

Shawnee State University

## Digital Commons @ Shawnee State University

---

Scioto Simon Pure (Portsmouth, Ohio), 1844

Historic Portsmouth Newspaper Collection

---

7-15-1844

### Scioto Simon Pure (Portsmouth, Ohio) - July 15, 1844

Portsmouth Clay Clubs

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.shawnee.edu/scioto\\_simon\\_pure](https://digitalcommons.shawnee.edu/scioto_simon_pure)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Portsmouth Clay Clubs, "Scioto Simon Pure (Portsmouth, Ohio) - July 15, 1844" (1844). *Scioto Simon Pure (Portsmouth, Ohio), 1844*. 1.

[https://digitalcommons.shawnee.edu/scioto\\_simon\\_pure/1](https://digitalcommons.shawnee.edu/scioto_simon_pure/1)

This Newspaper is brought to you for free and open access by the Historic Portsmouth Newspaper Collection at Digital Commons @ Shawnee State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Scioto Simon Pure (Portsmouth, Ohio), 1844 by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Shawnee State University. For more information, please contact [svarney@shawnee.edu](mailto:svarney@shawnee.edu).

# THE SCIOTO SIMON PURE.

"I WOULD RATHER BE RIGHT THAN BE PRESIDENT."—Henry Clay.

TRIBUNE OFFICE.

PORTSMOUTH, OHIO, JULY 15, 1854.

NUMBER 1.

CONDUCTED BY THE PORTSMOUTH CLAY CLUBS.

## THE ORIGIN OF NATIVE AMERICANISM IN PHILADELPHIA—THE PROOF THAT IT ORIGINATED IN AND IS SUSTAINED BY THE PROMINENT MEN OF THE LOCO FOCO PARTY!!!

We affirmed in the Journal, a short time since, that Native Americanism in Philadelphia and New York took its rise in the ranks of the Loco Foco party. Of this fact we had given, and still had in our possession, unpublished testimony so conclusive, that we defied successful contradiction. Some one writing from Philadelphia, and signing himself "B. of Pickaway," attempts, in the last Statesman, to controvert the truth of our position. Without producing the slightest proof to substantiate his assertions, or a single fact going to justify them, he expects to convince the people of Ohio that our assumptions were false, and put forth to delude the naturalized voters of Ohio. As his declarations only refer to Philadelphia, we shall not, at this time, do more than give a plain and unvarnished statement of the facts touching the rise and progress of Native Americanism in that city. Now, see how plain a tale shall utterly disprove every declaration of "B." and the Statesman. We are indebted to the Washington Standard for the following, made up from facts published in Philadelphia:

"Those who know any thing about the circumstances attending the rise of the Native American party in that city, know that it grew out of the hostility engendered between the Irish Catholics, headed by Hugh Clark, and the Loco Focos of the city and country, caused by the refusal of the Democratic Conference to nominate Clark, last fall, as the Democratic candidate for Sheriff, James Hutchison having been nominated after a violent contest of a week, during which the utmost heat and rancor were displayed by the friends of the respective applicants for nomination.

"Upon the rejection of Clark, and nomination of Hutchison, Clark's friends seceded from the Conference, joined those of Morton McMichael, the Whig nominee for Sheriff, who was, by their aid, elected. Clark's friends also voted for, and by their support elected, the Whig candidates for County Treasurer, County Commissioner, & County Auditor; they also voted for Mr. Conrad, the Whig candidate for Congress in the 4th District. C. J. Ingersoll's opponent, who, by their assistance, was near being elected. This opposition to the Democratic tickets provoked that party into denunciations and anathemas the most bitter and intemperate against foreigners, and especially against foreign Catholics, which were hurled at them upon all occasions, and at times and places during and subsequent to the election. The destruction of Mr. Clark's office and papers at the time of the riots, shows that the feeling entertained towards him during and subsequent to the election had not abated. The destruction of his office was the act of those whom he had defeated by joining the Whigs. Is it at all probable that the Whigs were concerned in destroying his office and papers?"

Now, it is here substantiated by giving names, dates and places, that the great body of the foreign voters voted with the Whigs, and for the whig candidates, thus enabling them to succeed where they had not been successful before: but where there had nearly always been a very large majority against them.

It is proved they did so, because they had been deceived and defrauded, as they believed, out of their just rights and claims, by those very men who did them, as they do now, profess to be their exclusive friends.

