

THE FREE SOIL BAN

EDITED AND PUBLISHED BY W. B. GREER & L. WALLACE. HE IS THE FREEMAN, WHOM TRUTH MAKES FREE; AND ALL ARE SLAVES BESIDE."

VOL. I.

INDIANAPOLIS, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 1848.

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

"SONGS FOR THE PEOPLE."

From the *Cleveland True Democrat*.

Poor Lewy Cass.

There is an old Hunker, and his name is Lewy Cass,
To the White House he length to go,
But they say such a thing shall never come to pass,
While the trees in the wild wood grow!
This old Hunker lives in the State of Michigan,
And he has a long head as we know,
But he has not the heart of a true honest man,
In the place where the heart ought to grow!

Then down with the faces of dough!
Strike we for Freedom, oh!
No more office for poor Lewy Cass,
For he's going where the old Hunker's go!

They sent him to France as a minister wise,
With Uncle Sam's cash for his wages;
To the Holy Land on a grand enterprise,
He went for His Majesty's babies!

With pious devotion he knelt on the shore,
And filled hunc bottles to bring,
From Jordan's stream, consecrated of yore,
To sprinkle the child of a king!

Then down with the faces of dough, &c.

He mourned in his heart that he could not vote,

For the Wilmot Proviso, he said,

For six months he had combed his head,

And a change was thought going on,

In the people's minds and his own,

The Constitution would be trampled upon,

And the tares of dissension be sown!

Then down with the faces of dough, &c.

His Southern lords called for more slave soil,

But the freemen of the North said "No!"

No more of the curse of ungod toil,

But come out for the Proviso,

Between these fires he roasted and sweat,

Till he hit on a plausible plan;

Quoth he, "I'll decide these Free Soilers yet,"

But I'm much deceived if he can,

Then down with the faces of dough, &c.

This wonderful plan was to say to the North,

"Let the Territories do as they please!"

And then, with a sly wink, suggest to the South,

"You can take out your slaves, you know!"

But he and the old Hunker will never speak at chaff,

He will spread his broad pinions for flight,

And our Freeman at such a contrivance will laugh,

While they put in their votes for the right!

Then down with the faces of dough, &c.

The Presidential Contest--Its Philosophy and Probabilities--A Set-off to the Boasts of Hunkerism.

The Taylor press frequently quote from the editorial columns of the N. Y. Herald. It may be well, now and then, to appeal from the editors, to those of his political correspondents, who are more temperate and independent in tone. Such is the Albany correspondent of that Journal, who, in a late communication, mingles some errors and crudities with many valuable and far-sighted suggestions.

Read it attentively, and inwardly digest the horoscope, cast by the writer in the closing paragraphs, of political organization in 1852.

But to the letter--*Cin. Globe*

ALBANY, October 13, 1848.

Calculations of the Strength and Projects of the Free Soil Party--Curious Exposition of the Views of the Triumvirate of the Democracy--Benton, Van Buren, and Calhoun--The Van Buren Views of the Struggle.

The results of the recent elections in Pennsylvania and Ohio prove that the Free Soil party will wield a powerful influence in the approaching Presidential election. I am aware that any statements which will enable the public to form some idea of the expectations and designs of the leaders of this party will be highly interesting at this particular crisis. Hence, I am about to give you the substance of some confidential conversations which have recently taken place between Martin Van Buren and others, in relation to the strength, and the present and future policy, of the Free Soil party.

The movement, they declare, is comprehensive and natural, not local. It looks to permanency, and while arriving at immediate success, pitches its view beyond '48 to the plain and visible mark of '52. It embraces, in the State, not only such sagacious politicians as Martin Van Buren, Flagg, Young, &c., but a host of ardent and enthusiastic minds among the younger class of politicians headed by that brilliant young man, John Van Buren.

We cannot believe that a cause can be a forlorn one, or anything but an auspicious one, when such a man as Judge Gardner throws himself into it, or when Dix stakes upon it a reputation fast rising to be the first in the nation. It is to the vast and eventually controlling army of young men that these leaders look for security and advancement, for the bold and apparently self-sacrificing attitude which they have assumed. It is owing to the presence of this body of young men, heavy vote also in Iowa, Michigan, and the confidence they inspire in Connecticut, and New Jersey, which regard to the future, that this comparatively hopeless party exhibits a zeal, strength now, but which will operate

confidence, and enthusiasm, that neither the military nor civil characters of the two leading candidates,--and services of Cass or Taylor have elicited in the old organizations. The Free Soil party, however, professes an entire willingness to submit

to the enthusiastic views to the cold and chilling certainty of an arithmetical wilbalance each other, the map of the

calculation. They claim to be able to carry the pending Presidential controversy into the House of Representatives, and there they insist, that their chances are as good as any of the candidates, if not better. They put down as certain for them New York, Vermont and Wisconsin, and a plurality in the popular vote, if not a clear majority in Massachusetts. In this State they contend the Cass party will not poll any considerable vote out of the city of New York--probably not more than 30,000 and certainly not more than 50,000. This deficiency the Free Soil men will make up out of the seceding whigs, the abolitionists, and the anti-rent and national reform parties. The whig vote will be diminished largely by the absence of dissatisfied voters from the polls. Here is an estimate made by Martin Van Buren and his intimate friends.

Cass cannot possibly get the popular vote; and according to this view, Ohio cannot give it to Taylor, nor even Massachusetts added to the list of States in his favor.

The election must thus go to the House of Representatives. Once there a new element enters into the struggle. There is but one contingency by which Cass or Taylor can get sixteen States, and with less than that number they are no better off than Van Buren with three States, or with only one.

The question must resolve itself--as the elements which compose it are attracted and repelled--into one of North and South. On that line of division, the States are evenly balanced; and yet, to two of the Southern States, (Texas and Missouri) Van Buren

is more acceptable than might be the candidate of the South--and this apart from all views of the succession. But if this be not so--and here, I take it, rests the real trust of the Van Buren party--the question can only be decided by a coalition and compromise (bargain and corruption, as the people would term it) between the two opposing candidates. Let that event come, say the free soilers, and "woe to the victors!" The administration thus formed is blasted in its strength from its birth, and the party of opposition--the free soilers in the van--become omnipotent in determining the destinies of the country. The battle of '52 is won beyond a doubt. In that battle of '52 to which the Van Buren party look forward as the era of deliverance and triumph, an element is to enter which is not understood by the multitude, but the operation of which, the sagacious leaders of the barnburners, looking into "the seeds of time," have anticipated.

By the certain and inevitable law of population--the calculation that leads to the result is predicated on the successive census of the last thirty years.

The enumeration of 1850, and the distribution of representatives and presidential electors, founded upon it, will give to the free northern democratic States, including Ohio, a vote exceeding

that of all the southern States, and the old fashioned whig States combined!

Here is the secret of the confidence, the enthusiasm, and the apparent desperation of the free soilers. Here, also, is the secret speculation that moves the profound mind of John C. Calhoun and his devoted followers, to demand that the New Mexico-American States should be attached to the Southern league by a community of institutions. This is the enigma of the opposition to the Oregon bill last winter; and to go back, of the surrender from 54 deg. 40 min. to 49 deg. It is this that moves the Mississian in his ponderous struggles. Benton, Calhoun, and Van Buren are studying the laws of population and its mystic but powerful secrets, (like Malthusians) while the whigs are wasting their energies and throwing away the future in a suicidal and pernicious contest for "Old Zack and Old Whitey."

Viewed in this aspect, the Presidential contest is the struggle of great powers--a contest of dynasty against dynasty--in which Cass and Taylor are the mere stool-pigeons of a small hawking party--the puppets of a present occasion--and permanent domination and the future empire of States, the secret stakes of the real parties to

the game.

I cannot view these men playing this deep game--if game it can be called--without a feeling of profound pity for the Whigs and their short sighted leaders, nor without a feeling of admiration for the sagacious men at the head of the Democratic party, in whose fore-

sight I think I discern the solution of the protracted ascendancy of that interest in the nation. Calhoun in the South, Benton in the West, Van Buren in the North have been a potent triumvir; and the contest of '44, which was only carried by secret and fraudulent promises to all three, since violated, because incompatible and impossible of fulfillment, has not deprived them of their power. The Whig party includes no such profound men--

The brilliant mind of Clay discarded such distant speculations; and the massive intellect of Webster eminently capable of discerning their character and estimating their power, has turned

from them in despair, and seeks con-

tent in the momentary triumphs of the present.

