

# 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, OCTOBER 27, 1848.

NO. 10.

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

From the Utica Democrat.

The Van Buren Gathering Song.

They're rousing, they're rousing in valley and glen,  
The noble in soul, and the fearless of heart;  
At freedom's stern call, to the combat again  
They march with a zeal no man can impart,

From the old Maquoketa a dark forest of pine,  
To the fertile glades where the calm Wabash

flows.

True sons of their fathers! the People combine,

To keep off the chains of their tyrants and foes,

They're gathering, they're gathering, on hill-side and plain,

They sway every vale and overshadow each river,

Each hamlet and dell is made vocal again

With the soul-thrilling cry of "Our Country forever!"

The Flag of the Free to the breeze is unfurled,

Around it they rally to guard its fair fame,

And well may the proud sons of freedom be bold

In the glory and strength of VAN BUREN's great

name.

Where the noble Ohio in wild beauty sweeps,

Where the swift Susquehanna bears onward its

waves,

And even where the Hudson in calm grandeur sleeps,

There are thousands of freemen who scorn to be

slaves.

Around them, true hearts! to the battle once more,

And Douglass faces quail at your gallant array!

You will conquer again, as you've conquered before,

And Hope's morn will brighten to shadowless day.

Tremendous Outpouring of the  
Free Soilers in New York.

The city of New York witnessed on Monday evening, Oct. 9th, the greatest demonstration which it has known for years. Nowhere in the present canvass has there been such an immense gathering of true hearted men, devoted to the great cause of human freedom.

The New York Tribune says:

"Say as you will about Free Soil, its principles are deeply rooted in the hearts of the people. The meeting in the Park last night, in point of enthusiasm, numbers and respectability, was one of the greatest displays of the season. We have no correct numberometer to guide us in a correct estimate, but we should think the numbers present could not have been less than 15,000. On and around the stand they were crowded thickly to hear the speakers, and away back on the steps of the City Hall thousands clustered, where seeing was easier than hearing.

The stand was densely embowered with flags and paintings of various descriptions. Several portraits of VAN BUREN were conspicuous among them. Bonfires flamed on each side of the meeting, and when the Fourteenth Ward Free Soil Delegation entered the Park with their banners and torches, the scene was exceedingly grand. A perfect roar of applause went up from the crowd, while every man seemed to have a piece of fireworks in his hands, from which a perfect inverted shower of blazing balls went up from Roman candles. Trees, houses, and everything around seemed crimsoned into a magic glare by the varying colors of the fireworks.

John Van Buren, "Prince John," the pride of the People, the *beau ideal* of the Barnburners, the indefatigable enemy of Old Hunkerism, was the principal speaker, and he showered his compliments in every direction, particularly on the left hand. Now John is a "broth of a boy," when he gets fairly started. His powers of sarcasm are inexhaustible, his energies untiring, his wit as keen as a blade just fresh from Damascus, his lungs like gutta percha, his voice pleasing, his manner captivating, his self possession perfect, and his popularity with a crowd unbounded. There's John Van Buren for you."

The meeting was called to order by John Cochrane, Esq., and was organized by the appointment of HENRY EVERSON as President, with 108 Vice Presidents and 36 Secretaries.

Samuel J. Tilden then made a report of the doings of the Utica Convention, which was received with great enthusiasm.

A series of resolutions were read by Mr. Cochrane, endorsing the Buffalo Platform, and advocating principles of reform.

John Van Buren was then announced and came forward amid great applause, holding the attention of the audience for nearly an hour, in a speech replete with argument and wit.

We take the following extract from the Tribune's report:

He denied that personal revenge wro't the nomination of his father.—

This crisis in the cause of Freedom only caused his re-appearance again on the political stage. He said his father was

desirous that his name should not be used in connection with the Presidency, from the Utica to the Buffalo Conventions, preferring the comfortable retirement he at present enjoys, with the best of health. No individual could be less solicitous for the result, and he asked for no man's vote. He said that much good had already resulted from this agitation at the North, and that Mr. Webster had acknowledged that the Free Democracy are on the right

track, probably thinking that they had made a mistake in the discovery of the North Star. (Cheers.) He demonstrated the preposterousness of the idea that this strike for Liberty would dissolve the Union, remarking in the language of Col. Benton, that the women and children would prevent such a result! He said that Calhoun himself admitted that the Free Soil party would prove victorious in 1852. He thought there was a general disposition with some to take an early train.

Texas was brought into the Union in the early war, and contrary to the stipulation Polk had made to Messrs. Dix, Tappan, Blair, &c., the thirty-first State, we say, shall be free in spite of any such intrigues. (Cheers.) Now is the time to settle this great question. Never had there been an agitation that had caused so great a commotion in so brief a period. He referred to the miserable Northern traitors in the House who had dwindled down to four in number, who had all lost a renomination. (Three groans were given for Birdsall.) He said the constituents of Mr. B. would soon settle his case.

He then gave an account of the enthusiasm for the movement throughout his travels, particularly in New England, where a great majority of the people were aroused for the cause.—He also pointed to the buoyant accounts continually being received from that section of the country which had experienced the great blessings of the Jeffersonian Ordinance—the States of the North-west. He also read a cheering letter from Mr. Giddings, pledging Ohio and the Reserve by about the same majority which Harrison received. In New York, he said, four-fifths of the "Democratic" party were for Van Buren, and a great portion of the Whig party, with many of the leading Whig orators and statesmen—Willis Hall, (loud cheers), Joseph L. White, &c. &c. [A voice in the crowd suggested "Where's Greeley?" also.]

To this allusion, Mr. Van Buren, ever ready with reply on any emergency, remarked: I am sorry to say that that distinguished gentleman, who had declared his unalterable opposition to mere military chieftains, intends to vote for Gen. Taylor, whose only claims for office were founded solely on these grounds, coupled with being also an extensive slaveholder. This man claimed to be an advocate of Land Limitation, and made some pretensions to be an Anti-Renter, but still he refused to vote for the Land Limitation and Anti-Rent candidates. He announced his intention of going with us if he thought we should succeed without him. (Laughter.)

In conclusion, the following letter was read from WILLIS HALL, which was given as the choice *morceau* of this immense gathering.

GENTLEMEN: I have received your invitation to address the Ratification Meeting of the Friends of Free Soil, to be held in the Park on Monday afternoon. You are not mistaken in supposing that I take a deep interest in the subject, and would gladly lend my feeble aid, in any way in my power, to its advancement.

But my voice is too feeble to enable me to be heard in the open air, and my official engagements on Monday afternoon and evening render it impossible to be present with you on this great rally of the Free Democracy. They might exclaim "surely this cannot be I," and straightway proceed to insist that by some magic in the mirror, another face had been presented instead of their own. However, at the risk of losing our labor in attempting impossibilities, we should like to make trial of convincing them, that when they taunt the whigs with supporting an old democrat, it is quite possible that they themselves are "cutting the ridiculous figure." We do not now speak of the original Taylor men, who bolted long before the nomination, and were determined that Taylor should be the candidate at all events; but of those Whigs who resisted his nomination to the last. The bare possibility of his nomination, made them irate. They were not going to stand such nonsense, not they. So hostile were they to it, that in this city they would not allow a Taylor man to go to Augusta. They were pretty much of the opinion of the Jonesboro Tennessee Whig, that Taylor was a *perfectly ridiculous candidate*.

