

FREE SOIL BANNER.



FOR PRESIDENT.
MARTIN VAN BUREN,
OF NEW YORK.

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

Senatorial Electors.

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

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

District Electors.

1st Dist.—NATHAN LITTLE,
2d " JOHN R. CRAVENS, of Jefferson Co.
3d " JAMES H. CRAVENS, of Ripley Co.
4th " GEO. W. JULIAN, of Wayne Co.
5th " OTTO BUTLER, of Marion Co.
6th " MILTON SHORT, of Lawrence Co.
7th " ALBERT G. COFFIN, of Parke Co.
8th " SAMUEL A. HUFF, of Tippecanoe 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 " Abiathur Cline.
9th " John U. Pugh.
10th " Daniel Worth.

State Central Committee.

1st Dist.—O. SHELMAN.
2d " R. E. STRATTON.
3d " JOHN P. MILLIKEN.
4th " R. VAILE.
5th " CALVIN FLETCHER, A. A. ACKLEY, B. S. NOBLE, J. H. JORDAN, JAMES SUGGROVE, PHILIP SPONABLE.
6th " W. JORDAN.
7th " L. JESSUP.
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 all 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 Knightstown.
On the 25th at Rushville.
On the 26th at Shelbyville.
On the 27th at Ellettsburg.
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 rush.

☞ 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, Esq., 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 a 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 perfectly safe from the fact that the territory is now free, and must so remain until the contrary is established by positive legal enactment. Therefore the Wilmot Proviso is a humbug, it only prohibiting a thing already prohibited. That where a slave is taken into a territory, he instantly becomes free by virtue of the law. This is the substance of the argument; will it meet the end proposed, and prevent slavery from attaching to the territories? It is well known that a difference of opinion prevails in the North and South relative to the constitutional power of Congress. The South contend that under that instrument they have a right to emigrate to any part of our new domain, and to carry with them and hold there, their slaves. The whole Congressional delegation from the South, able statesmen and some of them distinguished jurists, state this as their right, and believe it the law of the land. Will they not thus believing, emigrate to New Mexico and other portions and carry with them their slaves and thus establish slavery there, notwithstanding the declarations of the North that they have no right to do so? Slavery would most certainly be introduced into those portions contiguous to slaveholding States, and once introduced, owing to the repugnance of Northern men to interfere with vested rights, the evil will be fixed beyond a remedy. The very fact that there is a wide difference of opinion in the two great portions of our country, in relation to the legal rights of the slaveholder, is a powerful reason for the passage of a bill, declaring what the law is and shall be; once pass such a bill, and the question from that moment is settled beyond a controversy. It is the settlement of the question that the South fights against. All that such men as Calhoun, Butler, and Berrien contend for, is to let things remain as they are.—That is all that the Southern slaveholders wish, in order to secure the extension of their peculiar institution. They know that if they once carry their slaves into the territories, and hold them there for some time, that then in the event of the North attempting to prevent the continuation of the evil, they could cry out that we were depriving them of rights that have been acquiesced in, and they would with great force bring up the fact that Congress refused to declare what the law was, as an argument to prove the position. But says Mr. Owen, if a slave is taken into the territory he instantly becomes free. How? By virtue of the law of the land. But there are two parties. The master says you are my slave. Who is to inform the ignorant degraded negro that the dicta of his master is not correct? What is the position in which he is situated? He has in the first place to become informed of the fact that his removal has made him a free man, and this when his master makes use of every means to prevent him. He must then employ counsel to litigate the matter for him before a court, the judges of which probably hold slaves in the same way that his master claims him—he has no property by means of which he can pay for legal assistance, he cannot even go to seek it without his master's permission, he cannot attend to the suit because his master claims his time and services. If he overcomes these difficulties and obtains a hearing, the probability is that the judgment would be against him, for we may very naturally suppose that from Cass's

cringing servility to the South, he would appoint such men as judges for the territories, as would be pleasing to them and hold their peculiar views of Southern rights, who believe that the slaveholder has the legal right under the Constitution to hold the slave in the territories.

But says one Cass man, he could appeal if the judgment went against him. That is a mistake. No case can be appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States, unless the amount in controversy exceeds two thousand dollars, and the negro himself is worth only half that amount. But suppose he had the right to appeal, who would go his security, pay his expenses to Washington City, and his counsel fee? The more we look at this matter the more we are satisfied that Gen. Cass is wrong, and the more fully convinced that no Free Soil man who understands his position will vote for him. We do not believe that Free Soil men will vote for a man holding the same views as Calhoun, Butler and Foote, on the subject of slavery.

But again, Mr. Owen and Mr. Cass themselves differ in regard to what the effect of the non-interference would be. Mr. Owen declares that slavery could not be introduced, while Mr. Cass holds that the opposite will be the case. In his Nicholson letter he says:

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

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 chatting 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 at 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 an other man will that portion of the Union be satisfied, unless he comes from the North. We of the South, if indeed we love 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 fraternized 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 advocates 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 anything having paternity there!—Journal.

