

FREE SOIL BANNER.



FOR PRESIDENT,
MARTIN VAN BUREN,
OF NEW YORK.

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

Senatorial 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 Parke Co.
8th "—SAMUEL A. HOFF, of Tippecanoe Co.
9th "—JOSEPH L. JERNIGAN, of St. Joseph, Co.
10th "—LEWIS BIERCHER, of Allen Co.

CONTINGENT DISTRICT ELECTORS.
2d District—John Brazzleton.
3d "—John P. Milliken.
5th "—J. H. Jordan.
6th "—E. J. Sumner.
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 Connersville, Fayette Co.
On the 18th at Richmond, 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 Columbus.
On the 14th at Bloomington.
On the 15th at Greensville.
On the 18th at Crawfordsville.
On the 19th at Frankfort.
On the 20th at Lebanon.
On the 21st at Shelbyville.
On the 23d at Knightstown.
On the 24th 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 of November 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 debatable. 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 because 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 slavery extension, as to result in the triumph of the Democratic party, the election of James K. Polk, the annexation 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 barriade 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!

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 parties, is the organization of the institutions for the newly acquired territories of New Mexico and Upper California, and a recognition of the justice and expediency of the policy of the present administration.

Is the organization of institutions for our new territories an issue between the Whig and Democratic parties? Mr. Defrees affirms it is; we deny it. What is an issue? We understand it to be a principle maintained by one party and denied by the other; therefore, to make the extension or non-extension of slavery—the only question growing out of our newly acquired territories—an issue, one of the two parties must advocate, and the other deny its applicability to those territories. Instead of this, do not both parties—the one by supporting Gen. Cass, and the other by supporting Gen. Taylor—deny the policy of its application? If both the Generals oppose the principles of the Wilmot Proviso—if both are in favor of the extension of slavery over our new domain—the parties who have chosen them as standard bearers certainly adopt their principles, and constitute them exponents of their own. The question to be considered, then, is, whether Cass and Taylor oppose, or favor the non-extension of slavery.

That Gen. Cass is hostile to everything connected with the Wilmot Proviso, is no longer questioned. All parties, his own friends even admit his uncompromising hostility. He himself, in his celebrated Nicholson letter, declares substantially, that he is opposed to an legislation on this subject, and that he cannot see in the constitution, any grant of the requisite power to Congress to prevent the establishment of slavery in New Mexico and California. The Union, Gen. Cass's organ, declares upon the authority of a letter from the General, that, if he is elected President, he will veto the Wilmot Proviso. If he would veto the Proviso itself, may we not reasonably presume, he would also set his foot upon any bill containing its principles?

What are Gen. Taylor's sentiments on this subject? Nobody knows! He has not only declared none, but gone beyond that, and asserted that he never will. In vain have some of the great men who nominated him, together with the leaders of the now broken Whig party, begged and supplicated the little grace of a line, defining his position. Camly and determinedly has he written back this invariable answer, so murderous to their hopes and their party: "I have laid it down as a principle, not to give my opinions upon, nor pre-judge in any way the various questions of policy now at issue between the political parties of the country, nor to promise what I would or would not do, were I elected to the Presidency of the United States."—We are driven, then, to presumptions. Are there no facts upon which we may reasonably presume him opposed to the Wilmot Proviso? Certainly. 1. He is a Southern man, bound to the South by interest and feeling. 2. He is the owner of immense Southern plantations. 3. He is a Slaveholder. 4. He is claimed by the Whigs of the South as an anti-Proviso man. 5. He has refused to answer his friends of the North upon this subject.

6. At Philadelphia a resolution was offered, making the Wilmot Proviso a Whig principle; but it was voted down by that partisan mob, in order to accommodate the views of their candidate. Indeed, whenever a Northern or Western man attempted to introduce in that convention a resolution infected in the least with the spirit of that great measure, he was beaten down with hisses, hootings, and cries of "turn him out! turn him out!" from the Southern delegates. Never before was so vile an insult cast in the face of the North!—never before had we such just cause for indignation!

Cass and Taylor, then, are the exponents of the principles of their respective parties. The world understands the position of the former—who ever votes for him votes for the extension of slavery. And have we not given facts sufficient, in the absence of positive testimony to the contrary, to convict Gen. Taylor of entertaining similar sentiments? As we are "living christian men," we believe whoever casts his suffrage for him, will be instrumental in establishing "that great moral and political evil" over all our new territory.

What then, we ask, becomes of the assertion which Mr. Defrees makes in his seventh consideration? Is it not unsound in truth and fact? Have parties made an issue out of the Wilmot Proviso? On the contrary, is it not an issue between the Slave Powers, and the Free States of the North?

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

HENRY CLAY VS. TAYLOR.—At a late meeting of some Taylor club, in Lexington, Ky., 'tis said, a committee was appointed to wait on Mr. Clay, and tender him a respectful invitation to address them. The committee found the great man in a lawyer's office, and performed their mission with all due ceremony. Mr. Clay arose from his seat, bowed, and replied in that tone of sarcasm of which he alone of all living men is such perfect master,—"Address them! I would with pleasure, gentlemen, but my day is passed. I could not add to the availability of your candidate."

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, 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 moment's 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, shouts 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, to constitute a fair party issue.

But view the veto in another light.

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.

But, again: if we cannot carry the State, what will we accomplish by our movement? Much, very much. We can give a large vote; and that vote, strong as it evidently will be, will be a high conservative power, operating to keep in check our dough-faced Congressmen and Senators. 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 sympathize with their movement, and you will find no more dough-faces; 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 a 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 thralldom 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 freeman 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 between them and Gentlemen, by a Southern slaveholding Democrat? But, as we have said, the result of slavery is to degrade honest free labor. Go and vote with Mr. Butler for Cass, if you wish to have slavery extended farther.

FREE SOIL AMONG THE GERMANS.—The New York Democrat, of New York City, the German Tribune, St. Louis, the Louisville Messenger, and the Illinois Staats Zeitung, German papers, have all raised the flag of Free Soil. The Germans are industrious hard working citizens, and go against the extension of slavery, because it has a tendency to degrade free labor, and to shut out free laborers from the country where it is established.

They Come! They Come!!

We find from our Eastern exchanges that the ball is still in motion. The Albany Atlas gives the following items of news.

The Democrat and Freeman, the leading organ of the Independent Democrats of New Hampshire, takes down the name of Hale, and runs up the banner of Van Buren and Adams.

The Ballston Democrat, which has sustained thus far the Cass and Butler ticket, yields to the force of public opinion and to the convictions of the editor, and striking the black flag of slavery is ready to fight under the pure banner of Freedom.

The editor of the New Brunswick Times, the Democratic organ of Middlesex county, New Jersey, offers to sell the paper to Gen. Cass. If the offer is not taken up in one week, he will raise the flag of Van Buren and Adams.

The Windham County Democrat, Brattleboro, Vt., raises the names of Van Buren and Adams. The Keene Palladium and the Dover Advocate have sprung up to battle in the same cause.

The Hampshire Herald, Mass., has been united with the Northampton Courier, and will support Van Buren and Adams.

The Free World, published at Salem, Mass., holds up the banner of the Free cause.

Questions and Answers.

People.—Are you in favor of the Wilmot Proviso?

Old Zack.—I have adopted the principle not to give my opinions on the great questions at issue between the political parties.

People.—Are you in favor of the Wilmot Proviso?

Gen. Cass.—The noise and confusion would prevent my being heard in answer to that question.