The foregoing is strictly the Van Buren view of the present posture of affairs. I give them, and you may take them for what they are worth.

From the Albany Atlas,

Gen. TAYLOR and the PROVISO.

No Whig pretends that Gen. Taylor has given any assurance that he will stand by the rights of the Free States, unless it is contained in his Allison letter.

An attempt is made to pervert the fair and obvious import of that letter, and to construe it into such an assurance.

Ask a Taylor Whig why the Philadelphia Convention kicked out the Proviso with hisses and scorn and he will reply: "there is the Allison letter."

Ask him why the Convention failed to lay down any platform, and you meet with the same response.

Ask him why, being a Free Soil man,

he can support Taylor, and the stereotyped reply is, "There's the Allison letter."

It becomes important, then, to

examine this letter in connection with the circumstances under which it was written, for the purpose of seeing what was the real intention and design of its author.

It is proper in the outset, to state that the Convention at Philadelphia, after having hooted down every honored principle and usage of the party, undertook to adopt a resolution approving of the Allison letter, and that the resolution met the same fate as its predecessors, but not for the same reason.

The resolutions avowing allegiance to the whig party, approving of the nomination of Taylor if he would accept it as a whig, and declaring the principle of the Proviso to be an inseparable element of the whig creed, were rejected because they did not suit the *South*--that approving the Allison letter because it did not suit the *North*.

But to the letter.

Who is this Capt. Allison?

If we are correctly informed,

he is a brother-in-law of Mr. Van Buren, in imitation of those

never yet knew the difference between principle and party.

We take from yesterday's Tribune,

an extract honorable to

the heart of the writer, and a withering

rebuke to the slanderers of the great and good men, who bear the standard of Freedom:

The substance is this:

1st. The will of the people, as expressed by their representatives, ought to be carried out.

2d. The veto power ought not to be exercised except in cases of clearly unconstitutional legislation, or manifest haste or want of consideration.

3d. Upon questions of domestic policy, the constitutionality of a law will be determined by the exposition which the constitution has received in the legislation of the country, and the decision of the judiciary.

Now what is the meaning of this test?

If that distinguished whig, Judge Berrien, of Georgia, or Baile Peyton, of Louisiana, had used the same language, no one could doubt what was intended.

Either of them would say a law prohibiting slavery in the territories was unconstitutional, for the reason that it would be contrary to the previous legislation of the country on the question of slavery.

Such is the sentiments of the entire South, irrespective of party, on that subject.

President Polk so said in his recent *veto message* given to Congress with his *approval* of the Oregon Bill.

Is it to be supposed that Gen. Taylor proves an exception to southern men and slaveholders upon this question?

He is not so treated at the South.

They say he is "of them, and for them."

Take another view of the letter and it is equally as conclusive in favor of the South.

It is this: the doctrine of the Proviso or the Ordinance of 1787, has never been applied to an inch of territory south of the line of the Missouri Compromise.

That line has, since 1820, been recognized as the dividing line between the slave and free territory.

The South claim it as being as sacred as the compromise which permitted slavery in the "old thirteen."

Is it not clear then that the qualification given by the General in this letter was intended to meet the case of an attempt to extend the ordinance of Freedom south of that line?

Would not such a law be contrary to the exposition which the Constitution has received in the legislation of the country?

When we consider that Gen. Taylor has said the "South should never agree to the provisions of the Wilmot Proviso," that he "considered the Missouri Compromise a fair and liberal line for settling the Slave question, and he was willing to see it adopted," and that he has expressed his fears that this Free Soil movement would engross all other questions in this campaign, it would seem to leave no room to doubt the meaning of the Allison letter.

Then the farther fact, that the Allison letter was dressed as it was, to a slaveholder, brother-in-law, Mr. McClellan, of Cincinnati, Ohio, addressed to him, making the direct

er, if elected, he would also should it pass Congress refused to answer or to self not to do so. That

gives strong additional what his intentions are, and dissipates all hope of deriving from the vague generalities of the letter in favor of Free

It is said, upon good au-

lieve, that Mr. Hilliard, of

was in the Philadelphia Con-

on letter as evidence that I

creates no distrust of Taylor

The result in South Carolina is significant of Southern confi-

General.

Another consideration is we remembered in this connection effort of the South will be to

line of the Missouri Com-

Pacific. For that policy the

likely to secure the co-operation

Doughfaces. In the event

law passing Congress, the All

furnishes the most positive a

it would meet with the Execu

because that would be claimed

accordance with the past legisla

While the application of the

TO THE ELECTORS OF INDIANA.

FELLOW CITIZENS: The election which is to determine the future destiny of Free Territory, large enough to form twenty States, is to be decided by your votes on next Tuesday. The great question involved, in fact the ONLY question involved in the canvass is, shall this territory be consecrated to the interests of Freedom—be made the home of free men, whose free labor shall give contentment and plenty: or shall it be converted from its present position, and made the home of the slave? On your votes will the issue depend. The present is the only time, to speak by your ballots for or against this great question, for the first time made directly an issue before the AMERICAN PEOPLE. Unlike other questions of policy, its determination is to be final; if a wrong decision is made, the error is fatal, and cannot be hereafter amended. The decision made is for the FUTURE as well as the PRESENT. If this be true, and all will admit it, the canvass presents a question of the highest magnitude. The Washington Union, the National Intelligencer, the leading organs in all places, of all parties, together with the leading statesmen of the country, declare the extension or restriction of slavery to be THE ISSUE in the present canvass.

What then is the duty of every good citizen? 1st. We say with the Buffalo platform, to resist the extension of slavery by all constitutional means.

Because, Its influence is to impoverish any country in which it may be planted. It cripples the energies, degrades the morals, and prevents the spread of information among the masses. To the proof. The price of lands equal in quality and natural advantages, differ in the slave and free States, in favor of the latter one hundred per cent. In the old slave States, large tracts of land are worn out and entirely unproductive, while such a thing is unknown in the free States, where exists the energy of Free Labor.

The slave States are comparatively without commerce, manufactures, or common school systems, while the masses of the poorer classes, are grossly deficient in learning and morals. These are admitted facts, and we ask you if an institution which thus renders barren the soil, and enervates mental, moral, and physical energy whenever its influences are felt, should not be restricted from exerting its baneful effects over a portion of our common country now free from its curses.

2d. HOW CAN IT BE DONE? WE ANSWER, ONLY BY THE APPLICATION OF THE PRINCIPLES OF THE ORDINANCE OF 1787, EMBRACED IN THE WILMOT PROVISO.

The doctrine held by many that the question should be left to the settlers in the territories, is neither just nor in accordance with the true spirit of our institutions. Every Freeman in Indiana has a direct interest in every foot of unsold domain in our newly acquired territory, and it is his right to have a voice in shaping the destiny of that which is his own, in common with others, and the few settlers have no right to set at defiance the will of a majority of the whole people, and by cursing the public domain with the institution of slavery, thus destroy or diminish the value of lands which are the common property of ALL. Again, this "let alone policy" of John C. Calhoun, John M. Clayton, Lewis Cass and other slavery propagandists, is not sufficient to prevent the extension of slavery, but is the surest means of fastening it upon the territories. There exists a difference of opinion between the North and the South, in regard to the law governing the institution of slavery.—The South hold that they have a right to remove to their territories with their slaves, and to hold them there without any law save the constitution, and that under that sacred instrument, the flag of our country wherever it waves, carries with it slavery as a part of our country's institutions. The latest decisions of their courts sustain them in their position, and all they ask is to leave the question for the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, a majority of whom are slaveholders, and hold the same views of the law as are entertained by the whole South. We say then, that to render the matter safe, and to settle the controversy, we must have a positive enactment of Congress on the subject. That Congress has power to pass an act forbidding the extension of slavery, we of the North hold to be settled, Lewis Cass and the South to the contrary notwithstanding. Because the constitution declares that "The Congress shall have power to dispose of, and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States."—Con. Art. 4, § 3.