This is not the first time that corrupt leaders have found fault with "paternity." Some of the same "stripes," about 1800 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 parties, 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 irresistibly 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 Alison letter was referred to. This position we 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. This must be what is intended; for if Congress should pass a bill regulating some of the domestic relations of the country, which clearly violated the constitution, would Gen. Taylor sign it? Certainly not, for he swears to support the constitution, and so long as the veto power remains he must prevent the violation of that sacred instrument. He cannot sign it without violating his oath of office. We say then that the minor declaration was intended to be limited by the general proposition.

The Governor assumes that Old Zack would not veto a bill preventing the extension of slavery into our new free territories, that being a matter of domestic policy. This is a mere assumption without any testimony going to show the truth of it. If a man is a member of a certain church, it is reasonable to suppose until the contrary is shown, that he believes the general doctrines of that church. Gen. Taylor is a Southern man and a slaveholder. Calhoun, Berrien, Mangum, and indeed all the Southern statesmen and lawyers, now hold that slaveholders have a right to migrate to our new territories, and to carry with them their slave property—to hold them as slaves in those territories, and that Congress has no constitutional power to interpose an interdict. Is it not reasonable to suppose, in the absence of all proof to the contrary, that Gen. Taylor holds the Southern doctrine? We think this conclusion that every reasonable man would come to. Can we suppose then, that he would sign a bill preventing his friends and himself, from doing what he thinks they have a

right to do, and which he supposed Congress had no constitutional power to prevent? We guess not. Where is there then, any safety for true Free Soil men, in adopting the advice of the Governor and elevating the old veteran to the Chief Magistracy. We are unable to find it, after looking calmly at the whole ground, and are forced to the conclusion that the Governor's argument in favor of *Free Soil and Taylor*, was an arrant political humbug.

Queries for Consideration.

FIRST.—If the Ordinance of 1787 consecrated the North-western territory to freedom, and prevented slavery from being fastened on it, what would be the effect of a similar ordinance in reference to our newly acquired territories?

SECOND.—If the Wilmot Proviso is, (as many assert,) a thing that can have no force, and only declares what the law *now* is, why do Southern slavery extensionists oppose it so vehemently, and threaten to resist its provisions with force?

THIRD.—If it is injustice to prevent slaveholders from emigrating to the territories now free, and carrying with them their slaves, was it not equally unjust to prevent them from doing so in the North-western territory, and why is it that this objection is now raised for the first time.

FOURTH.—If the nature of the country in our territories prevents slave labor from being used, why are the owners of slaves anxious to have it made slave territory?

☞ Martin Van Buren is at this moment being fully maligned by every Hunker press in the State. He a *Southern man*! Let the recollection of the people go back to 1844, and they cannot but remember, that it was on account of the effect of his anti-annexation letter he was beaten by Mr. Polk, for the Democratic nomination. That letter roused all the malignancy of the Southern spirit against him. The South required a man who would sanction annexation; as Mr. Van Buren stood side by side and on the same platform with Henry Clay on this subject, he was not the proper tool for the execution of their design. Accordingly they waved their imperial hands, and he was hurled overboard by the servile slave-power propitiators, who met at Baltimore, as the delegated representatives of the FREE NORTH.

☞ Mr. Delano is on the stump every day for Gen. Taylor.—State Journal of Sept. 1.

The Knox County Times, a Whig paper, giving an account of a Free Soil meeting held in that county on the 25th of August, among other things says:

"Hon. C. Delano being called for, then took the stand and in an able speech again defined his position—which was that he was resolved not to support either Gen. Taylor or Gen. Cass, but if he voted for either of the three candidates, it would be Martin Van Buren. He further exhorted the people to keep up the Free Soil organization and push it forward with energy, as the only means of keeping the territories free.

He is certainly on the "stump." Will the Journal inform us of the number of converts he makes per week for Old Rough and Ready!

☞ Mr. Carey, the celebrated temperance lecturer, in a speech at Xenia, Ohio, in favor of Gen. Taylor, said that he would rather vote for Henry Clay's *old boots* than for either of the three candidates for the Presidency.

From the appearance of things in New York at present, he will have an opportunity of voting for them, legs and all.

☞ A regard for Whig principles forbids the nomination of Gen. Taylor."—Journal, April 1848.

If they forbid his nomination, wonder what they have to say to his election!

Taylor on the Reserve.

Corwin is having a sorry time of it on the Reserve. Taylor drags hard in these diggings. It is like drawing a cat by the tail.

The Taylor men in every county, anxious to make what show they can, still persist in announcing Delano as accompanying Corwin. At Akron, instead of Delano appearing, large handbills containing Mr. D.'s anti-Taylor letter, were posted all around the speaking ground, to the great annoyance of Tom, and to the equally great amusement of the bolters.