It is also asserted, as an incontrovertible fact, that the foreigners were abused and slandered because they had thus contributed to the success of the Whigs, and that their former Loco Foco allies started the Native American Association for the express purpose of punishing them.

The destruction of Mr. Clark's office is conclusive as to the political character of those who led in the scenes of violence, that so recently disgraced Philadelphia.

If more proof of the correctness of what

we have here stated, is wanting, we have it in the fact that the Native American party is infinitely stronger in those Wards and Districts of the city and county, that have always been Loco Foco. The riots were in Kensington, that has always been overwhelmingly Loco Foco! The mass meeting, a few days since, was held in Southwark, that has always been strongly Loco Foco! Nearly all the officers of that meeting were Loco Focos, and its President was a Loco Foco member of Congress from 1837 to 1841, (Col. Lemuel Paynter.) Mr. Grover, who was selected as the Marshal of the day, for the great Native American celebration of the 4th, is a very prominent and distinguished Loco Foco!

We might go on to add to this conclusive and irresistible testimony; but it is not necessary. Standing, as these facts must stand, uncontroverted and incontrovertible, every man must be convinced that Native Americanism in Philadelphia is indebted mainly to the Loco Foco party for its birth, and strength, and success!!! — O. S. Jour.

## OUR NATURALIZATION LAWS.

In order to correct some of the gross misapprehensions which exist with regard to Naturalization, as well as to explain to those who are interested, the conditions required and the proper steps to be taken, we copy a lucid summary of the Naturalization Laws from a new elementary work just published by Thomas, Cowperthwait & Co., of Philadelphia, entitled "The Constitution and Laws (to 1844) of the United States, reduced to Questions and Answers," for Schools, by W. B. Wedgwood, Esq. The chapter on Naturalization reads—

What are the rights of aliens?

1. They may reside within our territory;
2. They may transact any commercial business in our cities or elsewhere on equal terms with natural born citizens;
3. They may rent houses for their residences, and stores for their merchandize;
4. They are entitled to the same protection of life, liberty and property, by the laws of our country, as natives;
5. They shall enjoy a perfect right of conscience.

How have these rights been secured?

By treaties made from time to time between our own and other nations.

To whom has the power to establish a uniform rule of naturalization been entrusted?

To Congress.

Who may be naturalized?

"Free white persons only."

Where is the application to be made?

To the Circuit or District Court of the United States, or any court of record of any individual State.

What shall the alien declare on oath or affirmation before such court, or before the clerk thereof at least two years before his admission?

"That it is bona fide his intention to become a citizen of the United States, and to renounce forever all allegiance and fidelity to every foreign prince, potentate, state or sovereignty whatsoever, and particularly, by name, the prince, potentate, state or sovereignty whereof such alien may at the time be a citizen or subject."

What shall such alien, at the time of his application to be admitted a citizen, declare on oath or affirmation before some one of the courts aforesaid?

"That he will support the Constitution of the United States, and that he does absolutely and entirely renounce and abjure all allegiance and fidelity to every foreign prince, potentate, state or sovereignty whatsoever; and particularly, by name, the prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty whereof he was before a citizen or subject."

Of what shall the court admitting such applicant be satisfied?

That he has resided within the United States five years at least, immediately preceding his application, and within the state or territory where such court is at the time held, one year at least.

What shall further appear to the satisfaction of the court?

That during that time he has behaved as a man of good moral character, is attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the same.

What are the courts expressly forbidden to take for the proof of residence?

The oath of the applicant.

What are they directed to require?

The oath of affirmation of at least two citizens of the United States.

What is to be stated in the record to be made by the clerk of the court?

The names of the citizens as witnesses to prove the five years' residence, and the place or places of such residence for five years.

If the applicant shall have borne any hereditary title, or been of any of the orders of nobility in the kingdom or state from which he came, what is he required to do?

To make an express renunciation of his title or order of nobility.

Must his renunciation be recorded?

It must.

What is to be done with the judgment admitting the applicant a citizen of the U. States?

It is to be entered as such on record, and if it is in legal form, is like every other judgment, conclusive. It is complete evidence of its own validity, and no subsequent inquiry can be made into the sufficiency of the evidence upon which it was pronounced.

Can an alien be elected to any office, or vote for any officer?

He cannot.

Is he allowed to vote and hold office after he has been naturalized?

He is.

To what offices is he not even then eligible?

1. To the office of President of the United States;
2. To the office of Vice President of the United States;
3. To the office of Governor in New York and several other States in the Union.