In 1789, Congress, by authority of this provision, enacted an ordinance excluding slavery from all territories of the United States, and it received the approval of WASHINGTON; and similar provisions have received the sanctions of every President except J. Q. Adams and Harrison, who ever presided over our country. It has been held valid by the United States Supreme Court—was originated with Jefferson, and has given freedom and prosperity to Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana and Wisconsin.

With these facts before you who will you vote for?

Every vote cast for Cass is a vote given for extending the area of slavery.

In his Nicholson letter, he avers that he is opposed to the passage of the Wilmot Proviso, because he does not "see in the Constitution any delegation of the requisite power to Congress." As an honest man, believing it to be unconstitutional, he is bound to veto it. The papers advocating his election, from the Union down to the Indiana State Sentinel, say that he will do so. He will thus prevent legislation on the subject, and aid the slaveholders in their favorite "let alone policy," to extend the area of their "peculiar institution."

Again, Every vote given for Gen. Taylor is a vote given for extending the area of slavery. Gen. Taylor and the leading Whig statesmen and presses, are unfavorable to the ordinance of Freedom.

To the proof. Almost the entire Taylor party used every exertion to secure the passage of "Clayton's Compromise Bill," which yielded the whole question, and provided, as stated by Mr. Clayton himself, for the introduction of slave labor where found profitable. Every Southern Taylor Senator, with Phelps, of Vermont, voted directly to allow the extension of slavery.

The slavery propagandists of South Carolina, abandon Cass and adopt Taylor as safer for their interests. In their address they say:

"WE KNOW THAT IN THIS GREAT, PARAMOUNT AND LEADING QUESTION OF THE RIGHTS OF THE SOUTH, HE IS OF US, HE IS WITH US, HE IS FOR US."

With this declaration before him, Gen. Taylor accepts their nomination "with emotions of profound gratitude."

Mr. Benjamin, one of the Taylor Electors in Louisiana, in a speech recently delivered by him at Gen. Taylor's place of residence, said:

"I can assure my fellow-citizens here that Gen. Taylor will promptly veto anything like the Wilmot Proviso. The interests of the South are safe in his hands."

Add to this the fact that Gen. Taylor himself said to Col. Boone of the Mississippi Senate, "THE SOUTH OUGHT NEVER TO AGREE TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE WILMOT PROVISO,"—that he has subsequently declared himself in favor of adopting the Missouri compromise line—and we think no sane man can doubt the truth of the proposition that the supporters of Taylor do act directly in aid of the extension of slavery.

Again, Every vote cast for Van Buren is a vote direct against the extension of slavery.

The great argument against voting for the Buffalo candidate is, that he cannot be elected, and therefore every vote cast for him is thrown away. The conclusion does not necessarily follow the fact.

EVERY VOTE WILL HAVE A POWERFUL AND SALUTARY EFFECT UPON THE ACTION OF CONGRESS.

Willis Hall, late Whig Attorney General, in his letter to Clay Whigs of New York, thus places the matter in its true light. He says: "It is material to the ultimate success of the principle of Free Soil, that its friends should make the strongest possible demonstration, at this time. If it is feeble and limited, it will be despised by the South, and ridiculed alike by the friends of

Cass and Taylor. If, on the other hand, it shows an imposing front—if its lion roar is heard through the forest, the South will not dare to demand that the new territories be admitted without restriction, and if it does, neither the Cass nor the Taylor party will dare to accede to their demand. Every vote strengthens the cause of Free Soil, whether Mr. Van Buren is elected or not. Nineteen-tenths of the voters of the North are opposed to the further extension of slavery; let but half that number speak out like men, and their voice will be as potent as the creative fiat."

Again, Every vote cast for Martin Van Buren is a rebuke to sectional feeling. The great question of Freedom is a question involving the interests of the WHOLE UNION, without regard to geographical lines and sectional interest. It is the cause of the WHOLE PEOPLE against the sectional exactions of Southern slavery, demanding the extension of its evils for sectional interest, when it is against the interests of our common country.

That this sectional spirit should be rebuked, we appeal to the writings of the Father of our country, and the great and good of all parties. The spirit of every elector should be, *let me do what is for the best interests of our whole people.*

Fellow Citizens: From the above considerations we come to the conclusion that neither Cass nor Taylor are worthy of the support of the friends of a FREE COUNTRY. They and their supporters ask to enforce doctrines unknown to our true governmental policy, and held unwise and unpatriotic by WASHINGTON and JEFFERSON.

The banner upheld by our revolutionary Fathers, bore proudly inscribed on its folds, UNION FOR LIBERTY, and never sectional division for slavery extension.

However you and I may have heretofore acted in reference to this matter, our duty now is to uphold that same glorious old banner. How will it be done? We answer by voting for the candidates pledged to sustain the BUFFALO PLATFORM.

The Wilmot Proviso a Humbug.

This is the cry that now constantly greets our ears, as coming from the old hunker parties. It is unnecessary, there is no danger, slavery can never be extended unless by positive enactment, are the stereotyped phrases in the mouth of every small fry politician in the old Hunker ranks.

We will look for a moment at facts presenting themselves to us as found in the history of the past, and see what has been done heretofore, and then take the lamp of experience for our guide. In the year 1620, slaves were first introduced into Virginia, against the consent of the colonists, and without any legal authority. No legislative act was passed declaring slavery to exist, for more than 120 years, yet during all that time men were held in bondage, precisely as if the law had fixed the manner of holding them. Slavery had existed, in fact, in both Georgia and South Carolina, for 70 years before it was legalized.

But coming down to later times, slavery was abolished throughout all Mexico in 1829. Texas was a part of the Republic, and until the adoption of the Texan constitution, the same laws existed in that country as now exists in New Mexico and California. But did the fact that there was no law legalizing slavery in Texas, prevent slaveholders from migrating to that country, and holding slaves without law and against law? Certainly not. Would not reason teach us that the same thing will be repeated in our new territories if there is not means taken to prevent it?—Each candid, honest man, can answer this question for himself.

They may quote decisions which are not admitted to be law by the civilians of the South, to sustain their position, and they may make arguments which in theory appear plausible, but facts show conclusively that practice is not consistent with the theory.

The South contend that evidence of the existence in fact of slavery, is evidence of its legal existence. This was decided before the Supreme Court of Missouri, last year, in the case of Charlotte vs. Chouteau, which we published two weeks since.

The Wilmot Proviso, or a similar enactment is the only thing that can keep our territories free, and render these large domains the homes of happy free men.—Is this a desirable result? if so, how can it be accomplished?

With either Cass or Taylor as President, if the territories are organized, Governors, Judges and officers to carry into effect the laws, would be either slaveholders, or their willing tools, who would respect the rights of slave owners to their "peculiar property," and no effort of the friends of Freedom would be of any avail when frowned down by the minions of the slave power.

We say to northern freemen, if you wish to keep the national government in the hands of slavery propagandists, with executive influence in favor of extending the area of Calhoun's "blessed" institution, then vote for Cass or Taylor, it can make but little difference which. If, however, you wish the opposite, go for Matty, Free Soil, Free Speech, Free Labor, and Free Men. This alone can maintain our territories free, and prevent the establishment of slavery in New Mexico and California.

The "Old Keystone" gave her vote for Jackson and Harrison, and she will not withhold it from Taylor. There cannot exist reasonable doubt about the truth of the prediction.—*Indiana State Journal.*

Has John been among the prophets of late? He was wont to be found there, and put on record some curious predictions. He once predicted that Gen. Tay-

lor would be a man for the Presidency, who did not agree with them upon the unconstitutionality. In New York, we resolved that we would stand by the compromises of the Constitution—that we would not, in the least, infringe upon them; but we also resolved that we would never consent to the further extension of slavery. Lewis Cass had declared himself in favor of the Wilmot Proviso—declared his willingness to vote for it—regretted that he had not an opportunity to do so. But mark! When this stand was taken by the South, he became impressed with the conviction that a "CHANGE" (applause) had been going on in his public mind—he was sure a change had been wrought in his own mind. He declared that the Wilmot Proviso was unconstitutional. He voted against it. The Baltimore Convention assembled—N. York was refused a seat there. South Carolina was admitted, though the State had sent no representatives there.

