

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."

[PRINTED BY DOUGLASS & ELDER.

VOL. I.

INDIANAPOLIS, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1848.

NO. 5.

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

Free Soil Polka.

WRITTEN FOR THE PENN-YAN FREEMEN'S CLUB.

AIR—*Jim Crow Polka.*

What means this crowd that's gatherin' here,
They're comin' still, from far and near,
With shouts resounding high and clear,
We are the Free Soil VOTERS.

CHORUS.

Oh, come then, boys, and strike to-day,
For Freedom, and for Freedom's sway;
Oh, how delightful 'tis to say,
I'm a Free Soil VOTER.

We plant our flag upon the wall,
Resolved with it to stand or fall,
In fighting for the rights of all,
We are the Free Soil VOTERS.

Let others work for place and spoil,
For Natural Rights we'll ever toil,
Our motto is—"Free Men—Free Soil,"
We are the Free Soil VOTERS.

The curse of Slavery shall not be
The wedding gift of Liberty,
Our Territories shall be Free;
We are the Free Soil VOTERS.

Our country shall not bear the shame,
With which the South would load her name;
On every hill burns Freedom's flame;
We are the Free Soil VOTERS.

Come one, come all, this is the hour,
When Freemen must make known their power;
And Slavery will fall and cower,
Before the Free Soil VOTERS.

The Great Ratification Meeting in Boston.

The great Ratification Meeting in Boston, on Tuesday night was the largest held in that city since 1840. The Hall, says the Republican, was crammed, floor, galleries, window-seats, and all, with as enthusiastic and intelligent an audience as ever met together on any public occasion.

CHARLES SUMNER presided, assisted by a score of Vice Presidents, and a lot of Secretaries, first among whom we notice MARCUS MORTON, Jr. Mr. Sumner on taking the chair, spoke with great eloquence and power, in vindication of the positions of the party, and in support of its great principles.

Richard H. Dana, Jr. next spoke, and was followed by John A. Andrews of Boston, who presented a series of resolutions, which were unanimously adopted, and from which we have room to extract only the following:

Resolved, That when the Legislature of Massachusetts adopted the words of Charles F. Adams, and resolved that the encroachment of the Slave Power upon the rights of the Freemen of the Union, "is a perversion of the principles of Republican Government—a deliberate assault upon the compromises of the constitution, and demands the strenuous, united, and persevering opposition of all persons, without distinction, who claim to be the friends of human liberty." We took Massachusetts AT HER WORD; and when it further resolved, in the words of Charles F. Adams, that "now that the Slave Power arrogates the control of millions of freemen living beyond the State in which it exists and puts at hazard the predominance of the principles of Liberty in America, it justifies the adoption on their part, of a systematic policy of contraction, by lawful and constitutional means; ** and Massachusetts will co-operate with any or all of the free States of the Union, in an honest endeavor, by lawful means, to restore the Constitution in every case where it has been perverted from the fulfilment of its original and noble purpose." We THEN ALSO TOOK MASSACHUSETTS AT HER WORD.

Therefore, *Resolved*, That, impressed with a profound respect for the ability, integrity and patriotism of

MARTIN VAN BUREN for his fidelity to the great doctrine of Republican Equality, displayed in former years in his zealous advocacy of the measure of conceding the right of suffrage to the citizens of New York, irrespective of color; for his steadfast opposition to the spread of Slavery over Free Territory, maintained from his entrance into public life to the present day; for his resistance of the Missouri Compromise with Slavery; for his prudence evinced when President of the United States, in promptly declining the overtures of Texas for annexation; for his sound and salutary counsel against the consummation of the same measure at the cost of his political prospects, at a more recent period, when private citizen, and the most prominent candidate of his party for the Presidency; for his opposition therein to the aggressive demands of the slaveholding interest; for the manly and noble stand which he has now taken for Free Territory, the rights of Freemen, and of Free Labor, we tender him the tribute of our heartfelt thanks, and account him worthy of the gratitude of every true and free heart in the nation. We congratulate the friends of Free Soil throughout the country, that they have, in him, so distinguished and efficient an advocate of their cause, one of the first class of

statesmen in our country, one who, by the suffrages of his fellow-citizens, has already filled the highest office in the nation's gift; one who, with an unusual, amiable and dignified private character, in the maturity of his intellectual strength, in "the second sober thought" of his riper years, has come forth the fearless and efficient defender of the rights of Freemen against the aggressions of the slave power.

Resolved, That in the resolutions of Massachusetts, from which we have quoted, we recognize the spirit of an honest, sincere and devoted advocate of the principles of Liberty, the involuntary and acknowledged leader hailed as worthy to shape the policy of the Commonwealth upon all the great questions of Freedom,

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, who has shown himself ever ready for these purposes "to co-operate with all, without distinction, who may claim to be the friends of Human Liberty."—Though deserted by others, he has not betrayed Massachusetts, nor abandoned her position, and we will not abandon him. Doing honor alike to his illustrious ancestry and his country, in the position he has assumed in favor of Free Soil and Free Men, we recognize in him that integrity of character, that determination of purpose, and that capacity of action, which the times demand, and which entitle him to the esteem and confidence of his countrymen.

DAVID DUDLEY FIELD, of New York, followed up the resolutions in a speech of great power and beauty. JOSHUA LEAVITT, and Mr. HUNTER, of Illinois, followed, enchaining the attention of the audience to a late hour, in unabated interest. The Hurrah Song of the Hutchinsons concluded the proceedings of the meeting, which has seldom been surpassed in its character or in its enthusiasm.—*Ohio Standard.*

Impartial Testimony.

The following is an extract from the editorial correspondence of the *Watchman of the Valley*, a religious paper of the N. S. Presbyterian denomination, distinguished for its fearlessness for vindicating its own views of right. The testimony of Mr. Goodman to the nature, spirit and character of the Buffalo Convention will be received as the word of an earnest and impartial man, deeply impressed with the religious responsibilities of American citizenship.—*Cin. Herald.*

Buffalo Convention.

Were policy a stronger principle with me than love to my species, christian principle, or patriotism, I should perhaps touch delicately upon the subject of this Convention. But my readers have learned, years ago, that I have no other policy than *honesty* to guide the conduct of my paper, and, whether that is the best policy or not, it is best they expect from the *Watchman*, in its present hands. I have, therefore, with characteristic unreservedness, spoken right out what I think and feel respecting the whole movement. And my honest conviction is that the good hand of our God is upon it. When I learned, on arriving at Buffalo, that God had moved his people to make it a subject of special prayer, in their social gatherings, daily "rising up early" for the purpose, I could not but feel a delightful assurance that the Most High had taken the movement into his own hands and would crown it with as early a victory as in his wisdom it should seem best. What it has already effected is a cheering indication of the greater things that may yet be expected from it. It has killed the infamous Compromise bill which was designed to subject our nation forever to hopeless slaveholding rule; and has since overcome the pertinacity of the Senate, and extorted from them a government for Oregon with the Slavery restriction principle embodied in it. It is nothing but the spread of Free-Soil sentiment, as developed in this movement, which has wrought out these results, as every attentive and candid observer must know. Whether there is strength enough in this movement to carry the election at the present campaign or not, there will be strength enough in it to act powerfully upon our national legislation. It is a mistake to consider those votes thrown away that do not elect their candidate.—Such votes have a moral effect of great value often. Every one that casts his vote in the scale of righteousness, comes up to the help of the Lord against the aggressor upon justice and human rights.

CHARACTER OF THE CONVENTION.—Another indication of God's hand and spirit upon the Buffalo movement might be witnessed in the character and deportment of this vast assembly. Such a political meeting, so free apparently from all selfish collisions; such a mass of sober, considerate men, where there seemed the entire absence of the tainted breath, the profane oath, or the an-

grey word, is a new thing in modern political movements. In this respect, it far exceeded my most sanguine hopes. It was the object doubtless which, under God, gave character to it. A great moral object will attract from the multitude only those whose high moral tone sympathises with that object.—Men came to Buffalo, not to scramble for the spoils of party victory, but to intercept slaveholding aggression upon the rights of God and man. This it was that drew together the sober, wise and good, from seventeen different States, which taught them to cast themselves on the arm of the Lord for support, and gave a moral character and tone to their deportment and deliberations, which their opposers find it much easier to reproach than to imitate.