## RENUNCIATION OF PATENT DEMOCRACY.

Our exchange papers come teeming with renunciations of Polk and Dallas. The canvass of '40 is thrown entirely in the back ground in this respect. The following are but a very small proportion of the distinguished and influential men of the Democratic party who have come out for CLAY & FRELINGHUYSEN: The Secretary of the late Muhlenburgh Convention at Harrisburgh, Pa.; Mr. Campbell of Md.; David L. Child, editor of the National Anti-Slavery Standard; Governor Fenner of Rhode Island, and Mr. Potter, Representative in Congress, and Mr. Francis, one of the Senators of the same State; Col. Stafford of Georgia, Gen. Thomas Edwards and Alfred Edwards, of N. York; Senator Shinn, of Virginia; Hugh Lindsay and Jacob Hoffman, Esq., and Five Hundred others of Berks county, Pa.

The last Marion (Alabama) Herald has taken down the Polk and Dallas flag from its mast head & hoisted the following in its stead: INDEPENDENT DON'T CARE TICKET.

For Constable for the Corporation of Humbug. HON. ORIENTAL PEABLOSSOM PINK.

Striker for Ditto. GEN. RODOLPHUS ARAMANTHUS SQUASH!

Ketch 'em, knock 'em down, jug 'em, whip 'em, who's afraid.

OLD HAYS.

Zanesville Gaz.

EFFECT OF VIBRATION ON IRON.—About two years since, a dreadful accident happened on one of the railroads between Paris & Versailles. One of the iron wheels or axles of either the foremost car or engine broke; the long train of cars that followed were piled together upon the furnace of the engine; they took fire, and a dreadful scene ensued; the doors being locked, the passengers could not immediately escape, and great numbers were burned to death. An investigation into the causes of the disaster took place, and the result was, that the Academy of Sciences of France announced to the world a great discovery, in regard to the properties of iron, of a principle hitherto unknown, but a knowledge of which was of the utmost importance to the world. This principle was as follows: Iron, however tough

originally, loses its tenacity by long continued vibration or rapid jarring, becomes brittle, and finally breaks; when perhaps it has not a strain upon it of one-tenth the amount which it has safely borne for months or years. This was announced as a new discovery, but it was no such thing; still, the endorsement and promulgation of this principle by the Academy of Sciences were calculated to give it general publicity, and after that, it might have been expected that all workers and dealers in iron, as applied to important arts, would have recognized it as an established principle, and governed themselves accordingly.

Railroad cars are now generally provided with three or four axles, so that the breaking of a wheel or axle is of little or no consequence.

But it has been long known, perhaps ever since cannon were first manufactured of iron, that concussion produces the same effect that is now declared, as a new discovery, to be the result of vibration; in truth it is the most violent kind of vibration. Cannon of medium size, say 24 pounders, are not considered safe after having been fired with ball one thousand times; with powder alone, the effect is very much less, and in fact has never been computed. Cannon are often ruined by testing their strength, although they stand the tests. Perhaps the very next time they are fired with an ordinary charge they explode, from the very effects of the test which was intended to prove them trustworthy. This truth is so well known now that it has become common now to test only one cannon out of fifty, all being made of the same kind of iron, and alike in every particular. A gun is taken at random from the lot, and tested in the severest manner until it bursts. By this the strength of the others is measured.

With regard to the effect of vibration on iron, that too has been long known to private individuals, who supposed that all the world knew it also, though it seems it did not. Thirty years ago, the late George Simos, Esq., of Portsmouth, was acquainted with the fact, from his own personal experience, and stated it to a gentlemen now living here, as clearly as the Academy of Sciences stated it a quarter of a century after. He found that the steps of his chairs, though made of the toughest of iron, would grow brittle, and break with a very slight weight upon them, after having been in constant use for years; and he attributed this result to the effect of long-continued vibration on the iron.

Pistols and fowling-pieces may be fired an indefinite number of times; the concussion caused by their small charges seems to have little effect; at any rate, the limit of safety with small arms has not yet been clearly ascertained.

A 10-pounder may be fired safely perhaps three or four thousand times; a 24-pounder a thousand times; how many times can a 230-pounder be fired with safety? Surely not more than a hundred times! It is said, doubtless truly, that Capt. Stockton's "Peace-maker" was fired one hundred and twenty times.

[Portsmouth (N. H.) Journal,

"Gov. Polk is not only a religious man, and a strict member of church, but he is also a rigid member of a Temperance Society."