It was idle to say that the Convention could not determine which were the regular delegates. Had the New York delegates been irregular, hostile as they were known to be to the extension of slavery, they would not have been allowed to come near the building—they would not have been suffered even to land at Baltimore. (Laughter.) Why, if the Convention could not decide upon this question, they ought to have adjourned instantly and without day! (applause.) It is the first duty of a body of that character, to decide who is entitled to seats.

The whole Convention was irregular! They were a mob, and the riot act should have been read, and the mob dispersed. (Laughter and cheers.) Now they say this nomination was regular. What is regular? Had they nominated Daniel Webster, would it have been regular? A regular nomination should represent the whole. Every State in the Union should have been represented there—every man in the Democratic party should be eligible to a seat and a vote. But in this mob-convention, one man from South Carolina, not sent by the Democracy, votes for a whole State—a COMMANDER without men (much merriment) was given a seat and all privileges, while seventy two freemen and Democrats from New York, were excluded. The delegates from Virginia, Alabama, and Florida, were instructed not to go for any man known to be favorable to the Wilmot Proviso; and Thomas Jefferson was the author of the Wilmot Proviso! That illustrious patriot could not have had a seat in the Baltimore Convention. The Southern Democrats would not have allowed him to vote! Is that Democratic? Is that regular? If so, we ought to organize anew, and be irregular. It is high time that the Democracy should cease to be regular, and begin to be right.

The South required that the Candidate should be a believer in the right of the Slaveholders to go into the new territories, and take with them their slaves: but now let me read to you the manner in which the Baltimore candidate conformed to the test imposed. He says in his letter written to Mr. Nicholson of Tennessee:

"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."

Arguing thus in favor of the extension of slavery to free territory, and yielding the full subjection desired by the South. Now, having gone against the Wilmot Proviso, and in favor of slavery extension, how can a Free Soil Democrat say, "I shall vote for Lewis Cass?" (Cries of "they can't! they can't! nobody can!") How could they go to the polls, and vote for a candidate for Congress professedly in favor of Free Soil, and yet support a Presidential candidate who says, "the South have the right to take their property in slaves, to the new territory," and thus lay the sure foundation for more slave States? Could he go farther for the South, unless he should run a steamboat into New Mexico and California, and transported the slaves there himself? (Merriment and applause.)

Cass's Popularity.
The N. Y. True Sun is accustomed to brag of Cass's popularity. It is designated to do this, and has the hardihood for the brazen task. But it sometimes forgets its part, and becomes conscious of the ridiculousness of its candidate's position. In the same number of the paper in which we find a boast that Cass's popularity, at all points of the compass, will be seen at the polls, we find the following solution of this popularity:

The Rochester American tells a good one of Winchell. On Wednesday night, as the packet boat Cataract was coming into that city from the West, after the passengers were all in their berths, conversation continued quite lively, the temperature being considerable above the sleeping point. Some one threw out the remark that there was not a Cass man on board. Immediately a voice exclaimed, "I am for Cass." Another from a distant berth chimed in, "I too." Still another muttered, "And here's a Cass man," until twelve were counted. The thing was all explained in the morning. The outrageous ventriloquist, Winchell, was aboard!

CLEAR THE TRACK FOR THE FREE SOIL CAR.—The western counties are just beginning to wake up on the subject of Free Soil, and when we get fairly started on that track, we will give the Old Honkers "Hail Columbia," and no mistake. Such a three-cornered fight as you will see in Michigan will be a caution, about the first days of November, Anno Domini 1848.—[True Dem.

For the Banner.
The Taylor Party and Free Soil.

The Taylor party claim free soil as one of their principles, and ask its friends to confide it to them. But the folly of such a course can soon be made evident. The Taylor party has its Northern and Southern divisions. The Southern whigs are as much opposed to free soil, as Northern whigs are in favor of it. The primary object of both sections of the party, is to continue united. To preserve this union of the party, the politicians of both sections are willing to make sacrifices, not of their personal interest indeed, but of any general interest or principle however important or sacred it may be. The "Union of the Whigs" is the party watchword, and to this Union everything must yield. How absurd it is then, to ask the friends of free soil to rely upon the whig party, or any party organization which embraces both the interests of free-labor and slave-labor. The Southern whigs as well as Southern democrats, have always united upon the slavery question. They always have, and they will continue to uphold the interests of slavery. Northern whigs, thus far, have generally voted to sustain the interests of free soil. If, then, we suppose them to continue firm in the stand they have taken, the free soil principles cannot succeed unless Northern democrats unite with them. But a prudent free soil man will inquire whether, under circumstances different from any in which they have been placed, there is no danger of Northern whigs succumbing to the South, as Northern democrats have heretofore done. The whigs have opposed a democratic administration. Northern whigs, to obtain power, have denounced the subserviency of Northern democrats to slavery. From the necessity of the case, they have sustained Northern interests.

But what do we now behold? The extension of slavery by universal consent, is the great question of the day. The greatness of the crisis required a man such as John McLean, Gen. Scott, or Henry Clay, pledged against the extension of slavery. Southern whigs demanded a Southern candidate, and our Northern whigs yielded to their demand. They have thus sacrificed the principles they have professed for years, to obtain power, have commenced the same course of subversion to the slave power, for which they denounced Northern democrats. If a free soil whig is asked to vote for Taylor, let him think of the Philadelphia Convention, and commit, if he can, the interests of free soil to such politicians. If Northern whigs could be their backs to the lash of the slave-river, and then thank him for the slightest favor as at Philadelphia, what might not such whigs do in Washington, with a slaveholding administration, and the immense patronage of the government, dispersed by those who condescend to be called brethren indeed, but who in this case, as always, exercised Lordship over them.

Let us rebuke our betrayers at Philadelphia. It is their fault that they have deceived us once; it will be ours if they do it again. Let Northern whigs rebel against Southern dictation now, or forever after hold their peace.

Let no friend of free soil decieve himself, in the belief that the whig party, or the democratic party, as such, will carry out their favorite principle. The only hope of our country in this time of eminent peril, is the intelligent and independent action of every citizen.

PENN.

For the Banner.

To Democrats.

The principles of Democracy rightly understood and applied, are destined to regenerate the political world. That government is an institution of Heaven, to be modified and sustained by the governed for their own good, is the truth which will prevail.

Democracy should protect the rights and interests of every human being who is under its influence. In its own nature, it is incompatible with every form or system of oppression, nor can slavery of any kind exist where Democracy is carried into actual operation. The idea of a slaveholding Democrat is absurd. By the force of circumstances over which he imagines he has no control, he may hold a legal title to slaves; but if he is a Democrat, he will acknowledge that his slaves are his brethren and entitled by their Creator to the same rights which he claims and exercises. No true Democrat can cherish slavery or use any means to extend it. Men who advocate, who connive at, or in any manner consent to the extension of slavery, are enemies to Democracy by practice, whatever they may be by profession. Jefferson was the founder of the Democratic party; the great Apostle of Democracy. He was also a slaveholder. But he declared slavery an evil, a curse both to the master and the slave. As a consistent Democrat he endeavored to check the evil, to prevent the extension of slavery. He was the author and the great advocate of the Ordinance of 1787. Jefferson was a true Democrat. What a spectacle do we

now present to the civilized world. The Democratic party of this model Republic, forsaking the precepts and practice of Jefferson, denouncing his policy as opposed to Democracy, as unconstitutional, now supporting a candidate for the Presidency who is pledged to sustain the South in the extension of slavery. Gen. Cass pronounces the Ordinance of 1787 as unconstitutional, which was proposed and advocated by Jefferson, sanctioned by Washington, and recognized by every President down to the present time. Even Mr. Polk recognized the power of Congress by signing the Oregon bill. Gen. Cass is unworthy of the support of any freeman, especially of any Democrat. What true Democrat prefers the opinion of Cass to that of Jefferson and Washington? How can a Democrat vote for a man pledged to veto the Wilmot Proviso?

