Soil Whigs" under existing circumstances? I answer: **TO MAKE THE EXTENSION OF SLAVERY THE PARAMOUNT QUESTION.** With that steadily in view, every Whig who conscientiously *believes* Gen. Taylor is correct in his stand on this question, that he will *act* with the North, that he will bend the great energies of his Administration to restrict rather than extend the curse of Slavery, ought to cast his vote for him. Did I believe so, my vote and my tongue should be at the General's service. I honor him as a soldier, and respect him as an honest man. I would infinitely prefer his election to that of Gen. Cass. But for the life of me, on this great overshadowing question I cannot find the evidence I desire. So far from that, I see him a Southern man by location, a slaveholder by practice, Southerner in feeling, bred in the camp, whose only stepping-stone to the Presidency was the successful issue of three battles. Nay, more, I see him the candidate of the whole South, claimed as *their* man, *right on this question*, preferred even to Mr. Clay, because *more* of a Southern man, and safer to be trusted. I see them, moreover, rushing to his support with the avowal upon their tongues that no man who is against them can have their votes—And all this Northern Whigs are compelled to witness, without one openly-avowed affirmative *Whig principle* to redeem his standing. Can we go it? Shall we, ought we again to allow ourselves to be foiled by the second Tyler Administration?

No, but he is the Whig candidate, and we are bound by the nomination. I beg pardon. The Whig party is bound by its own Constitution, its great charter, its own landmarks. If these are violated, their acts are not binding.—The first duty of a Whig Convention was to select a Whig candidate. Did they do this? So far from it, they selected one, who had seven times proclaimed his independence of party, refusing to be the exponent of their principles, and threatening to defeat their nominee. Gen. Taylor says to me, in so many words, "I can't consent to be your party candidate."—Then, Sir, how can I consent to be your party supporter? "I can't," he says, "be the exponent of your principles, or the advocate of your views, if elected." Then, Sir, how can I be the promoter of your election at the polls? The truth is, I hold my Whig views and principles in so honorable an estimate, that I want a President to advocate and carry them out. If he is ashamed to do so, then should I not be ashamed of him at the ballot-box? I ask, are the Whigs thus to be hoodwinked out of their doctrines? Are they thus to be compelled to abandon

the great champions of their cause, whose pride and glory it has been for forty years to be the "exponents" and defenders of Whig principles? No, there are thousands who hesitate to take the chalice now offered to their lips. And thousands more asking if it is not time to draw the line and square the yards with our Southerners? Throw seventeen new Slave States into the U. S. Senate, and the North is swallowed forever. The hour is coming, and now is, when the North must rouse and break the withes of these Slaveholding Philistines, or our strength is gone.

Do I hear it said "Gen. Taylor is that leader"—those are his sentiments? Give me the evidence. I want the record proof that such is his motto; proof that he will be good *after* the election—proof that will nail him and his friends to the counter, when the pinch comes. *It can't be found.* It don't exist. And while Northern Whigs hope it so, dream it is so, and try to make themselves believe it is so, the South grin at our credulity, and laugh in their sleeves at our greenness. They know it otherwise, and ask no odds.

**Oregon—Mr. Webster—All Right.**

On Saturday evening when every effort was made to defeat the Oregon bill, by preventing the Senate from re-reading from its amendment, engraving upon the House bill the Missouri Compromise, Mr. Webster rose, and said it was desirable to establish a proper government for the Territory of Oregon. He was willing to vote for the House bill as it was, but if the Senate amendment was agreed to he could not vote for it. The House bill contains the clause in the Ordinance of 1787, excluding slavery from the Northwest. The amendment proposes to give a reason for applying the Ordinance of 1787 to the Territory of Oregon, in these words, "inasmuch as the said Territory is north of the parallel of 36° and 30' min. of north latitude, usually known as the Missouri Compromise."

I understand, (said he,) that where