Yet in one week after the nomination they made but one wry face and swallowed him, "war, blood, thunder," and all. A pretty set of people, truly, to "run" conscience whigs for supporting Martin Van Buren.

Now look at the matter a little further. Did you not say that one of the cardinal principles of the Whig party was resistance to executive usurpation? Did you not say so when Jackson was nominated? Did you not then assert that of all men, a military leader was the most likely to be dogmatical, imperious, arbitrary? The most likely to make his own will an arbiter in the affairs of the nation? What are you doing now? Supporting not merely a military chieftain, but a chieftain whom you laud for that very iron firmness, which in Jackson you looked upon with so much alarm. Are you precisely the men, to scorn those whigs who, still true to their old principles, have determined to cast their votes for a *civilian whose administration was eminently pacific*.

Again. Did you not, with that grand old leader Henry Clay, whom with remorseless arms the men who represented you at Philadelphia hurled into the depths of the sea, deprecate on many other accounts the accession of a war chief to the executive power?

Did you not denounce Gen. Jackson as a military man, notwithstanding he had been a Judge of the Superior Court of his own State, and successively a Representative and Senator in

Mexico was purchased by the common blood and treasure, gives any one the right to hold slaves upon it, is absurdly false. New York was redeemed from the domination of England by the common blood and treasure; but does that give any one a right to hold slaves here?—to drive three-fourths of our most valuable population from their fields and their work shops, and darken our land with the curse of Slavery?—Every State has a right to say what shall be property within its own jurisdiction.

The Missouri Compromise is totally inapplicable. That restricted Slavery in what had been the Territory of Louisiana, where Slavery had been established.

We seek to prevent the extension of Slavery to territory where it has never existed.

The friends of Free Soil seek no sectional advantages—violate no law—infinge no obligation which rests upon them as American citizens ready to "do or die" in defense of their country.

Please accept my thanks for the flattering terms of your invitation, and be assured of my hearty co-operation in the great cause in which you are engaged.

With highest respect, your obedient servant,

WILLIS HALL.  
New York, Oct. 7, 1848.

To JOHN COCHRANE, and others, Committee.

—

A Mirror for the Taylormen.

The most amusing thing going just now, is the stolid simplicity with which the Taylor men try to pour contempt on the true Whigs who refused to abandon the party and join the great "National Taylor Club." Perfectly delightful is the assurance, the infinite self-complacency with which they walk up to you and exclaim, "Oh, going to vote for Van Buren, hey! Don't you cut a ridiculous figure?"

How are we to account for so extraordinary a phenomenon? Simply, we suppose, on the ground that when a man is made he imagines all the rest of the world to be crazy. It was our intention when we began this article, to advise them to look into a glass. But we forbear; because seeing their own features so distorted, it is possible that like the old woman in the nursery tale, they might exclaim "surely this cannot be I," and straightway proceed to insist that by some magic in the mirror, another face had been presented instead of their own.

However, at the risk of losing our labor in attempting impossibilities, we should like to make trial of convincing them, that when they taunt the whigs with supporting an old democrat, it is quite possible that they themselves are "cutting the ridiculous figure."

We do not now speak of the original Taylor men, who bolted long before the nomination, and were determined that Taylor should be the candidate at all events; but of those Whigs who resisted his nomination to the last.

The bare possibility of his nomination, made them irate. They were not going to stand such nonsense, not they. So hostile were they to it, that in this city they would not allow a Taylor man to go to Augusta. They were pretty much of the opinion of the Jonesboro Tennessee Whig, that Taylor was a *perfectly ridiculous candidate*.

Yet in one week after the nomination they made but one wry face and swallowed him, "war, blood, thunder," and all. A pretty set of people, truly, to "run" conscience whigs for supporting Martin Van Buren.

Now look at the matter a little further. Did you not say that one of the cardinal principles of the Whig party was resistance to executive usurpation? Did you not say so when Jackson was nominated? Did you not then assert that of all men, a military leader was the most likely to be dogmatical, imperious, arbitrary? The most likely to make his own will an arbiter in the affairs of the nation? What are you doing now? Supporting not merely a

military chieftain, but a chieftain whom you laud for that very iron firmness, which in Jackson you looked upon with so much alarm. Are you precisely the men, to scorn those whigs who, still true to their old principles, have determined to cast their votes for a *civilian whose administration was eminently pacific*.

Again. Did you not, with that grand old leader Henry Clay, whom with remorseless arms the men who represented you at Philadelphia hurled into the depths of the sea, deprecate on many other accounts the accession of a war chief to the executive power?

Did you not denounce Gen. Jackson as a military man, notwithstanding he had been a Judge of the Superior Court of his own State, and successively a Representative and Senator in

Congress? What are you doing? Supporting a *mere military man*, who has not had the slightest experience in civil office, but whose whole life has been spent in border forays.—Are you the men to launch anathemas at those Whigs, who true to their old principles, have determined once more to throw their votes for a *sagacious statesman, all whose days have been spent in the civil service of the Republic?*

Further. Did you not say that the war with Mexico was wicked, inhuman, outrageous? What are you doing now? Supporting for the chief office in the nation, the chief instrument in that war. Are you the men to accuse us for adhering to our principles in voting for a man who, *had he been in power, would have prevented that war!*

Still further. Did you not say, that resistance to the slave-power was one of the cardinal principles of the Whigs? That the Whig party was the great Anti-Slavery party of the Union?

What are you doing now? Supporting as your standard bearer an old slaveholder from the extreme South, who was buying slaves at the very moment of his nomination, who has distinctly assured his friends that "the South ought never to sanction the provisions of the Wilmot Proviso," and who, the Southern Whigs aver, is with the South and for the South, and will be the faithful guardian of its interests.

Are you the men to censure us for taking as our leader a man who honestly and openly avows himself the advocate of that

great principle which you, by enlisting under the black flag, have so unequivocally abandoned?

Nay more. Under Van Buren shall we not gain, at least, the River and Harbor bill? And are we not left free by the Buffalo Platform to contend, if we choose, for a Protective Tariff? But in what Whig doctrine has Taylor avowed his belief? Has he told you, that he believed in the Internal Improvement system, or in the necessity of a Protective Tariff? Not a word of it. And are you the men to accuse us for throwing our votes for a man who has avowed his adhesion to several Whig doctrines for which we have always

strenuously contended, while the man whom you support has avowed no principles at all?

Let us tell you in conclusion, that before you can convince the community that it is we and not you who are cutting "the ridiculous figure," you will have to appear in some other dress than the spotted skin of the clown in the circus.—*Portland Inquirer.*

Cost of Mail Transportation.

The following exhibits the annual cost of mail transportation, and the annual receipts of postages, for the year preceding July 1, 1847, as we learn from an official source, viz :

States. Cost. Revenue.

Maine, \$41,964 \$59,440

N. Hampshire, 25,560 40,680

Vermont, 26,563 34,338

Massachusetts, 107,392 218,201

Rhode Island, 9,187 26,833

Connecticut, 45,797 64,157

New York, 229,307 494,757

New Jersey, 58,930 39,285

Pennsylvania, 115,412 252,176

Delaware, 7,862 8,789

Maryland, 133,751 81,656

Virginia, 192,615 92,292

North Carolina, 172,520 31,797

South Carolina, 118,157 50,335

Georgia, 153,001 55,859

Florida, 45,193 10,883

Ohio, 170,295 158,869

Michigan, 38,211 38,491

Indiana, 52,430 43,334

Illinois, 102,485 52,359



FOR PRESIDENT.  
MARTIN VAN BUREN,  
OF NEW YORK.