[N. Y. Plebeian.

This is all news to us in "these parts." Gov. Polk is neither the one nor the other.

[Nashville Whig.

Clay, Webster and Van Buren have all declared their opposition to the immediate annexation of Texas. "I should be willing, for one," said a sensible man to us, a few days ago, "to leave the settlement of any question of national policy to the concurrent opinion of those three men." — Scribner's Gazette.

Gen. Almonte, the Mexican Minister, is still in New York, and will remain there, his official functions being suspended, until the aspect of Texas affairs is materially changed, so as to admit of his diplomatic intercourse with our Government. — Philadelphia Egram.

MONDAY EVENING, JULY 15, 1844.

To be published weekly till after the Presidential Election—Terms, 25 cts. invariably in advance.

## Salutatory.

READER: Peace and truth attend thee.—Our errand is to present to you and to all a record of facts, and of pure—“SIMON PURE”—democratic principles. We come not in tabular array or picturesque colors to allure; we have no room nor disposition for the well rounded periods of eloquence to charm you; nor yet have we any interest to subvert or advantage to gain by the practice of deceit in this matter of politics, in the proper adjustment of which we are all alike equally interested. But we claim your attention because we are most deeply and solemnly convinced that we are RIGHT, and that it is of immense importance to you, and me, and all of us, that what is right should prevail. Henry Clay says: “I would rather be right than be President,” and who does not respond to the noble, the patriotic sentiment? A few dishonest men, men whose aim it is to be conspicuous some how, may reap the fruit of their desires by opposing what they know to be right; but the great body of the people, men who expect to live by their own activity and industry, asking nothing for themselves which they are not willing to grant to others, and disclaiming to be either the supple tools, or the supplicants, of power—have no other interest for themselves or their country than to be TRUE and RIGHT. To such people, and because they are such, do we address ourselves when speaking to our readers, claiming to speak with the tongue of kinsmen, and feeling and being with them as brethren of one household, one interest, and one destiny. We ask them then to take what we have to say into consideration: it will be said by those who love their country, and will be spoken for the good of the country, and of all.

The importance of the contest now approaching is vastly superior to any previous one since the days of '76. The questions to be settled by it, perhaps forever, are of immeasurably greater consequence to freemen, and especially to the workies of all the North, than in fact all previous contests together. The existence of a Protective Tariff, and consequently of a good market for labor and produce; the creation of a National Currency of equal value every where; (but why enumerate?) in fact the decision of all the great National questions which have divided the American people for fifteen years, are to be finally settled by this contest. But even these differences, great & important as they are, are not the greatest and most vital questions to be acted upon. One other new question, towering above them all in importance, and on which the safety, peace & very existence of our glorious Union depend, must be met and decided. The clandestine annexation of Texas to the Union, thus forever giving the slave States a preponderance over the free, or else a disunion of the Union—and perhaps both—are matters now to be submitted to the decision of American voters. We say “clandestine,” because the best authority in the country denies the constitutional power of our government to annex either this country to another sovereign nation, or another sovereign nation to this—(one and the same power can do both.) But we are told by that portion of the locofoco party which dictates to and governs the rest, (as in the selection of Polk, for instance,) that unless the people shall agree to the annexation of Texas, they will dissolve the Union. The Loco party leaders here we know try to smuggle this part of the menace, and keep things smooth; but what we say is God's truth, and susceptible of the clearest proof. (We shall present several chapters on this interesting subject for the considerate reader, before the election.)

In fact every principle which it is reasonable to conceive can enter into a political

contest, is most fully involved in this. It is essentially a contest of principle—the pride, the glory, the honor and the chivalry of Republican principles being bodied forth in Mr. Clay; and opposition to them, (and the question of the annexation of Texas,) in Mr. Polk. Such questions are sufficient to challenge the earnest attention and investigation of every friend of his country.

But if you take into consideration the comparative qualifications of the two candidates, what man proud of his country and his countrymen, can hesitate a moment in his conclusions? There is and can be no comparison between them; Henry Clay who has stood at the head of American Statesmen for thirty years, and James K. Polk, scarcely before heard of!!!

We claim the attention then of all men of all parties, for the honor of our intentions, for the triumph of truth over error, for the importance of the questions in issue, for the safety and honor of our Republic, for the sake of patriotism, honor and gratitude of American citizens, that they hear and heed us, humble as may be our sphere. Truth comes not always with the panoply of golden array or in brilliant guise, and though often found at the last hour of a long search, it is always more valuable than rubies if it be the genuine

SIMON PURE.