THE BARNBURNERS.—A different spirit it was developed in these men from what may be apprehended. They manifested no disposition to run their favorite candidate at all events. Their aims appeared to be in harmony with the great object of the Convention, to elevate principles rather than men. They promptly withdrew the name of Martin Van Buren, at his own suggestion, in order to leave the body untrammeled, and pledged their support to the nominee that might be selected. Prominent among this class was the Hon. B. F. Butler—a name conspicuous in the Temperance and Religious movements of the day. The part he took in this connection was promptly visited, according to current report, with Executive retribution. A telegraphic communication to Washington and back, as the report is, announced his position to Mr. Polk, and brought back his dismission from the office of Attorney General, all during a single speech that he was making.

Between Mr. Butler and Mr. Chase an interesting scene took place before the Committee of Conference. Mr. Chase had been warned to be on his guard against the sinister aims of Mr. Butler, a crafty fox. The latter had been warned in like manner, against Mr. Chase, who would overreach him if he was not on his guard. These things they publicly confessed, and gave to each other, at the same time, most cordially the hand of mutual confidence.

This fact I give, not as an eye witness, but on the authority of others. There was a spirit of concession at that meeting which is not characteristic of a set of greedy office seekers.—When it was asked if the Liberty men would be satisfied not to have one of the nominees selected from among them, their reply was, "You have given us *every thing*, all we ever contended for; you have given us our *principles*; take these, and Democrats and Whigs may divide the *men* among themselves.

THE PLATFORM.—A preliminary measure to secure unanimity in the Convention, was to agree on a platform or a declaration of principles. No little anxiety was felt on this point. The Liberty press had been warning the party against any amalgamation with the new movement which might involve an abandonment of any essential principle of their organization. The *non-extension* principle was not all they wanted. They could not leave their own platform to stand on that alone. But when they found that both the Committee of Conference and the Mass Convention had adopted essentially their own platform, without dissenting voice, they perceived that all obstacles to a complete amalgamation were removed. This platform declares it the duty of the General Government to free itself from all responsible connection with Slavery; which implies the non-extension of it where it is not, and the extinction of it where it is, under Federal jurisdiction.

Who did it?

That is the question. What great influence forced the Oregon bill with the Wilmot Proviso attached, through Congress? Assuredly those most nearly and strongly interested in opposition to the Proviso, will understand best to what quarter to attribute the victory against themselves. John C. Calhoun says it was caused by the great Northern movement for "Free Soil," and through the recreancy of two Southern Democratic Senators. Yet we have those among us who attribute that great Northern triumph to Whig votes and Whig influence solely! Judge Barton, in his speech at the Taylor meeting, Monday evening, alluded to the passage of the Oregon bill with the Proviso attached, as follows:

"Now he would ask, who had done this? Had it been done by the Free Soil party? No. It had been done by the Whigs, that is the Northern Whigs, for he knew that some of the Southern Whigs were not yet quite right on that question. They were the men who had fought the battle, they were the men who had gained the victory. But it had been said that

PRETTY GOOD.—A democrat remarked that the only thing which rendered the result in this State at all questionable, was the mischievous attempts of a few dissatisfied democrats to run a third ticket with Mr. Cass as the candidate.—*New York Banner*,

DANIEL WEBSTER'S SPEECH.—The Taylor men have, at length, got their long-expected and long-heralded speech from Daniel Webster, and little good do we think it will do them. He says that "Gen. Taylor is a military man *merely*. He has had no training in civil affairs—he has had no participation in the councils of the Republic—he is known only by his brilliant achievements at the head of the American army. The Whigs of Massachusetts, and I among them, are of the opinion that it was *not wise, nor discreet*, to go to the army for our candidates for the Presidency. This is the FIRST INSTANCE in the history of the government of the U. States, that any MERE MILITARY MAN has been proposed for that office. * * * The case therefore stands by itself, *without a precedent* in our previous history."

Again he says: "Before Gen. Taylor's nomination, I stated always, when the subject was mentioned by my friends, that I did not, and could not recommend the nomination of a military man to the people of the United States for the office of President. It was against my conviction of what was due to the *best interests of the country*, and the character of the Republic.— * * * I stand upon the same ground now. I considered that such a nomination it was NOT FIT for the Whigs to make."

The drift of the speech is the same as that of the Taylor papers—assuming, without sufficient reason, as we think, that either Cass or Taylor must be elected—bad as the nomination is, it must be supported in order to defeat Cass, and to preserve the unity of the party. The argument is not very strongly put, not so strongly, we think, as we have seen it in some of the Whig papers. The whole speech wears the appearance of an effort, as an advocate, to sustain a position averse to the convictions of the speaker, and is therefore entirely unworthy of the fame and reputation of Daniel Webster. We have already said that it would do the Taylor party little good. The speaker does not even say they shall have his vote. If he had, it would assure them one more than they were before certain of, and that, we think, is about the extent of the benefit which they are destined to derive from it.

The speaker was very severe upon those who nominated Gen. Taylor.—He said "that *gaudacious, wise, far-seeing* doctrine of *AVAILABILITY*, lies at the bottom of the whole matter."

A portion of the speech is occupied in showing that, in the evils of the influence of slave legislation, the North has borne her full share, and that in all the cases of slave extension, it has been done by Northern votes. This is true, and it always will be, so long as we have parties in office who depend on the slave power to sustain them. Both of the old parties do depend upon it, and are therefore inefficient for good, and can interpose no barrier against that power. But the Free Soil party, based upon opposition to the encroachments of slavery, offers a firm and substantial foothold for all the friends of Freedom, both North and South, to rally upon; and in its hands the interests of Freedom will be safe. Once in power, as it inevitably must be, before long, and we shall no more witness this truckling to slavery, this voting away the rights of freemen for the sake of securing the influence of the South.—*Mass. Spy.*

MOVEMENT OF THE GERMAN DEMOCRATS IN FAVOR OF VAN BUREN AND FREE SOIL.—The *St. Louis Republican* gives the following extract from a German Democratic paper of considerable influence, published at Herman, in Missouri, which is supposed to speak the sentiments of the Germans in that quarter. It will be seen that the editor abandons the support of Cass and comes out for Van Buren. It will not, however, probably affect the vote of the State materially, but it may be considered important as showing the views of the large German population, which controls the vote of several Western States.

From the Hermann Wochenblatt.—Our readers already know, from a former declaration in our paper, that we cannot coincide with that part of the Democratic party which considers slavery in the newly acquired territories, New Mexico and California as possibly permissible—we will say *admissible*. Therefore we cannot support for the Presidency the candidate who is brought out by that party as their representative—we mean Mr. Cass; but we take side with that Democratic party called Radical Democrats, or Barnburners, and who have put up Van Buren as their candidate for the Presidency. We therefore, declare our approbation of the well-known "Wilmot Proviso," which heads the Barnburners' confession, and lays down the principle, that in no part of the Union can slavery be legally introduced—and we believe Congress has a right to preclude forever, by way of legislation, the possibility of the introduction of slavery into the thus far free, now annexed territories of Mexico. Cass disputes the power of Congress, and he thereby, together with the party he represents, puts himself in direct opposition to the acts and the principles of the fathers of our revolution, the authors of the glorious Declaration of Independence, and the ordinance of 1787, which forever excluded slavery from the great Northwestern territory as it existed at that time. Could it possibly be brought about on the part of the Radical Democrats or Barnburners in this State, to get up a special ticket for Presidential electors, we would be very much gratified, but if even this cannot be, we owe to our principles and our dignity as republican citizens, openly to step forward with our opinion; as it could not be otherwise expected of us, of those who know us, as well with regard to politics, as with regard to religion. With us, it is a matter always to remain true to the principles we have professed—to confess them openly, no matter whether a few or many share them with us. The principles of Radical Democracy, however, call upon us to stand on the side of the Wilmot Proviso.