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

**Senatorial Electors.**

HENRY L. ELLSWORTH, of Tippecanoe Co.

JOHN H. BRADLEY, of Bartholomew Co.

**CONTINGENT SENATORIAL ELECTORS.**

E. DEMING, of Tippecanoe Co.

S. S. HARDING, of Ripley Co.

**District Electors.**

1st Dist.—NATHAN LITTLE,

2d " JOHN R. CRAVENS, of Jefferson Co.

3d " JAMES H. CRAVENS, of Ripley Co.

4th " GEO. W. JULIAN, of Wayne Co.

5th " OVID BUTLER, of Marion.

6th " MILTON SHORT, of Lawrence Co.

7th " ALBERT G. COFFIN, of Parke Co.

8th " SAMUEL A. HUFF, of Tippecanoe Co.

9th " JOSEPH L. JERNEGAR, of St. Joseph Co.

10th " DANIEL WORTH,

**CONTINGENT DISTRICT ELECTORS.**

2d D. district—John Brazzelton,

3d " John P. Miller,

6th " E. J. Sumner,

7th " Abiathur Crane,

9th " John U. Pettit,

10th " JOSEPH MORROW, of Grant Co.

**State Central Committee.**

1st Dist.—O. SHELMAN,

2d " R. E. STRATTON,

3d " JOHN P. MILLIKEN,

4th " R. VAILE,

5th " CALVIN FLETCHER, A. A. ACKLEY,

S. NOEL, J. H. JORDAN, JAMES SUL-

GROVE, PHILIP SPONABLE.

6th " W. JUDAH,

7th " L. JESSUP,

8th " J. B. McFARLAND,

10th " R. FABER,

D. W. JONES.

**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 OCTOBER.**

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, October 27, 1848.**

**Be Prepared.**

The election is now close at hand, and it is important that the friends of Free Soil are prepared for the contest. Tickets should be got out and placed in such position as to be ready on the morning of the election. They can be obtained of Douglass and Elder, printers of the Banner, at \$2 per thousand. Orders from adjoining counties, accompanied with the money, will meet with prompt attention. We call on our friends to supply themselves, don't let any man who wishes to vote with us want a ticket.

To our friends, at home and abroad, we say look to it that your tickets are all right. The correct ticket will be found at the head of our columns. Let every one read his whole ticket, and see that the names are right, as we have no doubt that there will be spurious tickets afloat. Look out!

There are thousands of Free Soil men in our State, who have determined to vote for one of the old party candidates, believing that Mr. Van Buren stands no chance of election. One word to such men. Ponder well the relationship our party bears the old ones. Think seriously, calmly, over the positions which Cass and Taylor have voluntarily assumed in regard to the mighty principles we defend. If those principles are sacred, conscience, and conscience alone should dictate to each voter, the man for his suffrage. If any arguments, any circumstances, induce you to throw aside the avowed exponent of those principles, vote, not as a Whig, nor a Democrat, but as a Free Soil man, independent of both.

**To the Whigs of Indiana.**

The great question to be decided in the present canvass is the extension of slavery, or its limitation to the bounds it at present occupies, by legislative enactment.

That it is a question of deep importance, and concerns nearly the welfare and honor of our country, is so universally admitted that the proposition requires no argument. The old world is now throbbing to her hearts core, and struggling to break the bands of oppression that have so long bound her. Every true freeman rejoices at the fact, and sympathizes with their efforts. But with what show of consistency, if at the same time that we raise the voice of sympathy, we are by our action extending the area of human bondage.

The suffering millions of Europe, who have been trodden under foot by tyranny, turn imploringly their eyes on the great "Model Republic," whose boast it is that she first proclaimed the inalienable rights and equality of man. But how uncheering the prospect when it is recorded that that Republic is at this time discussing the propriety of extending the system of human bondage over territory that now enjoys the blessing of freedom.

Whigs of Indiana, which side of the contest do you intend to espouse? are you for freedom or slavery for our territories? We do not intend to ask you an idle question. We have been observing the course of your public prints; are they a fair exponent of your position? If they are, we say you are not the Whigs of '44, doing battle against the further extension of slavery. If your press represents your feelings, you are not where *true Whigs* ought to be found. Were you not in '44 the opponents of the annexation of Texas, because you said it would be receiving more slave territory into our Union? Certainly your presses were loud in their advocacy of the claims of Freedom. Where are they now? are they the champions of liberty? Where is their bold defence, their eloquent articles against the extension of slavery? Read them, and see if you can gather from them that it is of any importance whether slavery is to be extended or not. You will find them silent or hurling abuse at men who would stay the evil, calling them sectionalists, disunionists, and deprecating, in every manner, the movement of Freemen.

This is true as you can see for yourselves. Their influence, then, as far as it goes is in favor of the extension of slavery. What then, we ask, is your position? If your organs were half as assiduous in battling for the right as they are in abusing us and our candidate, we would not have to ask where is the Whig party on this question? If the Journal and other Taylor presses speak your views, we say you are not where we were wont to find you. Where would we look for the old *Whig party*?—

If we were not mistaken, we would expect that party to be the foremost wherever the interests of Freedom were in jeopardy. Did you not ever stand foremost in the battles against the spirit of oppression?—

That was our impression when we acted in a party organization with you. What then shall we think of you when your leading organ in this State, in speaking of the Ohio election, says that if Mr. Ford, (whom every one knows to be a firm opponent to the extension of slavery,) did write that he would vote for Martin Van Buren, (the only candidate pledged to resist the extension of slavery,) that he was in hopes that he was beaten. Is that the way in which you speak of the cause of Freedom in our territories, or does the Journal misrepresent you?

Remember that our old motto was "principles not men." In your present position would it not be a perfect burlesque to see floating on your banners that motto? "Be sure you are right then go ahead," is a maxim that has led thousands correctly through life. If you, as many Whigs in other portions of the country do act on this motto, you will find no fault with Van Buren men, but will rather act with us, for we know that on this most important question he is with us. Can you say as much for Gen. Taylor? are you sure he is with you, if you are actually opposed to extending slavery over territory now free? Have you no doubts on the subject? Ponder the matter for yourselves, and remember the words of the Patriot Clay, "I would rather be right than be President." Would you not rather have your country right in the eyes of the world and posterity, than secure a mere triumph of party?

Would any of our readers suppose, after perusing the Nicholson letters, that Gen. Cass had ever voted for the Wilmot Proviso? A rabid slavery extensionist now, would the same reader dream that the illustrious hero, while Senator, had ever presented abolition petitions from the Michigan Legislature? Yet such is the fact.

The people require to be dealt with in fairness and honesty. Never can Gen. Taylor—never can a party who adopt him as their candidate on his present ground, succeed by a course of policy which every unprejudiced man must admit is at least equivocal. That our words are correct, we appeal to Ohio.