Many being anxious to see what this little sheet is to look like, we have issued the first No. without that amount of preparation and original matter which it will usually contain. The committee appointed to superintend its editorial management has not yet got into full operation, but by next week we intend to have all things “ship shape.” Contributors for the columns of the paper should hand over immediately. Persons holding names of subscribers, with the subscription money, will please pass them in soon, and keep the prospectuses moving about. A large list will be necessary to prevent actual loss in publishing. No papers after the second number will be sent to any except they shall have paid. A large edition will be struck off of the first numbers, so that subscribers can at any time have them from the beginning. Every body both whig and loco will of course take a paper that only costs two bits. Push about the prospectuses, friends, and let the truth be scattered broadcast over our own county at least.

## RARE INTELLECTUAL FEAST AND POLITICAL ENTERTAINMENT! “PROGRESSIVE DEMOCRACY” EPITOMIZED, OR POLKISM IN MINIATURE.

A meeting was held at the court house on Tuesday evening last, by the youths of democracy, and to those who were so unfortunate as not to be there, we can only administer such consolation as there may be in the assurance that “the like will ne'er be again.” It was rich, racy, delicious, and we regret our inability to give even a tolerable description of things then and there done and said, heard and enjoyed.

The performance was to have commenced as usual in such cases, “at early candle light,” but was delayed somewhat by an apparent misunderstanding as to whether the committee for such purposes had or had not procured orators for the occasion, in this dilemma wisely avoiding the chance of taking a “youthful” without a “cut and dried,” they called out one of the “old ‘uns” to break ground. As we were not prepared to take notes of remarks as delivered, we will not in justice to the speakers attempt to give their exact language, but will present in substance, sufficient to demonstrate that the heading of this article is not inappropriate. The first speaker then, denied that “Texas Annexation” was a question between the two parties, but insisted that it was only intended to raise a dust to distract attention from the real issues—(if James K. Polk does not build his hopes upon this question and this chiefly, may we inquire upon what basis the structure rests?) He contended that the Tariff was the all important

question. He said that the whigs were the advocates of protection, and upon this feature “the party” opposed them, and wanted only a tariff for revenue. This speaker insisted that the “bank question” was dead—he did not, however, satisfy the curiosity of his audience by giving the particulars of the catastrophe. We cannot devote more space to him without doing injustice to other prominent speakers who illustrated the “progression” of democracy on this occasion. Next came one who played the game of brag. In his opinion the Tariff was not a question, “it was the most hateful name in the English vocabulary, it meant every thing and nothing, it was asæstida in his mouth.” It was absurd to say it taxed one portion of the people for the benefit of another. He insisted that it was a national question, calculated to advance the interests of the whole country. This speaker then showed to his wondering audience the perfect certainty of the election of Polk and Dallas. New York would give them a majority of one third, Pennsylvania would crush the whigs by fifty thousand majority, Ohio and Kentucky were perfectly safe.—(Oh cracky I was ever any thing richer.) We are already devoting more space this, than we can well spare, but as faithful journalists, we would be recreant to our trust, not to give our readers a portion of the remarks of two other speakers, who had not “compared notes.” The first of these asked with a great appearance of pious astonishment, “how any christian could vote for Clay, who at the advanced age of seventy, was a duelist and a gambler?” (When I but wait,) his successor declared that if Mr. Clay was a duelist, such was the custom of the part of country in which he lived—that if he did sport, such was the practice of Kentucky society, and it was his opinion, that the “whigs might well say that they like drowning men caught at straws if such objections should be urged against Mr. Clay's election.” Is this not a fair representation of locofocoism—of “progressive democracy” as it exists and is taught all over the country. Some for a protective tariff, more against it—the whole south urging as the great issue, the annexation of Texas, and the north denying that it is a question. In one part of the country addressing “natives” and exciting them against foreigners, and in another part insisting that the whigs are the native party. In view of such things, and wondering that “the party” can even keep up the semblance of unity, who does not with old Stapleton exclaim “human natur is human natur.” We await farther developments.

