

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 BECHER, 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 Riehmond, 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 Elkhorn.
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; 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 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 adminis-

tration, or a repudiation of its whole career of blood, extravagance and corruption.

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 Democratic party, in the election of Mr. 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 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 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 adminis-

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 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, to constitute a fair party.

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 question?

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."

What then becomes of this mighty question?

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