**Who knows best?**

We have conversed with many of our Whig brethren who boldly declare that if they believed that Gen. Taylor would veto a bill containing the principles of the Wilmot proviso, they would not vote for him. His neighbors say that THEY would not vote for him if he was in favor of such a bill. We put the question. Who knows best? Who is to be deceived? One portion of the Whig party says one thing, another portion another thing. One portion is surely to be deceived; which is it? We say the North, because we say that Gen. Taylor's bosom friends, B. Peyton, P. Benjamin, and S. S. Prentiss, published that the General will veto such a bill, and we believe they know better than we who are taking him on trust. This we think is reasonable. If we want information on matters of business connected with a certain portion of country, we naturally inquire of residents there for that information. If we wish to find out the views of men, we naturally inquire of their friends about them—their every day companions. We wish to be just as certain in politics as in business. It is one of the most remarkable features of this campaign, says the Cayuga Advocate:

"That the Northern Taylor papers in endeavoring to prove that Taylor is trusty upon the question of slavery extension, quote only from the Cass papers, and addresses published in the slave States. The Washington Union, the Richmond Enquirer, and other Southern Cass papers, seem to be regarded as far better authority, and they are more freely quoted than any Southern Whig papers, or even the speeches and letters of Gen. Taylor's best and most confidential friends. We saw last Saturday an address of a Southern Cass committee published at length in a Taylor paper here, with the apparent purpose of proving that Taylor was all right on the question of Free Soil; the address charging that the South could not trust him. Two questions occur, first, why the Southern Taylor papers are never quoted, and second, how it is that the Whigs have suddenly acquired so much confidence in the authority of the Cass men. The answer is, they dare not quote the Southern Taylor papers, for they all declare that Taylor will veto the Wilmot Proviso; and in the second place, they do not believe the Southern Cass men, but merely use them to cheat the people of the North. Beware fellow citizens. A deception is being practised upon you. Demand of the Taylor papers to publish what their own press in the South says about their own candidate. If they dare not, or will not do it, you will readily believe that they are trying to deceive you."

We learn from the National Intelligencer, that Florida has gone Whig. Well, well! Immediately after the Philadelphia Convention, we declared that the Whig party had sacrificed the North, and thrown themselves into the arms of the South. To confirm our declaration, we want no better evidence than such a general ratification of their proceedings by States of the South, which have heretofore been radically democratic. Will not the North open her eyes? Does not all the world see that she stands, a blind man, on the verge of an awful precipice?

The Whig press, down South, are trying to prove Cass an abolitionist. How the great *dough-face* would swear, if he should pick up the Baton Rough Gazette, and read therein a cautioning paragraph like the following:

Remember that you cannot vote for William O. Butler, without voting for Cass THE ABOLITIONIST.

We received a letter this week from N. York, from an intelligent and well informed Free Soil man, from which we make the following extracts:

UTICA, Oct. 15th, 1848.

DEAR SIR.—Yours of the 7th came duly to hand, and in giving my opinion of the prospects in this State, as you request me, I shall use all candor.

We confidently expect to carry this State by a handsome majority. We are daily gaining ground, and our party is full of enthusiasm. Desperate efforts have been made to whip the Whigs into rank, but it has proved a failure.

Western New York, where the Whig strength of the State has always been found, will roll up a large majority for our candidate.

Would any of our readers suppose, after perusing the Nicholson letters, that Gen. Cass had ever voted for the Wilmot Proviso? A rabid slavery extensionist now, would the same reader dream that the illustrious hero, while Senator, had ever presented abolition petitions from the Michigan Legislature? Yet such is the fact.

The people require to be dealt with in fairness and honesty. Never can Gen. Taylor—never can a party who adopt him as their candidate on his present ground, succeed by a course of policy which every unprejudiced man must admit is at least equivocal. That our words are correct, we appeal to Ohio.

**Results of the Elections.**

The results of the recent elections in Ohio and Pennsylvania have disappointed all parties. The Whigs expected to elect their Governor in Ohio by a very large majority, while the Democrats confidently claimed Pennsylvania. Various reasons are given by the different parties for the unlooked for result. Ohio has elected a Whig Governor by about 200 majority. The Congressional delegation will stand eleven Democrats and ten Whigs. Of the ten Whigs five are anti-Taylor men, and three of the five Van Buren men. In the Legislature the Senate stands a tie, while the complexion of the Lower House depends upon the Hamilton County members. Certificates of election have been given to the Democratic members, and it is determined that they are entitled to their seats the Democrats will have a majority. If, however, in the contest which will take place, the Whigs are found to be entitled to the seats they will have four of a majority. As on this one contingency hangs the election of a United States Senator, we may look out for all kinds of intrigue and rascality in its determination.

We expected, in common with the Whigs here, that Ford's majority would have been larger than the result shows it. We believe that thousands of Whigs did not vote for him. He was nominated by the Whig Convention in Ohio, after having publicly proclaimed his opposition to Taylor's nomination, and his determination to vote against him if nominated.

The Philadelphia Convention subsequently nominated Taylor. A portion of Mr. Ford's constituents required him to recall his declaration; and others desired him to repeat it.

A portion, including many leading Van Buren men, suggested that he need make no further avowals. This advice he concluded to take.

It was after this definition of his position—after the strongest commitment to the cause of Free Soil, and after refusing to recall the only declaration he ever made of his Presidential preference—THAT OF OPPOSITION TO TAYLOR—that Ford came before the constituency of Ohio. Though he traversed the State making speeches, he never retracted his declaration of his hostility to Taylor.

Col. Weller, the Cass candidate, was a popular man, had just returned from service in Mexico, and had all the profuse patronage of the national government spent in his behalf. He also took the stump through the campaign in person. He undertook to sustain Cass, and though his supporters claimed to have an entire sympathy with the cause of Free Soil—in the abstract—yet the weight of Cass's infamously opinions broke him down.

The result of the Governor's election in Ohio, may be set down thus:

Cass man defeated.

Opponent of Taylor elected.

MARYLAND.—The election was for a portion of the Senate, for Sheriffs, and some inferior officers. The Senate last year stood, 13 Whigs, 8 Democrats. This year it stands, 14 Whigs, 7 Democrats.

ARKANSAS.—The official vote for Congress is as follows: Robert W. Johnson, 14,466; Thomas W. Newton, 9,234—Johnson's (Cass) majority, 5,232.

DELAWARE.—The Inspector's election in Delaware shows a Taylor majority of 198.

**Pennsylvania.**

It is, we believe, now ascertained that Johnson, Whig, is elected Governor by a majority of two or three hundred. The results for Congressmen are still some little in doubt. The delegation probably stands fifteen Whigs, eight Democrats, and one Native. Mr. Sevier, the Native candidate, was elected by the combined votes of Whigs and Natives. In the State Senate, the Whigs are reported as having a majority of nine, while the lower house is a tie. The Democratic Canal Commissioner is elected by nearly two thousand of a majority.

The election of Johnson we can account for in such a manner, as to us is satisfactory. The two candidates were interrogated as to whether they were in favor of or opposed to the principle of retaining free soil, free. Longstreth, the Democratic candidate, refused to answer and the people, numbers of them, refused to support him, and thus rebuked him for his silence on such a question.