## That Constitutional Lecture.

At a Loco meeting a week or two since, one of the orators gave notice that upon some future occasion, he would deliver himself of a lecture upon the unconstitutionality of a United States Bank, a Protective Tariff and the Distribution of the Proceeds of the Sales of the Public Lands among the States. We anxiously await this herculean task. We anticipate the “Democrat,” in requesting a copy for publication, that we may send it to Joseph Story and Chancellor Kent, who are groping in palpable darkness upon these questions.—Our chief sorrow is that Washington, Jefferson, Marshall, Hamilton, Madison, Monroe and numerous other illustrious citizens, have not been permitted to see this wonderful evidence of the march of intellect, and “progression of Democracy.”

We earnestly entreat “Youthful Democratic Association” not to let this promise go unredeemed. It is your duty to throw light upon these momentous measures, and if you suffer one beam of this illustrious sun of “progressive democracy” to be lost, you will be held accountable for a nation's sins committed in ignorance.

Great efforts are being made by “progressive” demagogues to connect the whig party with “Nativeism.” They dodge the discus-

sion of principle, and basely appeal to the worst passions for the purpose of arraying the adopted citizen against the native. And this is done with the least regard to truth—for it is notorious that Charles J. Jack, who harangued the “natives” in Philadelphia during the recent riots,—Grover, who was called to preside over one of their meetings and excused himself, and Lemuel Paynter, who did preside over the same meeting, belonged, one and all, to the locofoco party. Whigs disdain an appeal to any such illiberal prejudices, and never attempted to make capital out of it. As a party they sincerely deprecate a feeling that must, if indulged or encouraged, cause trouble, and seek rather to allay than increase excitements, that may result in evil and cannot possibly do good.

But since, in self defence, we are driven to it, did or did not one of the electors on the locofoco ticket, and who was a delegate to the Baltimore convention, whose labors resulted in the nomination of Polk and Dallas—declare, when a respectable naturalized citizen was a candidate for an office in Portsmouth, that “he would never vote for a foreigner when a native could be had.” Has or has not another delegate to that convention expressed it as his deliberate opinion that “foreigners should not vote until after they had been in the country 21 years.” We charge that these questions are truly answered in the affirmative. If wrong, correct us.

[For the Simon Pure.]

## “Sing, Coonies Sing!”

TUNE—Dance, de Boatmen Dance.  
Let's rally 'round Kentucky's son,  
The brave, the true, the faithful one,  
Who in eighteen and forty-four,  
Causes the “coonies” to sing once more.  
Oh! sing, ye “coonies” sing,  
Sing, coonies sing;  
O sing all night, till broad daylight,  
And vote for Clay in the morning;  
Hi ho, for Clay we'll go—  
The Buckeye boys in Ohio.

We all admit the times are hard,  
And badly for seven years we've far'd,  
A change we want—who'll give it to us?  
Clay and 'Hoyden, or Polk and Dallas?  
O sing, ye coonies sing, &c.

The Whigs propose to us a Tariff,  
That will in a few short years pay off  
The nation's debt, and fill the “pap”  
From which the Locos sucked the sap.  
O sing, ye coonies sing, &c.

It has advanced the price of wool,  
Forty per cent at least, in full,  
It gives the Laborers lots of work,  
And keeps up well the price of Pork.  
O sing, ye coonies sing, &c.

The Lokies say it makes goods higher,  
But this we leave unto the buyer,  
Who knows he can at any time  
Get goods a plenty for a dime.  
O sing, ye coonies sing, &c.

For a dime a day and no roast beef  
They want to make the weaver weave;  
Work all day long and go home at night  
With a single dime in his pocket light!  
Say no, coonies, no!  
Say no, coonies, no!  
Say No all night till, &c.

Eight hundred thousand men, they'd make  
Let go the tool, take up the rake,  
Destroy the market for produce  
By setting factory hands all loose—  
Say No, coonies, NO, &c.

Then sing all night for Henry Clay,  
Who will to the Laborer give his pay;  
Who but “one term” the President,  
Will pay our debt, yes! every cent!  
O sing, ye coonies sing, &c.

A “Coon.”

WHO ARE THE WHIGS!—All the survivors of the College of electors which cast the vote of New York for Mr. Jefferson, in 1800, and all the surviving members of the Senate and of the Assembly who voted for those electors, ARE STILL WHIGS and voted for HARRISON in 1840; and will, if alive, vote for CLAY and FRELINGHUYSEN in 1844! Among them are Gen. VAN CORTLANDT, JAMES BURT, Judge WOODWORTH, AMBROSE SPENCER and ERASTUS ROOT.—Philadelphia Forum.