At Ravenna, the fun was more serious. The bolters had the thing out and dried. When Walker, who proceeded Corwin, got through speaking, there was a universal yell for DELANO! The chairman attempted to introduce Corwin, but it was no go.—The crowd were vociferous for Delano. "But there is no Delano here," says the chairman. "Yes, there is," shouted the bolters; "here is his name on the bills"—holding up a large handbill with Corwin and Delano's names in glaring capitals. "It's a cheat," says one.—"It's all a cheat," says another;—and then they began scattering through the crowd Delano's letter denouncing Taylor. This created a "great commotion," which lasted some minutes. At length Corwin was allowed to speak but with a sepulchral tone and cast of countenance, which told that he had got into the wrong country. His speech was a spiritless, halting, lame affair, unlike his former efforts, when CONSCIENCE had something to do with his sentiments. The best of the joke, however, was reserved, like good wine, for the last. At the close of the speaking, the Taylor men brought forward their resolutions, and the VAN BUREN MEN VOTED THEM DOWN. It is said that Corwin turned up his eyes in despair, like a dying calf.—Plainsdealer.

Democratic Review and Free Soil.

The August number of the Democratic Review contains a political "leader" aimed at the Free Soil movement, but entitled "The Liberty Party." As it is the leading Journal of the Democracy, it is to be inferred that this article contains the great arguments, facts, and doctrines, from which, at least, the politicians of one party will peddle till November.

The writer sets out with the statement that ninety-nine of every hundred men in the Union are anxious to get clear of slavery; and proposes, as a plan to accomplish this, the extension of slavery into the new territories; thus, to drain the old States of their stock of slaves gradually.

The writer takes for granted that the institution is only temporary, and that it must, if permitted, follow the new and fertile lands of the Southwest. To prove this, it is shown by statistics that the price of cotton has been, since 1816, growing less, and that the planters have only been saved from utter ruin by removal into the new States of Alabama, Mississippi and Louisiana,—it is taken for granted that they only are capable of producing this staple and sugar. In a word: Slavery is only temporary; we will do away with it by removal; white labor will step into its tracks, and thus State after State will shake off the curse so loathsome to them.

This is indeed a beautiful theory. To see the bondsman and his owner, and all this train of evils, marching slowly, surely, and forever, to the Southwest in search of the El Dorado of cotton and sugar. It is well the writer stopped here; for, in his triumphal career, he would, in the course of a few years, have marched this grand army of blacks and whites into the Pacific ocean—all the while increasing at the rate of 50,000 a year. This is the only legitimate end of this argument.—Slavery never can be temporary while there is land Southwest; so that to make it temporary, the friends of removal must lead their host, like Moses, into the sea.

Let us look a moment at the process by which our writer says it has been extended, and must still be. The planter in the old States finding that, with his 50 or 100 negroes, he must break up, moves to the new land, borrows money to put his plantation into a state of successful operation, mortgages his land and his negroes, and thus hopes to surmount his debts and enjoy ease; but, how, says our writer, does it work? The enormous "sum of \$200,000,000 has been sunk in the last ten years." Nearly all the slave States borrowed large sums of money in London in 1831 and '32, when it was very cheap: Alabama \$11,000,000, Louisiana \$20,000,000, Mississippi \$7,500,000, Arkansas \$3,500,000, Florida \$3,900,000—total more than \$50,000,000. This money was raised on the sale of stocks in England, constituted Bank capital in these States; and was borrowed by the planters on mortgages of their homes and servants. "In Mississippi the Bank capital increased in the ten years, from \$950,000 to \$30,000,000,—nothing now remains but mortgages on lands and negroes, many of whom have long since gone *Southwest*." Such is the origin of repudiation, bankruptcy, and commercial death of the richest portion of the Union. Such is the sure and terrible train of disasters which haunts, like an angel of wrath, the slaveholder, which he is now seeking to drag over the Valley of the Del Norte, beyond the Cordilleras, into the green nooks, fertile hillsides, and the smiling valleys of California.

But even in the last ten years the number of slaves in the old States has increased, according to his own statement,

In 1830, there were	1,555,057
In 1840, there were	1,664,449
Increase,	86,392
Increase in new States, exclusive of Kentucky,	425,920

Which will make the total increase more than 50,000 a year.

This, then, is the effect of removal; instead of a diminution, 86,000 more are swarming the ranks of life, clamoring for bread, and work, and freedom, at the doors of the slaveholder in the *old States*. His own statistics rise up and condemn his arguments; nearly a hundred thousand men rise up and give it the lie; humanity and common sense spurn and spit upon it.

Again: in shewing that white labor can co-exist with slave labor, it is said that 50 whites emigrate to Texas to one black—thus the host of bondage is not the only one on the Southwest track. No! thanks to the enterprise of the hardy pioneer, he will shoulder his axe and carry the blessings of honest industry, of free labor, of home virtues, anywhere and everywhere on the wide bosom of our continent, on which the foul foot of the slaveholder has not set. But he must drive back this stream, which flows only to fertilize, to make glad the desert, to deck the mountain, to open its storehouses of opulence, to sprinkle the land all over with the channels of commerce, the seats of manufactures, and the temples of literature.