Let every Democrat ask himself what Democracy means, and whether he can answer it to his conscience, to his country, and to his God, in voting for Cass and the extension of slavery.

The Free Soil party is the only, the true Democracy. Van Buren is the representative of the principles of Jefferson.

Let the Free Democracy rally around him.

A FREE DEMOCRAT.

For the Banner.

David Wilmot.

The election of this gentleman to Congress, from Pennsylvania, is an event alike honorable to himself and his constituents, and auspicious to the cause to which he is devoted. The freemen of Pennsylvania are entitled to the admiration and gratitude, of every friend of freedom, for electing David Wilmot to Congress, and giving him a majority so great and overwhelming. Notwithstanding the factious opposition of a few pretended democrats, the true democracy of his district, aided by many independent whigs, have nobly sustained him.

The result proves that the heart of the people is right, upon the issue involved in the contest.

Let no Northern democrat in Congress, therefore, fear to trust himself with his constituents, while he places himself on the side of Jefferson and Wilmot. Let doughfaces look forward and see the scorn and contempt, which will assuredly be visited upon them, if they betray their constituents, and sacrifice the honors and interests of their country, in the present contest with the slave dealer.

P.

Read This.

The following observations, taken from the Cayuga Free Soil Advocate, published at Auburn, N. Y., we commend to the careful perusal of all our readers. They are applicable to all parts of the Union. Read them over carefully—reflect upon them seriously—let their truths make a proper impression upon every mind, and when you go to the polls,

REMEMBER, that this election will decide whether we are or are not to have FIFTEEN NEW SLAVE STATES, and be cursed with THIRTY MORE SLAVEHOLDING U. S. SENATORS, SLAVEHOLDING PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS, and some TWENTY THOUSAND MORE SLAVEHOLDING OFFICEHOLDERS, to be supported by the free North. Shall we have them?

REMEMBER, that if the North loses in this struggle, her political preponderance is gone, and the SOUTH WILL RULE US FOREVER.

Shall we suffer ourselves to be more enslaved than we now are? Have we not yielded enough already?

Remember, that if you suffer slavery to go into California and New Mexico, those countries can never be settled by free emigrants. What Irishman, or German, or Scotchman, wants to go there and work by the side of Negro Slaves, and be despised and abused as a WHITE NIGGER, as the laboring whites are in the South?

Remember, that the free democracy propose to cut up the public lands in those territories into suitable divisions, and to give a FARM FREE TO EVERY ACTUAL SETTLER. Who is willing to yield all that glorious country to spendthrift planters and their negroes? Who is willing to give those vast and rich gold mines, recently discovered, to the insatiable avarice of the slavedrivers?

Remember that CASS IS PLEDGED TO VETO THE WILMOT PROVISO, and that the candidate of the opposite party has not told you what he would do, but his Southern friends who know him best, declare that Gen. Taylor WILL UNDOUBTEDLY VETO THE PROVISO. The slaveholders have begun to move into New Mexico with their slaves. Judge Beard of Texas has gone to take possession of the country, claiming it for Texas. The moment of finale decision has come. NOTHING BUT THE PROVISO CAN SAVE THE COUNTRY. WILL YOU VOTE THE PROVISO?

Remember that the only opposition to Van Buren and Adams is the result of the old party prejudices. Is there one of you who will risk the rights of the North and the honor of the country to gratify an old prejudice? Be nobler men. It is better to join with an enemy to do right than with a friend to do wrong.

Remember that every vote is important. It has a vast moral power. The South will be sure to watch the election returns, and she will count the votes. Let us roll up such a majority as will astonish, confound and overwhelm the minions of slavery. We can do it. Shall we do it?

FARMER in the field, MECHANIC at the bench, STUDENT among the records of the past, PRIEST at the holy altar, we call upon you by all the glorious recollections of by-gone years, by all the blessings and comforts of our present freedom, by every hope that streams in light across the darkness of the future, by your love of liberty and man, by your fear of God who commands you to establish justice in the land, and by your hope in Him who died for the freedom of the world, we call upon you to choose the better side. We call upon you to strike for liberty and the rights of man.

What are you doing? Is your town organized? Have you an active, faithful committee, in every School District? Has every voter been conversed with? Have you supplied every one with the necessary documents? Have the Assembly District Central Committees, whose duty it is, taken the poll lists every where, so that they know just how many votes we shall have? Are you holding neighborhood meetings? Are you doing all that earnest men can do?

If you leave the work to others—if you grudge a few dollars expense or a few days time—if you neglect your duty and the work is not done, and we are defeated, how bitterly you will reproach yourselves hereafter. Reflect, the NEGLECT of TEN MEN may lose us the State, and with that loss bring down the curse of perpetual slavery upon the country. WHO WILL BE ONE OF TEN TO SELL HIS COUNTRY! We must have every vote. EVERY MAN MUST WORK. NOT AN HOUR MUST BE LOST. On then to the Battle. On to the Victory! The country "expects every man to do his duty."

From the Ithaca Journal.

Who are for Free Soil?—Read and see.

Mr. Harkell, a Taylor whig from Tennessee, was asked on the floor of Congress, this question, "Will Gen. Taylor veto the Wilmot Proviso?" He replied, "I can tell you what I believe—I believe that Gen. Taylor is opposed to the doctrine of the Proviso."—[App. C. Globe, p. 747.]

This is Taylor 'Free Soil' in Tennessee.

Again, Mr. Hilliard, a Taylor whig from Alabama, was asked whether he believed a majority of the Philadelphia convention were opposed to the Wilmot Proviso? In reply, he said, "I desire to say that, when that convention, in the open light of day, thousands looking on, voted to put down the Proviso, it gave me the strongest assurance I could ask that they would stand by the South against it."—[App. C. Globe, p. 777.]

This is Taylor 'Free Soil' in Alabama!

Again, Senator Phelps, a Taylor whig from Vermont, was one of the co-conductors of the infamous compromise bill, upheld it, and urged it through the Senate, thus giving over to the blighting curse of slavery a vast extent of territory now free! Yet he is sustained by the Taylor Free Soil party, and none of their journals have yet dared to speak of this 'Vernon Dickinson' as he deserves.

This is Taylor 'Free Soil' in Vermont!

REMEMBER, that this election will decide whether we are or are not to have FIFTEEN NEW SLAVE STATES, and be cursed with THIRTY MORE SLAVEHOLDING U. S. SENATORS, SLAVEHOLDING PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS, and some TWENTY THOUSAND MORE SLAVEHOLDING OFFICEHOLDERS, to be supported by the free North. Shall we have them?

REMEMBER, that if the North loses in this struggle, her political preponderance is gone, and the SOUTH WILL RULE US FOREVER.

Shall we suffer ourselves to be more enslaved than we now are? Have we not yielded enough already?

Remember, that if you suffer slavery to go into California and New Mexico, those countries can never be settled by free emigrants. What Irishman, or German, or Scotchman, wants to go there and work by the side of Negro Slaves, and be despised and abused as a WHITE NIGGER, as the laboring whites are in the South?

Remember, that the free democracy propose to cut up the public lands in those territories into suitable divisions, and to give a FARM FREE TO EVERY ACTUAL SETTLER. Who is willing to yield all that glorious country to spendthrift planters and their negroes?

Remember that CASS IS PLEDGED TO VETO THE WILMOT PROVISO, and that the candidate of the opposite party has not told you what he would do, but his Southern friends who know him best, declare that Gen. Taylor WILL UNDOUBTEDLY VETO THE PROVISO. The slaveholders have begun to move into New Mexico with their slaves. Judge Beard of Texas has gone to take possession of the country, claiming it for Texas. The moment of finale decision has come. NOTHING BUT THE PROVISO CAN SAVE THE COUNTRY. WILL YOU VOTE THE PROVISO?

Remember that the only opposition to Van Buren and Adams is the result of the old party prejudices. Is there one of you who will risk the rights of the North and the honor of the country to gratify an old prejudice? Be nobler men. It is better to join with an enemy to do right than with a friend to do wrong.