GERMAN FREE SOIL PAPER.—We are glad to perceive that the German friends of Free Soil in this city, have succeeded in starting a daily paper, in German, to support the Buffalo Platform and nominees. It is called the *True Democrat*, and is edited by a very competent person, Mr. George Walker. Its success already has been very great. On the issue of its third number, it had four hundred subscribers. It will be an efficient agent in the good cause.—There are now five daily, and twenty weekly papers supporting Van Buren and Adams in this State. This list does not include any of the whig papers who refuse to support Taylor, but who have not yet declared in favor of Van Buren. Of course, their influence is in our favor. We believe the daily Van Buren papers are as numerous as those for Cass.—*Cin. Herald.*

"This is an age of evocation in medicine, sure enough!" said Mrs. Partington, as she glanced at the column of new and remarkable specifics; "why will people run after metaphysics and them nostrums, when by taking some simple purgatory they can get well so soon? It's all nonsense, it is, and if people instead of dosing themselves with calumny and bitters, would only take exercise and air a little more and wash themselves with care and a crash towel, they would be all the better for it." She said this on her own experience. As for "diet drink" and summer beverages, Mrs. P. is high, she is.

We are happy to understand, by private letters, that Gen. Cass firmly stands to the ground which he has taken. Being applied to formally by a man or two of the Wilmot Proviso stamp, he declared unhesitatingly that he adhered to the Nicholson letter and to the Baltimore platform, and that if elected President he WOULD VETO THE WILMOT PROVISO.—*Washington Union.*

THE WISCONSIN BARNBURNER.—This is the title of a neat little paper published at Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Mr. Booth is its editor. Wisconsin is declared to be certain for Van Buren and Adams.

Cass in the South.

A remark of Senator Foote, of Mississippi, in the *Oregon Bill*, with respect to the success of Gen. Cass being hazarded by its passage, having been misapprehended, that gentleman appears in the *Wilson* in an explanatory letter. After giving a history of the struggle on the Oregon Bill, he concludes as follows:

If any are disposed to conjecture that the last scene in the *Senate* about the enfeoffment of our ticket in the South, let me assure them that never have I seen such signs of concord and brotherly love among Democrats from the North, South, East and West, (with very slight exceptions, indeed) as those some closing scenes unfolded. I may go farther, and declare, as I did by their express authority, on last Wednesday, in Virginia, that distinguished Democratic leaders from the South, heretofore lukewarm or hostile to our ticket, encouraged by the assurances given that Northern Democrats will hereafter concur and co-operate with Southern Democrats and Southern Whigs in bringing about a fair equitable compromise of the territorial question. Will now support our nominees cordially, actively, and to the end. I could go yet farther, and state what I personally know to be actually true—the Southern Whigs, as leading and influential men as in the whole South, seeing the united and unanimous opposition of Northern Whigs in Congress, to the extraordinary indications now disclosing themselves, of a general disposition among the Whigs of the North to fraternize with the Barnburners in support of Mr. Van Buren and Adams—perceiving, as all discerning men must now at last perceive, that General Taylor has really no strength anywhere, and that the only hope of defeating the abolition ticket of Buffalo, and thus securing the safety of the South and the integrity of the Union, lies in the success of the Democratic ticket, not in its *not* being voted a strong, doubt whether it is not their duty, as true patriots and Southern men, to come with all their weight and influence to the support of Cass and Butler. I speak not hastily on this point; and those who receive this suggestion lightly, will in a very short time find it made good, and even transcended, by actual facts."

Gen. Cass is relied on then, it will be seen, at the South, as their best security, in extending slavery, and according to Mr. Foote's own declaration the choice is between Cass, the slavery-extensionist, and Van Buren, the free soil nominee. We trust that free soil men who now support Cass or Taylor will bear this in mind and act accordingly. Cass or Van Buren—which will you choose?—*Ohio Standard.*

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 Tipppecanoe Co.
JOHN H. BRADLEY, of Bartholomew Co.

CONTINGENT SENATORIAL ELECTORS.
E. DEMING, of Tipppecanoe Co.
S. S. HARDING, of Ripley Co.

District Electors.

1st Dist.—NATHAN LITTLE,
2d " JAMES R. CRAVENS, of Jefferson Co.
3d " JAMES H. CRAVENS, of Ripley Co.
4th " GEO. W. JULIAN, of Wayne Co.
5th " OREN BUTLER, of Marion.
6th " MILTON SHOTT, of Lawrence Co.
7th " ALBERT G. COFFIN, of Parke Co.
8th " SAMUEL A. HUFF, of Tipppecanoe Co.
9th " JOSEPH L. JERNIGAN, of St. Joseph, Co.

CONTINGENT DISTRICT ELECTORS.
2d District—John Brazzelton.
3d " John P. Milliken.
5th " J. H. Jordan.
6th " E. J. Sumner.
7th " Abiahthor Crane.
9th " John U. Pettit.
10th " Daniel Worth.

State Central Committee.

1st Dist.—O. SHELMAN.
2d " R. E. STRATTON.
3d " JOHN P. MILLIKIN.
4th " R. M. COOPER.
5th " CALVIN FLETCHER, A. A. ACKLEY, B.
S. NORBLE, J. H. JORDAN, JAMES SUL-
GROVE, PHILIP SPONABLE.
6th " W. JUDAH.
7th " L. JESSE.
8th " J. B. McFARLAND.
9th " R. FABER.

Free Soil Platform.

No more Slave Territory
No interference with Slavery in States where it
now exists.
Cheap Postage for the people.
Retrenchment of the expenses of Government.
Abolition of all unnecessary offices and Salaries.
The election of all Civil Officers of the Government, so far as practicable, by the people.
Provision by the Government for such River and Harbor improvements as are required for the safety and convenience of Commerce, with Foreign Nations or among the several States.
Free grant, to actual settlers, of the Public Lands, in limited quantities.
Revenue Tariff sufficient to defray the expenses of Government, and pay annual instalments, together with the interest on the National debt.

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 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 16th at Greencastle.
On the 18th at Crawfordsville.
On the 19th at Frankfort.
On the 20th at Lebanon.
On the 21st at Noblesville.
On the 23d at Greenfield.
On the 24th at Knobsville.
On the 25th at Russellville.
On the 26th at Louisville.
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 22, 1848.

We call the attention of our readers to the advertisement of Messrs. Beck and Tully. We are glad to hear that their beautiful hats and caps go off with a rash.

We publish to-day a condensed account of the great Clay meeting in New York city.

The smothered indignation of the masses at the suicidal course of the Philadelphia Mob is beginning to be seen. What will be the result?

A pamphlet containing the decisions of our Supreme Court, reported by H. C. Newcombe, Esqr., is upon our table. The members of the bar have long felt the want of such a work in advance of Blackford's regular Reports. We hope Mr. Newcombe will meet with sufficient encouragement to induce him to continue the reports at terms hereafter.

General Taylor's opinions appear harder to find than were the Seminoles in the everglades of Florida. What says our Rough and Ready Club to sending a few of the hounds to hunt them up.

Robert Dale Owen's Speech.

On Tuesday of last week, we heard a speech from this gentleman, at a meeting of the Democracy of this city. Mr. Owen is plausible in his arguments, and is an effective speaker. Much as we differ with him in many of his positions, we cannot but admire his ingenuity, and the apparent fairness with which he presented the position of parties and their candidates. He spoke of Taylor and Cass as honorable, high-minded men. Mr. Van Buren, he said, was a man he had always respected, and thought his present course dictated by honest but misguided motive. We record this as being different from the usual course of stump orators, and creditable alike to the head and heart of the speaker. Mr. Owen considered the old issues between the Whig and Democratic parties, as matters now settled, and about which there could at this time be no further quarrel. He took up a considerable portion of time in vindicating the position of the Democratic party on the war, and the annexation of Texas. The position of Gen. Taylor in reference to the Indiana volunteers, was then subjected to a full investigation, and the documentary evidence to sustain the charge of injustice produced. Mr. Owen went into very lengthy legal argument to show that slavery was an institution created by operation of law alone, which we of the North are all willing to admit.

According to Mr. Owen, the argument in favor of the position of Gen. Cass stands thus: He is pledged to veto any bill either for or against the extension of slavery, from the fact that he supposes such legislation to be unconstitutional. If Congress should pass a bill extending slavery, it would not meet his sanction, while on the other hand, all is safe from the fact that the territory is now free, and must so remain until the contrary is established by positive legal enactment. The rejection of the restriction contained in the Wilmot Proviso, will cause the same numbers to spread over greater territory, says Mr. Cass. The rejection of the restriction will cause slavery to remain where it is, says Mr. Owen. When such doctors disagree, whose version shall we take? We think that the very fact of such disagreement, a sufficient ground for having the matter settled by positive enactment of Congress.