### Mr. Clay and Pre-emption.

Many of our readers have doubtless frequently seen quotations from a speech, purporting to have been made by Clay, in which the settlers on the public lands are denounced as "land pirates and squatters." This speech was pronounced by Mr. Clay, when first published, a base caricature; but the Locofoco press, with that fairness which is so eminently characteristic of it, still persisted in presenting it before their readers as an evidence of Mr. Clay's hostility to the West. The following letter received by a gentleman of Burlington, Iowa, from Mr. Clay, will have the effect to dispel the public mind on this subject, and relieve Mr. Clay from a charge, from which, more than any other, he has suffered in the West. Read it.

[Galena Gazette.  
ASHLAND, Sept. 25, 1843.

DEAR SIR.—I received your favor, transmitting a number of the Lee County Democrat, containing a copy of what purports to be a speech of mine, delivered on the pre-emption bill in the Senate on the 29th of January, 1838. It is a gross caricature of what I said, and I so pronounced it in the Senate. I regret that I have no copy of the correction by me, but it was published at that time in the National Intelligencer.

I was opposed to the pre-emption policy by itself. I believed it fraught with injustice to the public, that it occasioned great irregularity in the settlements of the public lands, and engendered controversy and dispute among the settlers. When, without the authority of law, the public lands were settled, I considered and treated such settlements as trespasses on the public property; so did Martin Van Buren in his message to Congress. But I never used the epithets which were put into my mouth, against the pre-emptioners themselves, many of whom I knew to be respectable, and my friends. I was willing on a general adjustment of the land question to combine the pre-emption and distribution principles together. And accordingly you will find in the Senate's Journal of 1840—41, (pages 155—56,) that I voted for such combination. Again: I voted for the distribution bill of the extra session of 1841, in which the pre-emption principle is incorporated, and large and liberal grants of land are made to the new States.

Accept my best wishes for your health and prosperity. Your friend and ob't serv't,

H. CLAY.

J. H. CLAY MUDD.

The following is an extract of a letter on the same subject, written to E. M. Samuel, now Receiver of the Land Office, in Plattsburgh, Mo., by Mr. Clay, bearing date March 11, 1839, and was first published in the Star, at Liberty, Mo., in the following month:

"The expression, 'Robbers and Land Pirates,' or any similar expressions, were never applied by me to Pre-emptioners. On the contrary, whilst I denounced Pre-emption Laws, and the act of taking possession of the public lands without the authority of law, in strong terms, and so often conducting to speculation, I spoke of my knowledge of many pre-emptioners as persons of high respectability.

"The above expressions were ascribed to me by political partisans for party purposes. They first caught my eye in a speech of Gen. Tipton, published in the Globe. I applied to him to have it corrected, and he did correct it, but the erroneous version continued to be freely circulated.

"At the last session of Congress, in the Senate, I stated from my seat the error. Senator Young, of Illinois, who had been active in giving currency to the expressions, acknowledged that I did not use them, and that he inferred them from what I did say.

"My opinion in regard to the public lands, is, that they should be administered for the benefit of all the States of the Union. Towards the new States I have always inclined to a liberal policy. This was evident from the Land Bill which I proposed, and which I hope will be ultimately passed. By that bill, the new States were to receive 12 1/2 per cent, beyond their numerical share upon the net proceeds of the sales of all public lands, situated within their respective limits."

The following letter was addressed to a gentleman in Batesville, in reply to questions proposed by him:

ASHLAND, 28th Sept. 1843.

DEAR SIR:—My speeches on the pre-emption system were never regularly reported. They were delivered from time to time, in a sort of running debate, and I was shockingly caricatured in the Globe. When it

was stated, I think by Mr. Young of Illinois, in the Senate, that I had applied degrading epithets to the Pre-emptioners, I denied it positively, and my correction was published in the Intelligencer, but I regret that I have no copy by me.

I was opposed to the pre-emption by itself, I thought it unequal to the public—was an irregular mode of acquiring the public lands, and led to disputes and controversies among the settlers. When public land was taken possession of, without authority of law, I considered it a trespass, and characterized it as such. So did Mr. Van Buren, who used the identical words in one of his messages (in 1837 or '8) to Congress.

On a general settlement of the land question, I was willing to allow pre-emption, properly guarded. Accordingly you will find in the Senate Journal, 1840 and '41, pages 155 and '56, I voted for a resolution of Mr. Crittenden, to allow pre-emption to the poor settler, to the exclusion of the rich and the speculator.