This is Taylor 'Free Soil' in Louisiana.

Again, in the preamble to the resolutions adopted at a Taylor meeting in Charleston, S. C., we find the following: "His interests are our interests. We know he must feel the lawless character of any attempt to interfere with our property, directly or indirectly; we know he must feel the senseless clamor that is raised to disturb our possession of that property, as violating the law either of God or man. We know that, in this great paramount and leading question of the South, he is with us, he is of us, and he is for us."

This is Taylor 'Free Soil' in Carolina!

Again, "Mr. Hope H. Slatter, the notorious slave dealer at Baltimore, has closed his slave market. The fugitives re-captured on board the 'Pearl' were about the last he purchased. Mr. Slatter has taken the stump for Taylor, and that is the cause of the closing of the market."—Detroit Press.

This is Taylor 'Free Soil' in Maryland!

Again, when a few weeks ago, the silly story was started in New Haven, Conn., that a "certain somebody" had received a letter from Gen. Taylor, saying, "that he would not veto the Proviso," it strayed out of its intended latitude, and found its way to Richmond, Va. The Richmond Times notices it as follows: "Gen. Taylor will veto the Proviso, and if any one has a letter pretending to be from Gen. T. saying he will not, it is a forgery."

This is Taylor 'Free Soil' in Virginia!

But where is Gen. Taylor himself on this great question that is overriding all others and throwing to the shades, for the present, at least, as minor and unimportant, all old issues? In justice to himself and the people whose candidate he claims to be, he should have answered long ago. But, bearing in mind that he is the owner of 280 slaves, a cotton planter in the State of Louisiana, and one who has been reared among slaves, and educated a slaveholder, let us proceed honestly to the work of finding out his position. To begin, take a speech delivered at Baton Rouge, (Gen. Taylor's residence,) by Mr. Benjamin, one of the Taylor electors of the State of Louisiana. In that speech he said, "I can affirm that the old General is all right on the slavery question. I can assure you, my fellow-citizens here, that Taylor will promptly veto anything like the Wilmot Proviso. The interests of the South are safe in his hands."

Again, in regard to the conversation we had with Gen. Taylor, we did not talk of the tariff—we did on the war. He expressed himself in favor of the war; he said he was decidedly in favor of prosecuting it vigorously until they should yield to an honorable peace; he was in favor of indemnity, and that territorial; he was not wedded to any particular line, but thought, as a kind of compromise, perhaps, with the Wilmot Proviso men, we had better go up to the 23d degree, making the Rio Grande the western boundary up to that degree; and said the South should never agree to the principles of the Proviso."

Again, "We find in the 'Mobile Herald,' a letter from one who had been on a visit to Gen. Taylor, from which we make this extract:—Speaking of the 'free soil' movement in the North, he (Gen. Taylor,) expressed fears that it would be the absorbing question in the present canvass, and engross all other questions. He said that he considered the Missouri Compromise a fair and liberal line for settling the slave question, and he was willing to see it adopted. In reply to a remark made by a person whom he was conversing with, he said that most of the old party questions were obsolete."—Mobile Herald, Aug. 28.

Add to this the following collateral evidence obtained from Taylor Whig prints, published, as it were, in his own neighborhood, and under his eyes, and we have a tolerable clear idea of Gen. Taylor's position on the Proviso.

"Gen. Taylor is from birth, association, and conviction identified with the South and its institutions, being one of the 'most extensive slaveholders in Louisiana, and supported by the slaveholding interests, as opposed to the Wilmot Proviso, and in favor of securing the privilege to the owners of slaves to remove with them to newly acquired territory."—New Orleans Bee.

That monstrous assertion, [that he will not veto the Proviso,] so entirely at war with the character of the man, and the tenor of his whole life, could only have been made by political leaders in the last stage of desperation, when they saw that everlasting political rout and ruin was approaching them as fast as the course of time would permit!—Natches, Miss. Con-

"We must elect a man for President who lives in our own sunny South, who is willing to peril all for the Constitution, who loves the South and her cherished institutions. Such a man is Gen. Taylor. He lives in the South, and makes his twelve hundred bales of cotton on the banks of the Mississippi. His interests, his feelings, are all with us."—Aberdeen Ala. Whig.

regard to his allowing the Proviso to pass, take the following: "The General owns too many 'niggers' for that; and he will not go for the Proviso, until somebody can make one of the blackest white, by washing him."—Augusta, Georgia, Chronicle.

That monstrous assertion, [that he will not veto the Proviso,] so entirely at war with the character of the man, and the tenor of his whole life, could only have been made by political leaders in the last stage of desperation, when they saw that everlasting political rout and ruin was approaching them as fast as the course of time would permit!—Natches, Miss. Con-

"We must elect a man for President who lives in our own sunny South, who is willing to peril all for the Constitution, who loves the South and her cherished institutions. Such a man is Gen. Taylor. He lives in the South, and makes his twelve hundred bales of cotton on the banks of the Mississippi. His interests, his feelings, are all with us."—Aberdeen Ala. Whig.

regard to his allowing the Proviso to pass, take the following: "The General owns too many 'niggers' for that; and he will not go for the Proviso, until somebody can make one of the blackest white, by washing him."—Augusta, Georgia, Chronicle.

A SCREW LOOSE SOMEWHERE.—A few weeks since, Horace Greeley paraded at the head of his columns the names of Taylor and Fillmore, and declared his intention of doing all in his power for their success. The next week we find the Tribune has dropped their names from its mast-head, says but little, if indeed it does anything, in favor of them, but its columns are filled with Free Soil intelligence—eulogiums of John Van Buren—"Prince John." Is this the kind of zeal with which he intends to support old Zack? We wish the Taylor papers generally partook more of the same spirit.

Letter from Robert Emmet.

[From the Buffalo Republic.]

Our respected fellow-citizen, PATRICK COFFEE, received a day or two since the following letter from ROBERT EMMET, of New York, in reply to an invitation to the latter to visit this city and to address the people on the all-engrossing subject of the extension of slavery to the free territories of the Union. The engagements of Mr. EMMET, it will be seen, are and have been such as to put it out of his power to comply with the invitation, but he is warmly devoted to the cause of Free Soil and free labor, and urges his countrymen not to desert the flag of freedom. To Irishmen it is scarcely necessary to say that ROBERT EMMET is one of the mostesteemed, distinguished and influential of our adopted citizens, and is second to none in point of patriotism, ability and integrity.—Like his ancestors, from whom he inherited the warmest devotion to the cause of human liberty, he is on the side of freedom and against oppression. In taking this position, he proves himself worthy of the name he bears—a name synonymous with patriotism and indelibly inscribed on many of the proudest pages of history. We trust no one will fail to read the letter. It is brief and to the point:

NEW YORK, Oct. 10th, 1848.
PATRICK COFFEE, Esq.—Dear Sir—I have received yours of the 3d inst., inviting me to visit your city, for the purpose, I presume, of aiding at a meeting of the Free Soil voters. I should be glad to aid by any exertion in my power a cause which I sincerely believe to be worthy of every honest patriot's support, but I find it will not be in my power to comply with your request. My business has suffered so much during the last four months, from the constant occupation of my time in attending the affairs of unfortunate Ireland, that absence from home would be little short of ruin to me. I have received several similar applications from different parts of the country, and have been compelled to decline them all.

I trust, however, that our countrymen in Buffalo will not desert the flag of Free Soil. Of all people in the world, the Irish, who suffered for ages the miseries of a serfdom more degrading and galling than slavery itself, should rally in defence of Free Soil and Free Labor. It is not a question whether this or the other man shall be President, or whether this party or the other shall have the offices to give away. It is whether the great principle of freedom shall prevail as the controlling policy of this country, where we have sought and found a refuge from foreign oppression; and every Irishman (barring an Orange man) is bound to give that principle his earnest and hearty support. Yours truly,
R. EMMET,

A Voice from Virginia--Mr. Janney's Letter.

[From the Woodstock (Va.) Tenth Legion.]