It is strange that in a speech of three hours length, Mr. Owen should have entirely forgotten to state this difference of opinion, or to give us one word in relation to the "diffusion" doctrines of his candidate.

The South.

The public presses of both the old parties are pursuing a most traitorous policy toward the people of Indiana. Instead of sounding the alarm awakening public attention to the proceedings of the Slaveocracy of the South, they are singing a song calculated to lull the people to a repose, at once dangerous and impolitic.

Indeed, thousands in the North have already gone to sleep in imaginary security. Never was inactivity on their part more inopportune. While they are quietly chattering over the news of their neighborhood, the slavery extensionists in the South are putting forth the most desperate exertions to secure to themselves the broad, fertile valleys of our new territories. That we may not be considered as alarmists, we publish the remarks on the resolutions adopted at a new Democratic Taylor meeting, held at Charleston, S. C., given by the Charleston News:

"The preamble and resolutions throughout, breathe the proper spirit. They adopt the views of Mr. Calhoun, and carry them out with decided strength. Recognizing the vital principle, that which is essential to our Union, and without which it cannot exist, that 'Southern men must feel a stronger affinity to each other, than to the citizens of the non-slaveholding States, no matter to which party they may belong.' These resolutions strongly urge the necessity of *union* of the South for the sake of the South. ON THIS GROUND DO THEY URGE THE NOMINATION OF GEN. TAYLOR.

"The North has selected its man, (Van Buren,) and with no other man will that portion of the Union be satisfied, unless he comes from the North. We of the South, if indeed we go for the South, must go for the man of the South. Let those who denounce us as Whigs, because we support Gen. Taylor, denounce Mr. Calhoun who has intermixed with Mr. Berrien, and Mr. Butler, who has fraternized with Mr. Mangum. We have no doubt that the preamble and resolutions, when published, will exhibit the resolutions of Gen. Taylor in that light which reveals their true position. They go for the South, and FOR GEN. TAYLOR, BECAUSE HE IS THE MAN OF THE SOUTH."

The same paper describes the meeting at which the resolutions above spoken were passed, as "large and enthusiastic."

With such evidence of a Southern movement, and extreme ultra Southern feeling, how can the North throw away the power which their majority give them, upon Cass or Taylor?

In a letter to the Central Committee Lewis Beecher asks the withdrawal of his name from the Free Soil Electoral ticket. Mr. Beecher states that the Convention was misinformed as to position he occupied, as he always expressed himself favorable to the Baltimore nominees. The vacancy will be filled and announced next week.

The present "Free Soil" organization originated with the old corrupt Albany Regency. Whigs, beware! There can nothing good come out of any thing having paternity there!—Journal.

This is not the first time that corrupt leaders have found fault with "paternity." Some of the same "stripe," about 1300 years ago objecting to certain doctrines, and their teacher said, "nothing good can come out of Nazareth."

Gov. Letcher of Kentucky—His Speech.

Some days ago this gentleman addressed the Whigs of this city. Like most other speakers of the Old Hunker party, he was fierce in his denunciations against the Free Soil candidate. The Governor could not give Martin Van Buren credit for a single honest motive. When we hear such speeches, we always feel irresistably inclined to doubt the nicety in morals of the orator. There is something about human nature that leads men to form opinions of the motives of others, from the feelings that under similar circumstances moves their own minds. Hence we see truly honorable men always willing to believe good action, until the contrary is shown, to have proceeded from honest motive; while others looking to the same index, come to directly opposite conclusions. The charge that Mr. Van Buren is prompted by impure motives to assume the position he now occupies, is very easily made, and one we care very little about. When men admit that our position is right, and have in order to find any fault to impugn the motive that prompted to good deeds, we think we are doing well.

The Governor attempted to show that Gen. Taylor, from the position he occupied relative to the use of the veto power, was just the man to insure the success of the Free Soil movement, and to prevent any more slave territory from becoming attached to our country, simply because he would let the people do as they pleased about the matter. To prove this, his Aliens letter was referred to. This position will briefly review. 1st. Is Gen. Taylor, taking that letter as our guide, opposed to the veto power, or its use? He evidently considers the veto as a necessary power. He pronounces it a high conservative power, that is, a power to preserve the people from their own action, and believing this, he thinks it should be used in certain cases. He declares that it should not be used except in cases of clear violation of the constitution, or hasty legislation. The inference is that it should be used in the cases pointed out by his exceptions. But what is hasty legislation? What fixed laws have we for determining? Congress has created some rules on that subject. They have declared that no bill shall be passed until read three different times and on different days, and this and other regulations have been adopted for the purpose of preventing hasty legislation. But Gen. Taylor assumes it to be the right of the executive, to say independent of these rules, how fast or how slow Congress shall proceed in their legislative deliberations. Truly we think there is great latitude given the executive in this position. Do the Cassites claim more? Ask them—Has ever so much been claimed by any of our Presidents?

But again. It is stated in the letter that the General thinks that in matters of "domestic policy," the will of the people should be respected, and from this, it is assumed by the Governor, that in any case fixing such policy he would not use the veto. To get a fair understanding of the letter it must be taken connectedly. The grand proposition is, that the veto should not be used except in certain events; the minor one, that the will of the people should be respected in matters of domestic policy. What is the common sense inference drawn? Certainly that on questions of "domestic policy," the will of the people as expressed by their Representatives should prevail, except in such cases as are limited by the general proposition.

But again. It is stated in the letter that the General thinks that in matters of "domestic policy," the will of the people should be respected, and from this, it is assumed by the Governor, that in any case fixing such policy he would not use the veto. To get a fair understanding of the letter it must be taken connectedly. The grand proposition is, that the veto should not be used except in certain events; the minor one, that the will of the people should be respected in matters of domestic policy.

What is the common sense inference drawn? Certainly that on questions of "domestic policy," the will of the people as expressed by their Representatives should prevail, except in such cases as are limited by the general proposition.

But again. It is stated in the letter that the General thinks that in matters of "domestic policy," the will of the people should be respected, and from this, it is assumed by the Governor, that in any case fixing such policy he would not use the veto. To get a fair understanding of the letter it must be taken connectedly. The grand proposition is, that the veto should not be used except in certain events; the minor one, that the will of the people should be respected in matters of domestic policy.

What is the common sense inference drawn? Certainly that on questions of "domestic policy," the will of the people as expressed by their Representatives should prevail, except in such cases as are limited by the general proposition.

But again. It is stated in the letter that the General thinks that in matters of "domestic policy," the will of the people should be respected, and from this, it is assumed by the Governor, that in any case fixing such policy he would not use the veto. To get a fair understanding of the letter it must be taken connectedly. The grand proposition is, that the veto should not be used except in certain events; the minor one, that the will of the people should be respected in matters of domestic policy.

What is the common sense inference drawn? Certainly that on questions of "domestic policy," the will of the people as expressed by their Representatives should prevail, except in such cases as are limited by the general proposition.

But again. It is stated in the letter that the General thinks that in matters of "domestic policy," the will of the people should be respected, and from this, it is assumed by the Governor, that in any case fixing such policy he would not use the veto. To get a fair understanding of the letter it must be taken connectedly. The grand proposition is, that the veto should not be used except in certain events; the minor one, that the will of the people should be respected in matters of domestic policy.

What is the common sense inference drawn? Certainly that on questions of "domestic policy," the will of the people as expressed by their Representatives should prevail, except in such cases as are limited by the general proposition.

But again. It is stated in the letter that the General thinks that in matters of "domestic policy," the will of the people should be respected, and from this, it is assumed by the Governor, that in any case fixing such policy he would not use the veto. To get a fair understanding of the letter it must be taken connectedly. The grand proposition is, that the veto should not be used except in certain events; the minor one, that the will of the people should be respected in matters of domestic policy.

What is the common sense inference drawn? Certainly that on questions of "domestic policy," the will of the people as expressed by their Representatives should prevail, except in such cases as are limited by the general proposition.

