

## 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-

no 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.

### 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.  
A fund to be given to 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.

**Friday, November 3, 1848.**

### To Our Patrons.

The present number of our paper will be the last issued, until the full returns of the election are received. In setting up with the printers, we will want funds, and we ask those indebted to us, to call immediately and close accounts. The labor of the campaign will be ended on next Tuesday, and on that day we ask our friends to be active and vigilant. Our engagement ends with the campaign, but we are pleased to learn that our party are about making an effort to have an organ permanently established in this city. It will be important to our future success, and we hope that every free soil man will use his influence in its favor, and give liberally for its support. Our subscribers will receive the last number, as soon as the returns are complete.

The Journal speaking of Ford's election, says:

Had he come out openly and aboveboard for TAYLOR, as he ought to have done, his majority would have been at least five thousand votes, instead of three hundred and thirty-six, shown to be his majority by the official returns.

There is a moral sublimity about a man's coming out openly and aboveboard. This has been our theory, and in this case the Journal agrees with us. When we ask the Journal's candidate to come out openly and aboveboard, he simply remarks that he has laid it down as a principle not to give his opinions. It is, perhaps, a poor rule that won't work both ways in the estimation of Brother John. The people of Ohio don't go the doctrine, and Gen. Taylor will be beaten in that State at least 10,000 votes, because he will not come out openly and aboveboard.

We admire consistency. Listen to the logic of the Journal. It was wrong to conceal opinions in Mr. Ford, it is right to do the same thing provided it is done by Gen. Taylor.

Keep pushing ahead John; if you don't succeed in showing that your candidate is an Ass, you certainly will convince people *nolens volens*, that one of his supporters is.

EDITORS RISING.—Horace Greeley of the Tribune, and James Brooks, of the Express, have both been nominated for Congress, in New York—the former to fill a vacancy in the present Congress, and the latter for the next Congress.