Mr. Johnson, the Whig opponent, was more fortunate. In the Legislature he had voted strongly for the instructions in favor of the Wilmot Proviso; and to the interrogatories of the electors on the subject, he replied with frankness and like a freeman. His letter is a marked rebuke to Gen. Taylor, and a condemnation of what we believe to be his principles.

Though the Free Soil party refused to identify themselves with either candidate, or make a separate nomination, there is no doubt that the silence of Longstreth and the letter of Johnson, have controlled the result.

The news from Vermont and Massachusetts is cheering.

### Hunker's Soliloquy.

AIR—"Floating Scow of Old Virginny."

The sinking craft of General Cass, I've bailed from day to day, While floating round the Northern shores With none to lend the way.

To old Virginia's shore, Will float such craft no more, So help me off to old Virginia, To old Virginia's shore.

Then help me off to old Virginia, To old Virginia's shore,

Oh! help me off to old Virginia,

To old Virginia's shore.

The Empire State's all in a blaze, The rats are running out,

There find no hole where they may hide,

'Tis searching all about;

Hold back the fires 'tis awful hot,

Their way to the South they'll bore,

So help them off to old Virginia,

To old Virginia's shore.

Then help them off, &c.

The party rag that I have rode

For a score of years or so,

Begins to wear, and kick, and frisk,

And who knows where it goes,

Our bank is broke, my money's gone,

"Our foot" is in the "grave" once more,

So help me off to old Virginia,

To old Virginia's shore.

Then help me off, &c.

The Whigs of late Old Whitey found,

All foaming from the war,

They thought they had a glorious chance,

To hitch him to their car.

Old Whitey balked upon the road,

And kicked their Fillmore o'er,

So help them off to South Carolina,

To South Carolina's shore,

Then help them off, &c.

They were only where they stood

Three months ago o'er the hills,

They'd nerve their arm and hoist the name

Of Harry Clay once more.

But now Old Zack, he holds them tight,

Their consciences' growing sore,

So help them off to South Carolina,

To South Carolina's shore,

Then help them off, &c.

From the Eastern States the Freemen's shout,

Comes pealing o'er the hills,

And all the West have caught it up,

Till the vault of heaven it fills,

I see it written on the wall,

That slavery reigns no more,

So help me off to old Virginia,

To old Virginia's shore,

Oh! help me off to old Virginia,

And bring me back no more.

GEN. CASS AS A PIONEER.—We have

heard Gen. Cass in the Senate, repeatedly

refer to his early pioneering exploration

in the West, and the democratic papers

speak of his having descended the Mississippi in a skiff. The Burlington (Iowa)

Hawke-eye says that this was the way in

which it was done:

"When Gen. Cass, many years ago,

made his voyage in a skiff down the Mis-

issippi, he had a large arm chair placed

in the skiff, with four strong men to pro-

pel it. When he came to shoal water

near Galena, where the boat could not

pass without being lightened, the men had

to take him as he was in the arm chair

and bear him through mud and water,

thigh deep, to the shore, where he remain-

ed until they got over the shoal water,

when they took him on their shoulders,

arm chair and all, and without wetting his

feet, placed him in his old position in the

skiff. O, the hardships underwent during

that famous trip."

WHAT HARM CAN IT DO?—The Cass

men claim to be opposed to the extension

of slavery. At the same time they op-

pose any action of Congress to prevent its

extension—for the reason, as they allege,

that as the territories are now free—and as

slavery cannot be extended to them with-

out a positive law for that purpose, they

must, in the absence of all legislation, ne-

cessarily remain free.

When you hear a Cass man put forth

this argument, just ask him what harm the

Wilmot Proviso can do? If the Territo-

ries after its passage, are to remain in the

same condition in which they would be

without it, what harm can it do? Why

this strenuous opposition to a measure,

which, according to their own showing,

can do no harm?—Dem. Union.

MISTAKING THE ISSUE.—Most of the

Taylor papers, says the Northampton

Courier, at the North, are exceedingly

zealous in adhering to free soil doctrines.

"This is no new doctrine with us," they

say, "we have occupied this ground for

years." Now we are not disposed to dis-

pute this matter with them. Indeed, we

believe a large proportion of the support-

ers of Gen. Taylor at the North are hon-

estly and conscientiously opposed to the

extension of slavery. They affirm their

adhesion to the free soil doctrines with an

earnestness which leads us to infer that

some body questions their views on this

point. No, gentlemen, the question is not,

are you in favor of free soil? but, is your

candidate in favor of it?

YALE COLLEGE.—One hundred and

six students have entered the Fresh-

man Class of Yale College this season.

CHARLES F. ADAMS, the grandson of

a Federalist. Indeed! And is it not a

well-established fact that Gen. Cass

was not only the grandson of a Federal-

ist, but was originally a Federalist

himself? Hezekiah Niles, the author of

Niles' Register, a valuable political

authority, has left it on record that "he

remembered when Lewis Cass taught

an academy at Wilmington Delaware,

and always appeared in public with a

black cockade [the badge of the Fed-

eral party] in his hat."—Northrn

Light.

GUARDIAN SPIRITS.—The belief that

guardian spirits hover around the paths

of men, covers a mighty truth; for every

beautiful, and pure, and good thought

which the heart holds, is an angel of

mercy, purifying and guarding the soul.

—Richter.

Gen. Taylor is from birth, association

and conviction, identified with the

South and her institutions, being one

of the most extensive slave-holders in

Louisiana, and supported by the slave-

holding interest, as opposed to the Wil-

mot Proviso, and in favor of securing

the privilege to the owners of slaves to

remove with them to newly acquired

territory."—New Orleans Bee.

HEARTS BEWARE.—Men lose their hearts

through the eye, and women through the

ear.

Governor Hammond, of South Carolina, comes out decided for Gen. Taylor. He says:

"I have been anxious not to share in the responsibility of those Southern men who are opposing Gen. Taylor, and have never failed, when a proper opportunity offered, distinctly and decided to avow myself to be in favor of his election. How any slaveholder can hesitate between him and Gen. Cass, is to me not only a matter of special wonder, but I think the worst omen for the South that I have seen in my time."

Senator Dodge of Wisconsin, has returned home, and is greatly alarmed at the extensive Free Soil feeling exhibited.—Cass it would seem, is distracting the party in that region too. It is gravity said in the Van Buren papers in that state, that Cass will hardly receive as many votes as Old Scattering obtained in the Green Mountain State.

THE DIFFERENCE.—When a poor loafer is keeled up, with an empty rum bottle by his side, the papers say—"Another victim of Intemperance." When a respectable citizen eats a dinner that kills him in a few hours, with or without the help of the doctors, the same papers head his obituary notice, "Mysterious Providence."

Glorious news! The Union preserved! Repudiation of the Wilmot Proviso by the Whig Convention! The friends of the South, as well as of the Union, will learn with inexpressible satisfaction, that the Whig Convention promptly met the question of the Wilmot Proviso, and repudiated a resolution adopting that doctrine at once, by an overwhelming majority. It would not touch the unclean thing.—Alabama Journal.

THE THREE PLATFORMS.—That of Baltimore as obsolete as the patriotism of its exponents. That of Philadelphia "without form and void," like the principles of its candidate. That of Buffalo, "living and moving, and having its being" in the wants and progress of Freemen and Freedoms.—Jefferson Democrat.