But again. It is stated in the letter that the General thinks that in matters of "domestic policy," the will of the people should be respected, and from this, it is assumed by the Governor, that in any case fixing such policy he would not use the veto. To get a fair understanding of the letter it must be taken connectedly. The grand proposition is, that the veto should not be used except in certain events; the minor one, that the will of the people should be respected in matters of domestic policy.

What is the common sense inference drawn? Certainly that on questions of "domestic policy," the will of the people as expressed by their Representatives should prevail, except in such cases as are limited by the general proposition.

But again. It is stated in the letter that the General thinks that in matters of "domestic policy," the will of the people should be respected, and from this, it is assumed by the Governor, that in any case fixing such policy he would not use the veto. To get a fair understanding of the letter it must be taken connectedly. The grand proposition is, that the veto should not be used except in certain events; the minor one, that the will of the people should be respected in matters of domestic policy.

What is the common sense inference drawn? Certainly that on questions of "domestic policy," the will of the people as expressed by their Representatives should prevail, except in such cases as are limited by the general proposition.

But again. It is stated in the letter that the General thinks that in matters of "domestic policy," the will of the people should be respected, and from this, it is assumed by the Governor, that in any case fixing such policy he would not use the veto. To get a fair understanding of the letter it must be taken connectedly. The grand proposition is, that the veto should not be used except in certain events; the minor one, that the will of the people should be respected in matters of domestic policy.

What is the common sense inference drawn? Certainly that on questions of "domestic policy," the will of the people as expressed by their Representatives should prevail, except in such cases as are limited by the general proposition.

But again. It is stated in the letter that the General thinks that in matters of "domestic policy," the will of the people should be respected, and from this, it is assumed by the Governor, that in any case fixing such policy he would not use the veto. To get a fair understanding of the letter it must be taken connectedly. The grand proposition is, that the veto should not be used except in certain events; the minor one, that the will of the people should be respected in matters of domestic policy.

What is the common sense inference drawn? Certainly that on questions of "domestic policy," the will of the people as expressed by their Representatives should prevail, except in such cases as are limited by the general proposition.

But again. It is stated in the letter that the General thinks that in matters of "domestic policy," the will of the people should be respected, and from this, it is assumed by the Governor, that in any case fixing such policy he would not use the veto. To get a fair understanding of the letter it must be taken connectedly. The grand proposition is, that the veto should not be used except in certain events; the minor one, that the will of the people should be respected in matters of domestic policy.

What is the common sense inference drawn? Certainly that on questions of "domestic policy," the will of the people as expressed by their Representatives should prevail, except in such cases as are limited by the general proposition.

But again. It is stated in the letter that the General thinks that in matters of "domestic policy," the will of the people should be respected, and from this, it is assumed by the Governor, that in any case fixing such policy he would not use the veto. To get a fair understanding of the letter it must be taken connectedly. The grand proposition is, that the veto should not be used except in certain events; the minor one, that the will of the people should be respected in matters of domestic policy.

What is the common sense inference drawn? Certainly that on questions of "domestic policy," the will of the people as expressed by their Representatives should prevail, except in such cases as are limited by the general proposition.

But again. It is stated in the letter that the General thinks that in matters of "domestic policy," the will of the people should be respected, and from this, it is assumed by the Governor, that in any case fixing such policy he would not use the veto. To get a fair understanding of the letter it must be taken connectedly. The grand proposition is, that the veto should not be used except in certain events; the minor one, that the will of the people should be respected in matters of domestic policy.

What is the common sense inference drawn? Certainly that on questions of "domestic policy," the will of the people as expressed by their Representatives should prevail, except in such cases as are limited by the general proposition.

But again. It is stated in the letter that the General thinks that in matters of "domestic policy," the will of the people should be respected, and from this, it is assumed by the Governor, that in any case fixing such policy he would not use the veto. To get a fair understanding of the letter it must be taken connectedly. The grand proposition is, that the veto should not be used except in certain events; the minor one, that the will of the people should be respected in matters of domestic policy.

What is the common sense inference drawn? Certainly that on questions of "domestic policy," the will of the people as expressed by their Representatives should prevail, except in such cases as are limited by the general proposition.

But again. It is stated in the letter that the General thinks that in matters of "domestic policy," the will of the people should be respected, and from this, it is assumed by the Governor, that in any case fixing such policy he would not use the veto. To get a fair understanding of the letter it must be taken connectedly. The grand proposition is, that the veto should not be used except in certain events; the minor one, that the will of the people should be respected in matters of domestic policy.

What is the common sense inference drawn? Certainly that on questions of "domestic policy," the will of the people as expressed by their Representatives should prevail, except in such cases as are limited by the general proposition.

Drive back the man of toil, who knows and feels that he is a freeman, whose production is substantial, whose wealth was not born on credit and begot by mortgages, and let in the slaveholder in his Southwestern tramp to wealth, with bankruptcy, repudiation, vice, amalgamation, idleness, pride, and fear of poverty to ply the lash and wring from the bondsman at once his livelihood and his ruin! And yet, these are the men who have the effrontery to talk about the "mean social privileges" of the negro in the North, and complain of the "gratuitous malevolence of those who wish to force local laws on a *free people*" in the territories! Is it, indeed, a wonder that the North is exasperated? No feeling but terror, and hope almost against despair is appropriate, when the full crater in the old States is pouring its scalding tide over territory after territory to the Southwest—more terrific than the flames of war, which threatens to consume the Constitution, to desolate the fairest half of our continent, and blast the prosperity of its population for a hundred years to come.

Let us, then, calmly, and yet with boldness, rescue this wide and fair domain from bankruptcy, from lethargy and oppression, which we have so recently snatched from the hands of Anarchy. But the crowning argument of the whole is, that the free soil movement fastens slavery forever on the old States. Can the mere removal of it lessen the evil, or mitigate the curse? No; it only spreads and strengthens it. As well say that the Atlantic slope would now contain the wealth of the Union as it is, had the man of enterprise never ventured in, occupied, and blessed with the hand of culture the rich empire of the Mississippi Valley. Who doubts that the older States are more populous, more prosperous, more enterprising, more powerful, from the very fact of the settlement of the West?

Then stop your clamor about the extension of slavery thinning, weakening, and finally doing away with it. It seems that the Hand of the Almighty has quenched the conflagration of war, which had glared on the pinnacles of the Cordilleras and swept to the falling Metropolis of Mexico, by the addition of free territory, to fence in forever the progress of that power for which all this drama of blood has been enacted. There is a question behind the constitutionality of legislation on this subject; but when did humanity weigh a feather when interest or pride lay in the opposing scale?

The following statistics show the comparative growth of two States, whose natural advantages are about equal:

MISSOURI—Slave State.	ILLINOIS—Free State.
In 1830, Population, 77,182.	In 1820, 55,211
In 1844, 528,383.	In 1844, 662,125

In Missouri, of these seventy-one thousand four hundred are slaves.

Twenty-eight years ago, Missouri contained 21,971 more people than Illinois—four years ago, slaves and all, 133,743 less.

Doubtless the framers of the Constitution never contemplated such alarming prosperity as this on free soil, or they would have checked it by some positive enactment in favor of the extension of slavery.

CANDOUR.

The old Hunker whig presses still stick to it that Mr. Delano of Ohio is out making speeches in favor of Gen. Taylor. There has been quite a chuckling over the matter since it was announced that he was to stump the State in company with Mr. Corwin. We give below a letter in which Mr. Delano defines his position—We take it from the *True Democrat*.

MT. VERNON, O., Aug. 25, '48.
THOS. BROWN, Esq., Cleveland, O.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of the 15th inst., came to hand during my absence from home, on a journey to Cincinnati. I have just returned and hasten to answer.

You are aware of the object of my visit to Cleveland, during or immediately preceding the Buffalo convention. I could not, without gross neglect of duty to others, omit the business in which I was then, and am still engaged.

I have never hesitated in my own mind as to the dictate of duty in regard to Gen. Taylor's nomination for the Presidency.

I cannot vote for him, and shall not ask others to do so while he occupies before the world his present position in regard to certain measures which I have always regarded as cardinal in the creed of northern whigs.

At Columbus last winter, I expressed a willingness to assist, if I could, General Ford's election. So I feel now, and I am ready to redeem the pledge there given.

The State Central Committee, judging me correctly in this regard, made the announcement in the Journal without consulting me.