It has been the practice of the Society of Friends for many years, to discourse, on the part of its members, any participation in the excitement and party spirit which prevails in elections and political meetings, believing that the feelings thus engendered are calculated to withdraw the mind from religious contemplation, and to retard its growth in piety and virtue.

In these sentiments I fully concur; yet, there are seasons in which the discussion of great political questions so deeply agitates the public mind, that we cannot withhold our sympathies, nor can we forbear the expression of our hopes and fears, when the interests of humanity and the reputation of our beloved country seem to be in jeopardy.

Such a crisis in our public affairs seems to be now at hand, and the question for us to consider is, whether we shall altogether withhold our influence in the approaching presidential election, or exert it in accordance with our principles, so as to promote the cause of liberty and of human happiness.

In favor of the latter course we have the example of the great and good William Penn, who on the occasion of an election for members of the British Parliament, published an address to the freeholders and electors of England, in which he lays down the principles that ought to govern them, in order to promote the cause of civil and religious liberty.

Although I do not intend to discuss the merits or demerits of any of the Presidential candidates, I will follow the example of Penn, so far as to touch upon some of the principles involved in the issue now on trial before the American people.

This nation has just emerged from a war waged against a sister Republic, who was too poor to pay the debt she owed us, too proud to make humiliating concessions, and too weak to resist the power of our armies. Our government had not sufficient magnanimity to wait with her, but, like the creditor in the parable, "laid hands on her and took her by the throat" saying: pay me what thou owest!

Of the two great parties represented in Congress, one urged on the war, applauded the course of the Executive, and called for large supplies of men and money; the other denounced the war as unnecessarily begun by the President, and yet voted the supplies of men and money required to carry it on, affecting to throw the responsibility on the Executive, but, in reality, lacking in moral courage to assert and maintain the cause of justice and humanity, by refusing the supplies.

The war is now ended, and not only is Texas secured and slavery established there, but two new territories, of great extent, have been wrested from Mexico, into which our southern politicians have avowed their determination to allow the introduction of American slavery. This ruinous system which has been the bane of our own land, and the fruitful source of dissension among the several States, has been abolished by the government of Mexico. The territory recently acquired, comes into our possession as free soil, and the very reason urged by southern men for the continuation of Slavery in Louisiana, Florida and Texas, applied with full force, for the continuance of freedom in California and New Mexico.

They contended that where slavery existed by law, Congress had no right to interfere by its prohibition, and so where freedom is now established by law, Congress has no right to repeal that law, or to pursue a course that will result in its repeal. Yet our executive has already declared in advance, that he will not sign any law for establishing territorial governments in California and New Mexico, which shall not be based upon the Missouri compromise, which is tantamount to declaring that slavery shall be permitted in all the territories of the U. S. South of 36 deg. 30 min, leaving nearly the whole of New Mexico and the whole of California subject to its introduction.

The existence of slavery has always been deplored by Virginians, and is now regarded by our citizens as a grievous evil, not only regarding the mental and moral progress of the slave, but entailing a burden on the master, that he is scarcely able to bear, and yet is unwilling or afraid to lay down.

That constellation of great men, who rose in Virginia, at the time of the American Revolution, were all, so far as I am informed, opposed to the extension of slavery.

Washington declared the only way in which it could be extinguished, was by legislative enactments, and, that whenever his vote was required for that purpose it should not be withheld.

The strong terms in which Jefferson expressed his abhorrence of the system are too well known to require repetition. Patrick Henry, George Wythe, and other names might be adduced to show, that this was then the prevailing sentiment among our prominent men.

It was through the influence of such men, especially of Jefferson, that the ordinance of 1787, prohibiting slavery in all the territories of the U. S. northwest of the Ohio, was passed by the

Continental Congress, and confirmed by the action of the Federal Government.

When we consider that the territory thus dedicated to freedom has been ceded by Virginia, and had once been subject to the introduction of slavery, the fact of its being prohibited there by the votes of southern men, is the more striking and instructive. It is to this celebrated ordinance that the states of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin owe their exemption from the blighting effects of slavery.

Such progress as they have made in population, wealth, internal improvements, and in all that constitutes the elements of prosperity, lies, I believe, never before been realized in the history of man.

Contrast their progress and condition with any of the slaveholding states, and no further argument is needed to prove the wisdom and foresight of Jefferson, in the framing of that ordinance.

Why should not the same policy, which has proved so beneficial, be extended to the newly acquired territories? We know from experience that slavery will injure them: why then should we permit it to go there?

Our object is to get rid of it here by pushing it off to a neighboring territory, such a course is as unjustifiable in this nation, as it would be for a man whose grounds were infested with noxious weeds, to pluck them up and cast them into his neighbor's garden.

But even if this selfish policy were right in itself, and moreover if it were expedient and proper to encourage the domestic slave trade by opening a market for the slaves of Maryland and Virginia, there is ample room for such a purpose in the state of Texas, where the people have been so infatuated as to open the floodgates for this desolating evil.

In stating this question there is one view which I have never seen stated, and which I consider important in a moral point of view. A large proportion of the inhabitants of New Mexico and California are of mixed blood.—The Indian, the Spaniard, and the African, are mingled in every variety of hue; and should the laws of the slave states be introduced there, every one of these inhabitants who has negro blood in his veins will be liable to be reduced to slavery, unless he take measures to prove his freedom.

It is well known to all who are conversant with the subject, that in the slave states African blood is prima facie evidence of slavery, and the burden of proof lies upon all of this class, who claim their freedom. After reducing these people by conquest, and repeatedly promising, through the agents of our government, that they should enjoy all the privileges of American citizens, would it not be an act of monstrous injustice to keep them or any portion of them, in the condition of our free colored people; bound to carry with them the evidence of their freedom, forced to associate with the degraded slave, and perhaps in the end, like the same class in Virginia, forbidden to be taught to read or write, and not permitted to assemble for religious worship without the presence of a white person! It is usual with southern politicians to make a false issue in discussing this question. They say the prohibition of slavery would exclude the citizens of the southern States from their just share in that territory? So far from it, we all know that many of our most industrious and enterprising citizens emigrated to that country, and the descendants of Virginia are now to be found in almost every part of Ohio, and the other northwestern states. In considering the interests of Virginia, it is too often taken for granted that all her citizens are interested in slavery; but this is far from being the fact. In many of the western counties, there are very few slaves; and even in Eastern Virginia there is a large class of non-slaveholders whose interests have been so long disregarded in our legislation, that many of them are scarcely conscious of the loss they are sustaining.

What is it that degrades labor in the field and the work-shop, and causes so many of our young men to live in idleness, or to seek a precarious subsistence in the over-crowded professions of law and medicine? Is it not the presence of slave labor? What is it that reduces the value of property in all the slaveholding states, so that the price of land is generally not one-fourth so high as in the free states? Is it not the wasteful and ruinous system of slavery? Why do so few among the many thousands of immigrants, who are flocking to this country from abroad, come and purchase the cheap lands of Eastern Virginia? Is it not the following result will show:

Norton, Van Buren, 231
Meade, Taylor, 170
Bryan, Cass, 84

With all the consequences of this wretched system before us, it would be the height of injustice to entail it upon territories that are now free, and this generation, if guilty of such a proceeding, would richly deserve all the reproaches, so liberally cast on the government of Great Britain, for its course during the past century in relation to the introduction of slavery into her American colonies.

In my estimation this question overshadows all other questions of domestic or foreign policy; for it involves the reputation of the country and the

happiness of unborn millions, who may hereafter inhabit that virgin soil.

Compared with this, the much debated question of the tariff, the bank and the sub-treasury, sink into insignificance. An intelligent and enterprising people will surmount the obstacles thrown in its way by erroneous legislation, provided it be left in the enjoyment of civil and religious liberty.

But in a country where the laborer is held in involuntary bondage, his degradation reacts upon the dominant class, so as to paralyze the arm of industry, and destroy the life of enterprise; agriculture languishes, commerce declines, education is neglected; and the whole body politic suffers a premature decay.

Entertaining these views, if I go to the polls, I cannot consistently do otherwise than support the Free Soil Ticket.

'Principles not men,' should be the motto of the American voter, and the great principles laid down in the resolutions of the Buffalo Convention meet my unqualified approbation.