Whigs, when you think that Gen. Taylor is safe on all important questions, cast your eyes back awhile, and refresh your recollections with the precious remembrance of John Tyler:

CHANGING THE ISSUE.—The Milwaukee Sentinel owns up that the contest in Wisconsin is no longer between Taylor and Cass; but between Van Buren and Taylor.

ALEXANDER CAMPBELL.—This distinguished founder and leader of a large and influential sect, and a resident of Virginia, has declared for the Free Democracy. The Spirit of Freedom says: "We had the pleasure a few days since of hearing this gentleman manfully endorse the Buffalo Convention and its platform, and give his most decided and hearty approval of the Free Soil movement of the North."

PERSONAL.—It is almost improper to make any allusions to Cassises in this city, because there are so few of them, you cannot speak of one, without its being taken as a personality by all three.—Chicago Journal.

The chap who imagined the above must have forgotten our opposition to any man owning "a large tract of land."—Tribune.

JACKSON'S WARNING AGAINST CASS AND TAYLOR.

To the prophecy of Jackson that the American people in 1848, would by acclamation elevate Van Buren to the Presidency, let us add the warning of the old chieftain against such candidates as Taylor and Cass:

"I say, again, fellow-citizens, remember the fate of ancient Rome, and VOTE FOR NO CANDIDATE who will not tell you with the frankness of an independent freeman the principles upon which, if elected, he will administer your government." \* \* \* \* \*

That man deserves to be a slave who would vote for a MUM CANDIDATE, where his liberties are at stake."

This was received with an ominous silence.

Soon afterwards, he took occasion to return to the charge. He said, "Most of you, my friends, probably agree with me that this issue is the most important and pressing of all those to be decided at this election." The Clay men present, and a very few Taylor men, cheered and cried "Aye," while an opposing shout of "No! no!" burst from the mass of the Taylorites, and was kept up by them for several moments.

How the eyes of the alvaholding General (Coombs)—who pronounced the Wilmot Proviso a humbug—twinkled! Friend Horace was manifestly much disconcerted by such a response to his Free Soil appeal.

We thought he could hardly have expected any thing else in a Taylor meeting.

While we felt for his embarrassment, we were rejoiced that the appeal had been made, and so repulsed. It showed the real spirit of Taylorism, and what the friends of Free Soil may look for from the Taylor dynasty.

It was letting the cat out of the bag with a vengeance—decidedly enough to open the eyes of the verdant good people who have been deluding themselves with the hallucination that they were going for "Taylor and Free Soil."

Certainly it ought to be, with all those who have sense enough to go in doors when it rains.

NEW SECT.—There is a religious society in Chicago, who have no priest or deacon

**Mr. Giddings at Cleveland, Ohio.**  
*Immense Meeting of the Free Democracy—Highly interesting Discussion—Taylorism used up.*

There was an immense meeting of free soilers at Cleveland, Ohio, Tuesday night, 26th ult., at which Mr. Giddings spoke. The most prominent Taylor men of the city, were present at the meeting, and upon the invitation of Mr. G. propounded a few of their supposed unanswerable queries to him. We give an account of the proceedings from the Plaindealer, a Cass concern, and of course not over friendly to Mr. G., however much delighted at the rebuff of Taylorism. The old Senator completely unhooked the Taylor chameleons.

The star actor and lion of the play was Giddings himself. The secondary lights—the jesters, prompters and interrogators—were Senator Backus, F. J. Prentiss, D. J. Garrett, and S. Prentiss. The morning paper, the "True Democrat," announced that Mr. Giddings had arrived, and would hold forth at the Court House in the evening. The evening paper, the Herald, gave notice that the Taylor meeting which was to be held that evening, would be postponed. Thus were signals exchanged between those contending organs, and everything betokened a desperate fray. No one was disappointed.

The Court House was crowded. The Taylor men were there, armed to the teeth with interrogatories sharper than stilettos, and intended to be more fatal. Giddings was on hand with every preparation that an invaded individual could make. He was armed at all points, and, like the porcupine, whenever attacked, left his mark upon his adversary. He commenced the humble, anxious inquirer after truth; said he loved everybody; was open to reproof, correction, and conviction. If he in his innocence, stated anything wrong, he hoped to be corrected, and desired his auditors to ask him any questions they pleased. He would make statements and then call upon his audience to know if he was not right. If none answered, of course silence was presumed to give consent, and in this way he went on for a while.

Giddings in this manner, was proceeding, carrying everything before him, demolishing Taylorism, rearing monuments to its memory, &c., when one of the members of the Taylor Club pitched at him like a yearling bull at a brush fence. This was what the old fox wanted. The young and fierce assailant F. J. Prentiss, Esq., a scion of the green mountains (our native state) and as ardent as the eternal snows of those bleak hills could make him. Giddings had asked if any Taylor man present could tell what Gen. Taylor's views were in reference to the Wilmot Proviso; Prentiss answered that he could. He had lately had a private talk with one Leslie Combs, (a Kentucky slaveholder,) and this Combs (of liberty pole memory) had lately had a private talk with General Taylor, in which private talk, General Taylor had avowed his opposition to the extension of slavery, and was in favor of the Wilmot Proviso. That was the proof Giddings smiled triumphant grin. He had his victim entirely in his power.

"Leslie Combs," said he, "and who is Leslie Combs? What right has he to Gen. Taylor's private sentiments on this subject more than the humblest citizen of this Republic? Does not this momentous question concern us all? Have we not all a right to know the sentiments of a Presidential candidate on a question which absorbs all others? Why did not Gen. Taylor publish these opinions to the world? He has been repeatedly asked to do so and he pertinaciously refuses. The great mass of voters are to be led to the polls blindfolded, and compelled to vote in the dark upon a question which not only affects them and their children, but their children's children! "Now," said Mr. Giddings, "what kind of proof is this, upon which Gen. Taylor is convicted of entertaining even private opinions in favor of the Wilmot Proviso? "Why," said he, "it is evidence that would be ruled out of court before a country magistrate in a case of sheep stealing." [Here the cheers of the Van Buren men were tremendous.]

After considerable parleying with Mr. Prentiss, Mr. G. proceeded and stated that he with several other members of Congress, had addressed letters to Gen. Taylor on the subject of the Proviso, to which no answers were ever received. Some one asked if they had paid the postage. "No!" says Giddings, "we franked them!" [A shout.] But, said he, when Gen. Taylor was addressed by a Southern editor, to know if he meant in his Signal letter to be understood as a Provisoist, he promptly replied that he did not wish to be so understood. To prove that Taylor was opposed in toto to the Proviso, Giddings cited the case of the legislative committee of Mississippi, and the report of one of its members to Mr. Thompson, a member of Congress. Here Senator Backus arose, shook the dew from his mane, and asked Mr. Giddings what proof he had that any such correspondence was ever had? Giddings quickly replied, that he had seen the original letter of Boone, the committee man, to Mr. Thompson, a copy of which he there had, and would read. Dunder and blixen, what a shout here rose from the Van Bu-

ren men. Backus slunk into his chair, and looked but the pygmy of his former self. After a long roar of laughter by the whole crowd, they wound up by three loud cheers. It was feared that this, would be the last appearance of the Taylor men. But not so. Their chief "never surrenders," and old Zack would have been proud of his young "bloodhounds," could he have seen them in this unequal fight, like volunteers at Buena Vista, sticking by him to the last. But old Zack would never have been ambushed as were these bully boys last night. They showed more courage than discretion in trying to make out this old slave dealer a *Proviso man*, and that too in the presence of Giddings. Storming Monterey with a pop-gun would have been about as sensible and successful an act.