I am ready to comply as far as business engagements before me contracted will permit, provided by doing so I can advance the cause of Gen. Ford, and be guilty of no deception in word or deed.

This, my dear sir, is my position in regard to the appointments.

I do not like Van Buren. I can forget most of my objections to him, but I cannot forget that himself and friends have given countenance and support to this accursed war—the bitter, *bitter* fruits of which we are now tasting, and I fear only beginning to taste. Nevertheless, I know, at least I feel, that upon the preservation of the Free Soil movement every thing depends,

and its success ought to be paramount to all other considerations.

If objections to Van Buren drive men back to Cass and Taylor, and thus break down the cause of freedom, slavery will certainly be carried back into California and New Mexico, and the South having triumphed, will involve us in war for more Southern territory, as soon as they can use another slice.

If we convince the South that all future acquired territory must be free, we shall have no more war of conquest begun by the usurpations of the President, or by the declaration of Congress, for many years at least. If the Free Soil movement is now crushed, I fear that it cannot soon be revived. My feelings, therefore, are all engaged in its success. I consider it the cause of truth and justice, and the cause which carried out to success, will most certainly secure the future happiness and prosperity of our country.

One word as to myself. I have felt that if I took a prominent part in the movement against the Philadelphia nomination, I should be accused of being moved to do so on account of my defeat before the convention last winter. I have, therefore, avoided all speeches away from home. Here I have made three, in all of which I have opposed Taylor, and therefore among my neighbors I am well understood.

I have also avoided any publication that would give to the world my reasons for opposing Taylor. In all this I begin to fear that I have erred, and that it would have been better to have said all that my heart felt. But in doing as I have done I have avoided all concealments. Every body knows, who knows me, that I cannot support Taylor, though some Taylor men have attempted to convey a different impression. I have in this letter attempted to tell you my exact opinions, so far as the limits of a single sheet will permit.

This letter is not written for publication—nor is it private or confidential. I wish every man in the State understood me exactly.

Truly and Respectfully
C. DELANO.

From the Rochester Daily Advertiser.
Van Buren's Casting Vote.

Among all the bare-faced calumnies that party has resorted to, to malign Mr. Van Buren, no one is characterized by a more shameless disregard to truth and manly fairness, than the casting vote Mr. Van Buren is charged with having given, as Vice President, in the United States Senate, on the bill "authorising the Post-masters to search the mails, and throw out postal and incendiary matter."

All who recollect the state of southern feeling on the subject of circulating, what was termed, inflammatory publications, calculated to excite a servile war between the slaves and their masters, in the South, cannot forget the high state of excitement that pervaded the entire South upon this subject, and the only part Mr. Van Buren took in the legislation growing out of this excitement.

Our attention has just been called to a letter of the Hon. Seth M. Gates, a highly respected Whig, and at that time a member of Congress from Western New York, giving a history of the bill, and most triumphantly vindicating Mr. Van Buren from the foul libel—from which letter we are indebted for our extracts :

"December 21, 1835, Mr. Calhoun made a motion in the Senate that so much of the President's (Jackson's) message as relates to the transmission of incendiary publications by the United States Mails, be referred to a Special Committee. The propriety of a reference to the standing Committee on Post-offices and Post-roads, or to a Special Committee, was debated at considerable length, and seems to have been decided in favor of a Special Committee, principally for the following reasons, as signed by Senator Davis, of Massachusetts, who was a member of the Standing Committee, and who said:—'Looking at the motion rather as a matter of *courtesy*, than in any other light, he for one, would be glad to send it to a Special Committee; because it was desired by the gentlemen from that section of the country should present to the Senate their views—southern gentlemen certainly best knew their own embarrassments in relation to this matter. It seems not only *courteous* but *parliamentary*, that those who are most vitally interested, should first present us with their views.'

The following is the conclusion of Mr. Gates's letter :

"Even Gen. Cass acknowledges that there have been great changes going on in the public mind, and I fancy it will appear in the sequel that most of the changes have been less like Lucifer's than his. I have opposed Mr. Van Buren nearly all my life, but as I regard the question of non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-engrossing subject of the present campaign; as I find both the other candidates beyond the possibility of a doubt, unyieldingly opposed to Free Territory; and as Mr. Van Buren has always been right and consistent in regard to annexation and the non-extension of slavery—Free Soil—the all-eng

The Claims of Gen. Taylor.

Mr. EDITOR: Having in my former article presented some of the considerations which justify Whigs in withholding their support from Gen. Taylor, on the score of his being merely a military chieftain, I now proceed to notice, in the order of my arrangement, the second main objection, which applies, of course, only to Northern Whigs. This objection is politically speaking, that Gen. Taylor is in the hands of the South, and the undoubted exponent of Southern, in opposition to Northern policy and interest. A glance at the evidence by which the truth of this proposition is tested, cannot fail to satisfy the mind of any intelligent and candid inquirer. In the first place, Gen. Taylor is both personally and politically identified with the "peculiar institution," and has been for a long series of years. "By birth, education, and association," he is entitled to be styled emphatically *Southern* man. He has been reared, and has spent the greater part of his life, in the midst of those influences which make Southern politicians believe slavery is a political blessing, and Southern divines teach that Christianity does not regard it as a moral evil. He is associated by the strongest political and social ties with a community of people who hold, with great unanimity and without distinction of party, that Congress has no power over the subject of slavery, either in the States, or in interfering with its establishment in the Territories belonging to the Union; and that, if such power existed, it would be impolitic and unjust to exercise it. The obvious and natural inference to be drawn from these circumstances is, that Gen. Taylor is a Southern man in his feelings, opinions, prejudices, and principles. Any other supposition, though by possibility it might be true, is unnatural and unwarranted. Having about him the frailties of our nature, it is not to be expected that his mind has been proof against those influences which have distorted the intellects and perverted the moral principles of the greatest and best spirits of the South.

In the next place, Gen. Taylor, in the Philadelphia Convention, on every balloting, received the vote of every Southern delegate, with perhaps one or two exceptions from the State of Delaware. Should to shoulder did his Southern friends come up to his rescue; and their devotion to him could only find a parallel in their avowed and uncompromising hostility to the principles of the Wilmot Proviso. They went to the Convention just as any other Southern politicians would have done, with the love of their peculiar institutions burning warm in their hearts, notwithstanding all this, are telling their readers that General Taylor is in favor of extending the Ordinance of 1787 over our National Territories, and is, of course, a Wilmot Proviso man of the very first order! And they attempt to make out their case by the most shameless perversion of his "Signal Letter," by like perversions of his opinions of the veto power, and by assertions that *third persons* have the most positive pledges from Gen. Taylor himself. They know they are attempting to palm a fraud upon the People, and they should be compelled to answer for it at the bar of an offended and indignant public opinion. Political profligacy and recklessness in a public man are more detestable than licentiousness and meanness in private life.

But I am told that either Gen. Cass or Gen. Taylor will certainly be elected; and that, as the election of the latter would be the less evil of the two, Northern Whigs ought, on this ground, to give him their support. Granting the truth of these premises for the sake of argument, I deny that even the alleged conclusion would follow. I admit, that, in a certain sense, and to a certain extent, it is right to choose between evils. In filling all the offices of the country, for instance, we should endeavor to select those who are least objectionable, or, in other words, who are best fitted for their several trusts. There is this limitation, however—that in doing this we should never compromise a great and fundamental principle, or place ourselves in the attitude of doing evil that good may come. For example: If I should vote for Gen. Taylor, I should feel that I was helping to plant the curse of slavery in vast regions now free, and over unborn millions of my fellow-beings, who might be deprived (in part by my agency) of those natural and unalienable rights, without which existence itself is a calamity. I cannot for a moment think of participating in an act so signally wicked, infamous, and Heaven-daring. Nor is the question of duty in the smallest degree changed by asserting that the leaders of parties have placed the country in a predicament out of which the apprehended evil will necessarily proceed, in spite of my exertions. I did not assist in bringing upon the country so unhappy a state of things, and "touch not, taste not, handle not," must be my motto. Neither could I plead, in justification of an act so high-handed, that I meant, in committing it, to avert some comparatively trifling evils, or even some unimportant political advantages to the country. I have no right to determine a question of duty by looking solely to the imagined consequences of an act; nor have I any right to look to the consequences at all, in a case where the question of duty is clear. As we possess not the gift of foreknowledge, and cannot therefore determine all the consequences of an action, immediate

Whigs of the North, we find even the special friends and admirers of John C. Calhoun, whose sensitiveness on the subject of slavery, and exclusive if not fanatical devotion to it, are matters of proverb throughout the nation. What does all this signify? When such men as Holmes, of South Carolina, make speeches in Congress in favor of Gen. Taylor, will Northern Whigs be so crazy as to believe he has any Northern blood in his veins? Circumstance, we are told, cannot lie. Those which I have here presented for the reader's consideration all point to one conclusion, harmonize with it, and are utterly irreconcilable with any other.