SAMUEL M. JANNEY.

London county, 9th mo., 8th, 1843.

Hunker "Regularity."

[From the Northern Budget.]

The bolting hunker politicians have a great deal to say about "regular nominations." Ask them if it was right or regular for the Baltimore Convention to disfranchise New York—a State equal in population to fourteen other States of this Union—and equal in electoral votes to nine of the smaller States—to disfranchise the democracy of the Empire State because, with Jefferson, they had expressed their opinion against the extension of Slavery—and their only reply will be: "We go the regular nominating."

Ask them if they can, conscientiously, support a candidate who was nominated by a denial of the rights of the New York democracy, and they will answer: "We go the regular nominations."

Ask them if the Cass electoral ticket of this State which was nominated by the Albany Convention—an organization which had no claim to regularity and was almost unanimously regarded as a bolting affair—ask them if they can, as regular democrats, yield their support to such a ticket, and their reply is: "We go the regular candidates."

Ask them if they can, consistently, support a candidate for the Presidency, who sets at defiance all the principles of our republican fathers—who declares that Congress has not the power to maintain the existing freedom in our territories; who is pledged, if elected to veto any law Congress may pass to maintain that freedom; and their only answer is: "We go the Regular nominations."

Ask them if they can, in the name of democracy, consent to an abandonment of one of the first principles of the democratic creed, in uniting with an aggressive slave power to convert this government into a slaveocracy—making our national blood and treasure only available to extend the withering curse of human slavery. They will reply: "We go the regular nominations."

Ask them if they can, consistently with the democracy to which they profess attachment, yield their support to such a man as Cass, who, in the language of Silas Wright, is both a "TIME-SERVER and a DEMOGOGUE." They will only answer: "We go the regular nominations."

Now, then, it has come to this, that "regular nominations" are used to bolster up Fraud and Wrong, we think it is about time for honest men to inquire whether it is not better to be right than REGULAR.

The principal argument (if indeed that can be called one) which the Cass men urge in support of their candidate, is this matter of "regularity." Though they themselves were disfranchised, they persist in calling the nominations "regular!" Though the electoral ticket that represents Cassim in this State is notoriously bolting and irregular, they swallow it all down under the plea of "regularity." Out upon such hypocrisy! Shame upon such driveling party subserviency! Honest democrats despise it. They have declared their INDEPENDENCE. They will be free and will support the Free Soil ticket.

Resolved, That we inscribe on our banner, "FREE SOIL, FREE SPEECH, FREE LABOR, AND FREE MEN," and under it will fight on, and fight ever, until it will right on, and fight ever, until a triumphant victory shall reward our exertions.

Resolved, That we do now adjourn.

BUFFALO PLATFORM.

WHEREAS, We have assembled in convention as a union of freemen, for the sake of freedom, forgetting all past political differences in a common resolve to maintain the rights of free labor, against the aggressions of the slave power, and to secure free soil for a free people;

And WHEREAS, The political convention recently assembled at Baltimore and Philadelphia, one stifling the voice of a great constituency, entitled to be heard in its deliberations, and the other abandoning its distinctive principles to mere availability, have dissolved the national party organizations heretofore existing, by nominating for the Chief Magistracy of the United States, under slaveholding dictation, candidates neither of whom can be supported by the opponents of slavery, extension, without a sacrifice of consistency, duty, and self-respect;

And WHEREAS, These nominations so made, furnish the occasion, and demonstrate the necessity of the union of the people under the banner of free democracy, in a solemn and final declaration of their independence of the slave power and of their fixed determination to rescue the federal government from its control;

Resolved, Therefore, That we the people, here assembled, remembering the example of our fathers in the days of the first declaration of independence, putting our trust in God for the triumph of our cause, and invoking his guidance in our endeavors to advance it, do now plant ourselves upon the national platform of freedom, in opposition to the sectional platform of slavery.

Resolved, That slavery, in the several States of this Union which recognize its existence, depends upon State laws alone, which cannot be repealed or modified by the federal government, and for which laws that government is not responsible. We therefore propose no interference by Congress with slavery within the limits of any State.

Resolved, that the proviso of Jefferson, to prohibit the existence of slavery after 1800, in all the territories of the United States, southern and northern; the votes of six States and sixteen delegates in the Congress of 1784, for the proviso, to three States and seven delegates against it; the actual exclusion of slavery from the northwestern territory, by the ordinance of 1787, unanimously adopted by the States in Congress; and the entire history of that period, clearly show that it was the settled policy of the nation, not to extend nationalization or encourage, but to limit, localize, and discourage slavery; and to this policy which should never have been departed from, the government ought to return.

Resolved, That our fathers ordained the Constitution of the United States, in order, among other great national objects, to establish justice, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty; but expressly denied to the federal government which they created, all constitutional power to deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due legal process.

Resolved, That in the judgment of this convention, Congress has no more power to make a slave than to make a king—no more power to institute or establish slavery, than to institute or establish a monarchy—no such power can be found among those specifically conferred by the constitution, or derived by any just implication from them.

Resolved, That it is the duty of the federal government to relieve itself from all responsibility for the existence or continuance of slavery, wherever that government possess such constitutional authority to legislate on that subject, and is thus responsible for its existence.

Resolved, That the true, and in the judgment of this convention, the only safe means of preventing the extension of slavery into territories now free, is to prohibit its existence in all such territories by an act of Congress.

Resolved, That we accept the issue which the slave power has forced upon us, and to their demand for more slave States, and slave territories, our calm but final answer is, no more slave States, no more slave territory. Let the soil of our extensive domains be ever kept free for the hardy pioneers of our own land, and the oppressed and banished of other lands seeking homes of comfort and fields of enterprise in the new world.

Resolved, That the bill lately reported by the committee of eight, in the Senate of the United States, was no compromise, but an absolute surrender of the rights of the non-slaveholders of all the States; and while we rejoice to know that a measure which, while opening the door for the introduction of slavery into territories now free, would also have opened the door to litigation and strife among the future inhabitants thereof, to the ruin of their peace and prosperity, was defeated in the House of Representatives, its passage in hot haste by a majority of the Senate, embracing several Senators who voted in open violation of the known will of their constituents, should warn the people to see to it, that their representatives are not suffered to betray them. There must be no more compromises with slavery; if made, they must be repealed.

Resolved, That we demand freedom and established institutions for our brethren Oregon, now exposed to hardships, peril and massacre, by the reckless hostility of the slave power to the establishment of free government for free territories, and not only for them, but for our new brethren in New Mexico and California.

And WHEREAS, It is due not only to this occasion, but to the whole people of the United States, that we should also declare ourselves on certain other cases of national policy, therefore:

Resolved, That we demand cheap postage for the people; a retrenchment of the expenses and patronage of the federal government; the abolition of all unnecessary offices and salaries, and the election by the people of all civil officers in the service of the government, so far as the same may be practicable.

Resolved, That River and Harbor improvements whenever demanded by the safety and convenience of commerce with foreign nations, or among the several States, are objects of national concern, and that it is the duty of Congress, in the exercise of its constitutional power, to provide therefor.

Resolved, That the free grant to actual settlers, in consideration of the expenses incurred in making settlements in the wilderness, which are usually fully equal to their actual cost, and of the punctuality, according thereto of reasonable portions of the public lands, under suitable limitations, is a wise and just measure of public policy, which will promote in various ways, the interests of all the States in this Union; and we therefore recommend it to the favorable consideration of the American people.

Resolved, That the obligations of honor and patriotism require the earliest practicable payment of the national debt; and we are therefore in favor of such a Tariff of duties, as will raise revenue adequate to defray the necessary expenses of the federal government, and to pay annual installments of our debt and the interest thereon.

Resolved, That the obligations of honor and patriotism require the earliest practicable payment of the national debt; and we are therefore in favor of such a Tariff of duties, as will raise revenue adequate to defray the necessary expenses of the federal government, and to pay annual installments of our debt and the interest thereon.

Resolved, That we do now adjourn.

Platform Adopted by the Whig National Convention.

Resolved, That we do now adjourn.

Resolved, That we do now adjourn