Giddings had the boys all the time on this subject, and played with them as a kitten plays with its first mouse, first poking them about and then swallowing them. So far from Taylor daring to desert the South on this subject, (said Mr. G.) he had a still more powerful interest not to desert himself—that by allowing slavery to be extended over New Mexico and California, Taylor's property, in slaves, would be enhanced \$30,000. It is folly, said he, to suppose that the man who refused to pay ten cents postage on a letter, is insensible to such an interest. Here Backus having "come to," arose, looking daggers at the speaker, and pounced upon him in this wise: "Sir, would you consider it honorable in a constituent of yours, to suppose that you could be influenced in your Representative duties by a consideration like this?" "Yes," most emphatically, said Mr. G., "if I refuse to give my sentiments publicly, when asked! Suspect me of anything, when I thus tamper with my constituents." Cheers, stamping, and roaring followed this reply. Backus was down floored, and fizzled out.

The True Democrat says that this meeting made at least, 100 converts to Free Soil in that city.

**'44 and '48—Letter from Ansel Bascom.**

SENACA FALLS, Oct. 4 1848.

HORACE GREENLY, Esq.—Dear Sir: In your article in Monday's Tribune, entitled "'44 and '48." I think you allude to me as "A friend who had fought the Birney party to the best of his ability." You say "this friend is now very ardent in his advocacy of the Buffalo movement. We are sure he means right. We do not expect him to judge with equal charity the motives of those who take a course different from his." I thank you for the compliment to my sincerity, and, so far as you are concerned, reciprocate it.

Perhaps I shall be justified in defending my consistency. The Free Soil movement of '48 and the Birney movement of '44 are unlike in their origin, unlike in their objects, as they are unlike in the strength exhibited one month preceding the election. The Liberty party was organized mainly to arouse the public attention to the enormities and wrongs of existing slavery; its weakness resulted from its inability to satisfy the public mind that the National power could be constitutionally exerted to its eradication.

The Free Soil movement results from the proposition for Slave Territories and more Slave States; to defeat this the action of the General Government is legitimate.

Long after the organization of the Liberty party, a new question was presented—the Annexation of Texas with its Slavery. That party—unpatriotically, as I thought—preferred the preservation of its party organization to merging with the anti-Annexationists to keep out Texas, just as the whig party, unpatriotically, as I now think, prefers preserving its party organization to merging with the anti-Extensionists it is the Taylor party that is now in the way of the anti-Slavery principles for which the great whig party battled in '44.

I am contending now, as in '44, against the strengthening of Slavery—against more Slave States—against the increase of Slave Representation. I am acting with the only party that now makes opposition to Slavery Extension one of its distinct principles, either by the resolutions it adopts, or the candidates it nominates, and the only party that in my judgment can be trusted to prevent Slavery Extension; the only party that when in power can arrest it without being at once dissolved. You talk of electing Gen. Taylor and a whig Congress, that some old whig measures may be saved.

How long, my dear Sir, do you think this Taylor whig party will hold together after its Northern Representatives in Congress shall have defeated Slavery Extension? Not an hour. Southern whigs will not support your Tariff, or Internal Improvements, or Distribution measures, after you shall have inhibited Slavery in the new Territories; and the great danger is that Northern whigs will not be ready to disband, dissolve or destroy their party, by a stern, unyielding opposition to Slavery Extension, when they come to see that such must be the result. I fear compromises, that shall give a little and take a little; for just as soon as any compromise is effected that shall give conquered territory to Slavery,

you have sharpened the Southern appetite for more wars, more conquest. But let us see again with what justice you compare the Free Soil party of '48 with Birneyites of 1844:

Polk was openly for annexation.

Clay was openly opposed. Now, to make your parallel good, should you not show that Cass is for Slavery Extension, (no difficult matter, by-the-by.) Taylor openly opposed.

This you are too honest to attempt: that work is underlet to those less scrupulous.

Again, the whig party—the National whig party of '44—was opposed to Annexation, the Southern as well as the Northern section; its representatives in congress had twice defeated annexation schemes; the Southern members had stood shoulder to shoulder with their Northern brethren in those contests; the non-ultra whig who occupied the Presidential chair, had been repudiated by the whole party, South as well as North; the Whig National Convention has adopted anti-Annexation resolutions, and nominated anti-Annexation candidates unanimously.

How is it now upon the subject of Slavery Extension? Every Southern whig in the Senate, save one, even votes against the bill giving government and protection to Oregon because it contains the inhibition of Slavery.

The whig convention assembles; does it adopt anti-extension resolutions, or nominate an anti-extension candidate for President?

Even at the North the whig party is not sound. What means the resolution of your great canal-street meeting. "That we deprecate sectional issues and that we will countenance no factions in the whig party and no coalition with any factions out of it which shall threaten to array one section of our common country in angry hostility against any other?"

What means the silence of the address adopted by the Whig State Convention upon this subject, which more engages the concern of the electors of this State just now than all others?

Why are the resolutions of the meeting at which you gave in your adhesion to Taylor silent upon this question, while both eloquence and wit are employed against the *conquest* of Cuba and Yucatan?

Can this thing you call the whig party be trusted upon this question as we trusted the whig party of '44 upon the question of Annexation, with its opposition blazoned upon every banner, published by every nominating convention, and reiterated by all its candidates?

I claim to be at least as wise as in '44, and I tell you that, much as I loved Clay, much as I loved the whig party, for its constancy and fidelity to its principles, I would have voted for Birney had Clay withheld his opinions upon the subject of Annexation, as Taylor undertakes to withhold his upon the subject of Extension now.

You are right in saying that I am ardent in advocating the Buffalo movement. How could I be otherwise, if sincere in the reasons I urged against the Annexation of Texas in '44? The only difference with my action then and now, is, that then I found a great party acting in opposition to that scheme; in '48 it had become necessary to organize a new party to give an anti-extension banner to the breeze.—Congratulating you upon the glorious prospects of support to your principles and my candidates that every day makes brighter, I am your friend, &c.,

ANSEL BASCOM.

EXTENT OF OREGON TERRITORY.—

Our readers are probably but little aware of the immensity of our possessions on the west of the Rocky Mountains. To say nothing of the east territories, as they are unlike in the strength exhibited one month preceding the election. The Liberty party was organized mainly to arouse the public attention to the enormities and wrongs of existing slavery; its weakness resulted from its inability to satisfy the public mind that the National power could be constitutionally exerted to its eradication.

The Free Soil movement results from the proposition for Slave Territories and more Slave States; to defeat this the action of the General Government is legitimate.

Long after the organization of the Liberty party, a new question was presented—the Annexation of Texas with its Slavery.

That party—unpatriotically, as I thought—preferred the preservation of its party organization to merging with the anti-Annexationists to keep out Texas, just as the whig party, unpatriotically, as I now think, prefers preserving its party organization to merging with the anti-Extensionists it is the Taylor party that is now in the way of the anti-Slavery principles for which the great whig party battled in '44.