But we are told that General Taylor has pledged himself not to veto the will of Congress "on questions of domestic policy," and that therefore the North can have nothing to fear. Let us analyze this supposed crumb of comfort, and see what there is in it. I will suppose, (which is not so very improbable) that there will be sufficient number of "Doughfaces" in Congress to enable the South to carry a measure (say the extension of the Missouri Compromise line) protecting the rights of the slave holder in the territories we have acquired from Mexico. In this case, the act being clearly unconstitutional in the opinion of the Northern Whigs, we should want a President who would place his veto—his "high conservative power"—upon it. We should not desire the will of Congress to prevail in such a contingency. If it be said that Gen. Taylor's pledge must be understood in connection with the reservation he makes as to unconstitutional and hasty legislation, I reply, that, on the supposition I am now making, the South would hold that such a measure would be neither hasty or unconstitutional, but wise, salutary, and above all things to be desired; whilst the power of Congress to pass a law *absolutely prohibiting* the extension of slavery would for the same reason be denied. General Taylor, then, would unquestionably sanction such a measure as I have mentioned, and he would sanction it in accordance with those very principles which would compel him to veto the Wilmot Proviso, should Congress pass it. I see not what other conclusion men can come to, unless they suppose, gratuitously, and in the face of strong concurring presumptions to the contrary, that General Taylor is not a Southerner, and has, by some strange and mysterious process, hitherto unknown in our Government, completely emancipated himself from those influences which operate so omnipotently upon all other Southern politicians.— Yet the Whig papers of the North, notwithstanding all this, are telling their readers that General Taylor is in favor of extending the Ordinance of 1787 over our National Territories, and is, of course, a Wilmot Proviso man of the very first order! And they attempt to make out their case by the most shameless perversion of his "Signal Letter," by like perversions of his opinions of the veto power, and by assertions that *third persons* have the most positive pledges from Gen. Taylor himself.— They know they are attempting to palm a fraud upon the People, and they should be compelled to answer for it at the bar of an offended and indignant public opinion. Political profligacy and recklessness in a public man are more detestable than licentiousness and meanness in private life.

But I am told that either Gen. Cass or Gen. Taylor will certainly be elected; and that, as the election of the latter would be the less evil of the two, Northern Whigs ought, on this ground, to give him their support. Granting the truth of these premises for the sake of argument, I deny that even the alleged conclusion would follow. I admit, that, in a certain sense, and to a certain extent, it is right to choose between evils. In filling all the offices of the country, for instance, we should endeavor to select those who are least objectionable, or, in other words, who are best fitted for their several trusts. There is this limitation, however—that in doing this we should never compromise a great and fundamental principle, or place ourselves in the attitude of doing evil that good may come. For example: If I should vote for Gen. Taylor, I should feel that I was helping to plant the curse of slavery in vast regions now free, and over unborn millions of my fellow-beings, who might be deprived (in part by my agency) of those natural and unalienable rights, without which existence itself is a calamity. I cannot for a moment think of participating in an act so signally wicked, infamous, and Heaven-daring. Nor is the question of duty in the smallest degree changed by asserting that the leaders of parties have placed the country in a predicament out of which the apprehended evil will necessarily proceed, in spite of my exertions. I did not assist in bringing upon the country so unhappy a state of things, and "touch not, taste not, handle not," must be my motto. Neither could I plead, in justification of an act so high-handed, that I meant, in committing it, to avert some comparatively trifling evils, or even some unimportant political advantages to the country. I have no right to determine a question of duty by looking solely to the imagined consequences of an act; nor have I any right to look to the consequences at all, in a case where the question of duty is clear. As we possess not the gift of foreknowledge, and cannot therefore determine all the consequences of an action, immediate

and remote, direct and collateral, our Creator has wisely given us his *moral law* for our government; and he expects our obedience to it, not because we can in every case perceive the advantages of obedience, but because he has the power to command us as his subjects, and the wisdom to teach us what is best. Unless, therefore, we are moral atheists, unbelievers in the omnipotence of truth and virtue, we must suppose the moral world to be governed on such principles that every right act will have its appropriate effect and power, just as every drop of water goes to swell the bulk of the ocean; that an unsweaking compliance with the moral law can never go unrewarded or unattended, sooner or later, with the consequences of virtue created and diffused by its own example; in fine, that men, under the pretence of helping Providence avert particular evils, or of doing their country a great good, are never justified in trampling his law under foot.

These observations may help to meet an objection frequently urged by the friends of General Taylor against the course of those Whigs who cannot give him their support. It is said, "You cannot affect anything by your separate action. What can you accomplish by uniting with little factions here and there against the regular nominee? Wait till the public mind in the North is prepared; wait four years longer and we will be with you." My brothers, have you duly considered what you tell me? Have you taken a peep into the great future, so that you are prepared to decide that a movement in behalf of the just rights of the North can effect nothing? I believe the movement is a right movement. I believe it ought to have been made long ago; which not having been done, ought to be made *now*. And, as I believe in God, I believe it *will* effect something. It may not, it is true, elect a President who will be true to the rights of the North, but it will rouse the public mind, and the right kind of sentiments will germinate and take root in the heart of the free States. "Opinion is stronger than Kings;" and he must be shortsighted, indeed, who imagines every thing failure that may for the time be outvoted. Every reform must have a beginning; and the proper place of beginning is at the door of every man who sees that a reform is needed. Let it begin here; let men be true to their convictions; let the "little factions," scattered here and there through the North, be united and uncompromising, and the triumph of the cause will be as certain as fate. "One strong thing," says Carlyle, "I find, here below, the *just* thing, the *true* thing." This independent movement *cannot* fail, unless it should voluntarily abandon its purpose. Ought it to do this?— Ought we to fall into our old party traces, and wait four years longer for an uprising? By so doing, we should obviously postpone a Northern movement indefinitely. We should wait in vain for a spontaneous movement of the whole People. Reforms are not carried on after that fashion. Somebody must take the lead, and those who believe the movement called for, certainly cannot excuse themselves for keeping quiet, on the plea that the mass of the people of the North are not ready to co-operate with them. Every man ought to act out the principles which he believes to be right, leaving every other man to act as he may think proper. By pursuing a contrary policy, we become the slaves of party, and perpetuate the necessity of choosing between evils continually, by permitting party leaders to bring them upon the country, and exact from us our support of men unworthy of our suffrage.— On such principles, four years hence, or forty years hence, would find us using the same cowardly excuses for going with our party "one time more," and, in the meantime, the evil which timely action might have averted, would be fastened hopelessly upon the country. "Cease to do evil!" now should be the motto of Northern Whigs; and if we act it out, we *cannot* fail of accomplishing an ultimate good. We shall not lose our votes, even if our candidate is defeated; for, as has been well observed, those votes only are lost which we cast for men who are not entitled to receive them.

In reply to such reasoning, I frequently hear it said, "That is abolitionism." "Let him go, he has got to be a crazy abolitionist." Very convenient, I acknowledge, when better resources fail, to raise the old cry of "mad dog," and bolster up the weakness of a cause by the strength of a popular prejudice. But, I ask, is it abolitionism to oppose the further extension of slavery? Has not this doctrine been uncompromisingly adopted by the Whigs, in all the free States, in their primary meetings, through the press, and by legislative resolve? The doctrine has been, that we would see the Union itself dissolved before we would consent to the extension of Slavery a single inch beyond its present limits. If this is Abolitionism, then the Whigs of the North generally are Abolitionists. If it is not, then how can it be Abolitionism to carry the principle into practice, by refusing to support men for office, who will not pledge themselves in its favor? What is a principle worth, if men will not labor to carry it out? As to anti-Taylor men, this is the sum of their offending—that they wish to reduce their professions by practice, and thereby exhibit their consistency and sincerity. Suppose, however, the Wilmot Proviso is Abolition? Suppose that, after so long a time, a portion of the Whigs have endorsed a principle which forms a part of the creed of Liberty men. Ought we, for this reason to abandon it? Ought men to decline accepting a seat in the kingdom of Heaven, unless Abolitionists are to be excluded?

But we are told by the Whig papers, from the least to the greatest, that the Philadelphia Convention having nominated General Taylor, *submission in silence*, is now the duty of all Whigs. Let me examine this position for a moment. Individuals attach themselves to a party organization, because they believe, in so doing, they can best promote the prosperity of the country. Party is not an *end*, but

means, and every man's allegiance to it ceases, whenever it ceases to subserve the public good. Certainly, the allegiance which a man owes to his country for its protection and care over him, is not destroyed by his joining a political organization. His obligation to his country is still in force, though his party should go to pieces. Nor can party fealty dissolve any man's *moral* allegiance, or that tie which binds him to duty and to his Creator. As the citizen must not lose himself in the partizan so neither must the Christian lose himself in the citizen. There is a moral in every political duty. I am willing to acknowledge the *reasonable* claims of party; but its claims *must* be reasonable. I repudiate the idea that my right to think and act for myself on political matters is *utterly* gone, the moment my party shall issue its decree. To concede this, would be to subscribe to a system of Popery in politics, which makes every votary of it a slave. The idea of infidelity in any man or body of men has been abandoned in the Protestant Christian world, and ought to be abandoned in the political world. Shall I allow a set of men, mortals like myself, to say to me: "You are a Whig, and we have determined upon the course Whigs ought to pursue. We require you to vote for Gen. Taylor. You may think that in doing so you would be guilty of a moral wrong, and that your duty requires you to withhold your support from him. But we differ with you. Our party will be ruined unless Gen. Taylor is elected; and if you vote for him contrary to your own convictions of duty, we hereby absolve you from your allegiance to your country and your Creator, and will be answerable in your stead!" This is virtually the claim set up by the Whig party of 1848. Ought men who claim to be free submitt to it? Shall men who have their eyes fixed upon Duty, and who, in pursuit of it, have already abjured the tyranny of party, be driven back to its Devil worship by the cry of Abolitionism, or any other cry? If, through fear of public opinion, or dread of popular obloquy, we fail to do our duty, *can* we escape the responsibility by throwing it upon our party? Shall honest convictions be stifled, through lack of courage to stand by them and avow them, under whatever circumstances, in the good hope of ultimate triumph? I submit these questions to the judgments and consciences of the Whigs of the North.

A NORTHERN WHIG.

Our Prospects.

The present prospects of the Free Soil party are very far from being gloomy;— this may be proven in a very few words.

The politicians of 1844 well remember that the present incumbent of the presidential chair was elected by a plurality vote. Clay and Birney's majority over Polk exceeded 2500. The loss of this State, which gave Polk the small majority of 5000, would have elected the Whig candidate. In this State and Michigan, the Whig and Abolition vote overran the Democratic some 11,000; and in Indiana, 100 votes taken from the Democratic ranks, in addition to the Abolition, would have given the State to Mr. Clay. In Pennsylvania, a change of 1600 votes would have produced a like result.

These facts, when taken in connection with the present Free Soil movement, render it not at all improbable that the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Indiana, Wisconsin and Iowa, and perhaps Massachusetts, Connecticut and Ohio, will support either the Van Buren or the Taylor tickets. The free states cast 169 electoral votes—146 constitute a majority in the Electoral College. Eleven Northern States could elect Mr. Van Buren. The Democratic States number 111, and the Whig States 58 electoral votes. The popular majority for the former, after deducting the Abolition votes on both sides, scarcely exceeded 9000.

From a glance at these statistics, will not the impartial reader be led to conclude that the election will be decided by the House of Representatives, in which there is a decided anti-Cass majority, both of members and States?

Are not the prospects of the Free Soil party most cheering, when we reflect that a few short months have averted, would be fastened hopelessly upon the country.

These facts, when taken in connection with the present Free Soil movement, render it not at all improbable that the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Indiana, Wisconsin and Iowa, and perhaps Massachusetts, Connecticut and Ohio, will support either the Van Buren or the Taylor tickets. The free states cast 169 electoral votes—146 constitute a majority in the Electoral College. Eleven Northern States could elect Mr. Van Buren. The Democratic States number 111, and the Whig States 58 electoral votes. The popular majority for the former, after deducting the Abolition votes on both sides, scarcely exceeded 9000.

With a porch to each story, extending the entire length of the building, upon which a door opens from each room. The rooms are large and well ventilated, and the entire house is well protected from the sun by shade trees.

THREE STORY BRICK BUILDING,

INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA.

The undersigned, who reside in the above house, have now prepared to accommodate all who may favor him with their custom.

The above house, which has been recently built by R. B. Duncan, of the City of Indianapolis, is situated in said City, a few rods east of the Depot of the Madison and Indianapolis Rail Road Company, upon one of the most beautiful and healthy sites in the City; is a large and commodious

THREE STORY BRICK BUILDING,

INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA.

The undersigned, who reside in the above house, have now prepared to accommodate all who may favor him with their custom.

The above house, which has been recently built by R. B. Duncan, of the City of Indianapolis, is situated in said City, a few rods east of the Depot of the Madison and Indianapolis Rail Road Company, upon one of the most beautiful and healthy sites in the City; is a large and commodious

THREE STORY BRICK BUILDING,

INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA.

The undersigned, who reside in the above house, have now prepared to accommodate all who may favor him with their custom.

The above house, which has been recently built by R. B. Duncan, of the City of Indianapolis, is situated in said City, a few rods east of the Depot of the Madison and Indianapolis Rail Road Company, upon one of the most beautiful and healthy sites in the City; is a large and commodious

THREE STORY BRICK BUILDING,

INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA.

The undersigned, who reside in the above house, have now prepared to accommodate all who may favor him with their custom.

The above house, which has been recently built by R. B. Duncan, of the City of Indianapolis, is situated in said City, a few rods east of the Depot of the Madison and Indianapolis Rail Road Company, upon one of the most beautiful and healthy sites in the City; is a large and commodious

THREE STORY BRICK BUILDING,

INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA.

The undersigned, who reside in the above house, have now prepared to accommodate all who may favor him with their custom.

The above house, which has been recently built by R. B. Duncan, of the City of Indianapolis, is situated in said City, a few rods east of the Depot of the Madison and Indianapolis Rail Road Company, upon one of the most beautiful and healthy sites in the City; is a large and commodious

THREE STORY BRICK BUILDING,

INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA.

The undersigned, who reside in the above house, have now prepared to accommodate all who may favor him with their custom.

The above house, which has been recently built by R. B. Duncan, of the City of Indianapolis, is situated in said City, a few rods east of the Depot of the Madison and Indianapolis Rail Road Company, upon one of the most beautiful and healthy sites in the City; is a large and commodious

THREE STORY BRICK BUILDING,

INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA.

The undersigned, who reside in the above house, have now prepared to accommodate all who may favor him with their custom.

The above house, which has been recently built by R. B. Duncan, of the City of Indianapolis, is situated in said City, a few rods east of the Depot of the Madison and Indianapolis Rail Road Company, upon one of the most beautiful and healthy sites in the City; is a large and commodious

THREE STORY BRICK BUILDING,

INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA.

The undersigned, who reside in the above house, have now prepared to accommodate all who may favor him with their custom.

The above house, which has been recently built by R. B. Duncan, of the City of Indianapolis, is situated in said City, a few rods east of the Depot of the Madison and Indianapolis Rail Road Company, upon one of the most beautiful and healthy sites in the City; is a large and commodious

THREE STORY BRICK BUILDING,

INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA.

The undersigned, who reside in the above house, have now prepared to accommodate all who may favor him with their custom.

The above house, which has been recently built by R. B. Duncan, of the City of Indianapolis, is situated in said City, a few rods east of the Depot of the Madison and Indianapolis Rail Road Company, upon one of the most beautiful and healthy sites in the City; is a large and commodious

THREE STORY BRICK BUILDING,</p