I am contending now, as in '44, against the strengthening of Slavery—against more Slave States—against the increase of Slave Representation. I am acting with the only party that now makes opposition to Slavery Extension one of its distinct principles, either by the resolutions it adopts, or the candidates it nominates, and the only party that in my judgment can be trusted to prevent Slavery Extension; the only party that when in power can arrest it without being at once dissolved. You talk of electing Gen. Taylor and a whig Congress, that some old whig measures may be saved.

How long, my dear Sir, do you think this Taylor whig party will hold together after its Northern Representatives in Congress shall have defeated Slavery Extension? Not an hour.

Southern whigs will not support your Tariff, or Internal Improvements, or Distribution measures, after you shall have inhibited Slavery in the new Territories; and the great danger is that Northern whigs will not be ready to disband, dissolve or destroy their party, by a stern, unyielding opposition to Slavery Extension, when they come to see that such must be the result. I fear compromises, that shall give a little and take a little; for just as soon as any compromise is effected that shall give conquered territory to Slavery,

you have sharpened the Southern appetite for more wars, more conquest.

But let us see again with what justice you compare the Free Soil party of '48 with Birneyites of 1844:

Polk was openly for annexation.

Clay was openly opposed. Now, to make your parallel good, should you not show that Cass is for Slavery Extension, (no difficult matter, by-the-by.) Taylor openly opposed.

This you are too honest to attempt: that work is underlet to those less scrupulous.

Again, the whig party—the National whig party of '44—was opposed to Annexation, the Southern as well as the Northern section; its representatives in congress had twice defeated annexation schemes; the Southern members had stood shoulder to shoulder with their Northern brethren in those contests; the non-ultra whig who occupied the Presidential chair, had been repudiated by the whole party, South as well as North; the Whig National Convention has adopted anti-Annexation resolutions, and nominated anti-Annexation candidates unanimously.

How is it now upon the subject of Slavery Extension? Every Southern whig in the Senate, save one, even votes against the bill giving government and protection to Oregon because it contains the inhibition of Slavery.

The whig convention assembles; does it adopt anti-extension resolutions, or nominate an anti-extension candidate for President?

Even at the North the whig party is not sound. What means the resolution of your great canal-street meeting.

"That we deprecate sectional issues and that we will countenance no factions in the whig party and no coalition with any factions out of it which shall threaten to array one section of our common country in angry hostility against any other?"

What means the silence of the address adopted by the Whig State Convention upon this subject, which more engages the concern of the electors of this State just now than all others?

Why are the resolutions of the meeting at which you gave in your adhesion to Taylor silent upon this question, while both eloquence and wit are employed against the *conquest* of Cuba and Yucatan?

Can this thing you call the whig party be trusted upon this question as we trusted the whig party of '44 upon the question of Annexation, with its opposition blazoned upon every banner, published by every nominating convention, and reiterated by all its candidates?

I claim to be at least as wise as in '44, and I tell you that, much as I loved Clay, much as I loved the whig party, for its constancy and fidelity to its principles, I would have voted for Birney had Clay withheld his opinions upon the subject of Annexation, as Taylor undertakes to withhold his upon the subject of Extension now.

You are right in saying that I am ardent in advocating the Buffalo movement.

How could I be otherwise, if sincere in the reasons I urged against the Annexation of Texas in '44? The only difference with my action then and now, is, that then I found a great party acting in opposition to that scheme; in '48 it had become necessary to organize a new party to give an anti-extension banner to the breeze.—Congratulating you upon the glorious prospects of support to your principles and my candidates that every day makes brighter, I am your friend, &c.,

ANSEL BASCOM.

EXTENT OF OREGON TERRITORY.—

Our readers are probably but little aware of the immensity of our possessions on the west of the Rocky Mountains.

To say nothing of the east territories, as they are unlike in the strength exhibited one month preceding the election.

The Liberty party was organized mainly to arouse the public attention to the enormities and wrongs of existing slavery; its weakness resulted from its inability to satisfy the public mind that the National power could be constitutionally exerted to its eradication.

The Free Soil movement results from the proposition for Slave Territories and more Slave States; to defeat this the action of the General Government is legitimate.

Long after the organization of the Liberty party, a new question was presented—the Annexation of Texas with its Slavery.

That party—unpatriotically, as I thought—preferred the preservation of its party organization to merging with the anti-Annexationists to keep out Texas, just as the whig party, unpatriotically, as I now think, prefers preserving its party organization to merging with the anti-Extensionists it is the Taylor party that is now in the way of the anti-Slavery principles for which the great whig party battled in '44.

I am contending now, as in '44, against the strengthening of Slavery—against more Slave States—against the increase of Slave Representation. I am acting with the only party that now makes opposition to Slavery Extension one of its distinct principles, either by the resolutions it adopts, or the candidates it nominates, and the only party that in my judgment can be trusted to prevent Slavery Extension; the only party that when in power can arrest it without being at once dissolved. You talk of electing Gen. Taylor and a whig Congress, that some old whig measures may be saved.

How long, my dear Sir, do you think this Taylor whig party will hold together after its Northern Representatives in Congress shall have defeated Slavery Extension? Not an hour.

Southern whigs will not support your Tariff, or Internal Improvements, or Distribution measures, after you shall have inhibited Slavery in the new Territories; and the great danger is that Northern whigs will not be ready to disband, dissolve or destroy their party, by a stern, unyielding opposition to Slavery Extension, when they come to see that such must be the result. I fear compromises, that shall give a little and take a little; for just as soon as any compromise is effected that shall give conquered territory to Slavery,

you have sharpened the Southern appetite for more wars, more conquest.

But let us see again with what justice you compare the Free Soil party of '48 with Birneyites of 1844:

Polk was openly for annexation.

Clay was openly opposed. Now, to make your parallel good, should you not show that Cass is for Slavery Extension, (no difficult matter, by-the-by.) Taylor openly opposed.

This you are too honest to attempt: that work is underlet to those less scrupulous.

Again, the whig party—the National whig party of '44—was opposed to Annexation, the Southern as well as the Northern section; its representatives in congress had twice defeated annexation schemes; the Southern members had stood shoulder to shoulder with their Northern brethren in those contests; the non-ultra whig who occupied the Presidential chair, had been repudiated by the whole party, South as well as North; the Whig National Convention has adopted anti-Annexation resolutions, and nominated anti-Annexation candidates unanimously.

How is it now upon the subject of Slavery Extension? Every Southern whig in the Senate, save one, even votes against the bill giving government and protection to Oregon because it contains the inhibition of Slavery.

The whig convention assembles; does it adopt anti-extension resolutions, or nominate an anti-extension candidate for President?

Even at the North the whig party is not sound. What means the resolution of your great canal-street meeting.

"That we deprecate sectional issues and that we will countenance no factions in the whig party and no coalition with any factions out of it which shall threaten to array one section of our common country in angry hostility against any other?"

What means the silence of the address adopted by the Whig State Convention upon this subject, which more engages the concern of the electors of this State just now than all others?

Why are the resolutions of the meeting at which you gave in your adhesion to Taylor silent upon this question, while both eloquence and wit are employed against the *conquest* of Cuba and Yucatan?

Can this thing you call the whig party be trusted upon this question as we trusted the whig party of '44 upon the question of Annexation, with its opposition blazoned upon every banner, published by every nominating convention, and reiterated by all its candidates?