I voted at the extra session of 1841, for the Distribution Bill, in which a provision is incorporated for pre-emption, and in which a large grant is made of land to Arkansas. I am, &c.

H. CLAY.

### PRIZE SONG.

The Boston Clay Club No. 1, lately offered a premium of Fifty Dollars for the best Whig song, to the tune of "The Brave Old Oak." The premium was awarded for the following spirited, graphic lines, from the pen of ex-Judge BACON of Berkshire,—himself a vigorous son of the old Revolutionary Democratic Whig stock of that quarter:

#### THE OLD ASH TREE.

BY EZEKIEL BACON.

TUNE—"The Brave Old Oak."

A song for the Sage, the brave old Sage,  
We have known and honored him long;  
Whilst fame and renown have encircled his crown,  
With garlands enduring and strong.  
There was fear in his frown, when his eye looked  
On the hosts who envied his way;  
And he rose in his might, midst storms of the night,  
And held the fierce foemen at bay.

Let us sing of the Sage, the brave old Sage,  
Who stands in his glory alone!  
And still stands he, as the firm oak tree,  
When Lindenwood saplings are gone.

O'er the years of his youth, shone honor & truth  
As his star ascended the sky;  
It still with bright beams round the horizon gleams,  
As bursts its clear light from on high.  
We well knew the day, when he moved on his way,  
With Patriots and Sages of yore,  
Now gone to their rest, in the land of the blest,  
And we walk in their shadows no more.

Still we sing of the Sage, the Ashland Sage,  
Yet standing unscathed and alone; [tree,  
And long stand he, the same storm-beaten  
When the time-worn forest is gone!

As the cedar's strong hold he struck his root  
When sounded the clarion of war; [look  
When faction was rife, the world rent with strife,  
And invasion came from afar;  
Our barriers of CLAY, held Britons at bay,  
With Madison firm at the helm;  
So now for the right, we rise in Whig might,  
And hordes of fell faction o'erwhelm.

Then a song for the Sage, the time honored  
Yet towering in fame and renown; [Sage,  
There long shall he stand, the pride of the  
Still shining as ever he shone. [land,

PITTSFIELD, May 29, 1844.

### BARGAIN & SALE SLANDER.

Mr. Benton, speaking of the charge that Mr. Clay had bartered his vote for the office of Secretary of State, says:—"I have to state that the article to which you invite my attention is substantially, not verbally, correct, so far as it represents me as saying that I was informed by Mr. Clay in the forepart of December, 1824, that he intended to vote for Mr. Adams." Here is a declaration by a political opponent, that before the assembling of the Congress that elected Mr. Adams President, Mr. Clay avowed his determination to vote for Adams. His conversations on this subject with Gen. Lafayette and other gentlemen previous to the meeting of Congress, corroborate this statement. Hear Gen. Lafayette:

"My remembrance concurs with your own on this point: that in the latter end of December, either before or after my visit to Annapolis, you being out of the Presidential candidature, and after having expressed my above mentioned motives of forbearance, I, by way of confidential exception, allowed myself to put a simple, unqualified question respecting your electioneering guess and your intended vote. Your answer was, that in your opinion the actual state of health of Mr. Crawford had limited the contest to a choice between Mr. Adams and Gen. Jackson; that a claim founded on military achievements did not meet your preference, and that you had concluded to vote for Mr. Adams."

Here is a corroboration of the fact, that

Mr. Clay had determined to vote for Mr. Adams as soon as he became satisfied that the state of health of Mr. Crawford, who was Mr. Clay's first choice, "had limited the contest to a choice between Mr. Adams and Gen. Jackson."

But this charge had its origin in the statement that Mr. Buchanan, of Pa., had visited Gen. Jackson for the purpose of "entering in to a league of 'bargain and sale'" to secure Mr. Clay's vote, and influence in favor of Gen. Jackson. This was the main foundation upon which Mr. Carter Beverly based this infamous charge. Now hear Mr. Buchanan:

"I called upon Gen. Jackson on the occasion which I have mentioned, solely as his friend, upon my own individual responsibility, and not as the agent of Mr. Clay or any other person. I never have been the political friend of Mr. Clay, since he became a candidate for the office of President, as you very well know. Until I saw Gen. Jackson's letter to Mr. Beverly of the 5th ultimo, and at the same time was informed by a letter from the editor of the United States Telegraph, that I was the person to whom he alluded, the conception never entered my mind that he believed me to have been the agent of Mr. Clay and his friends, or that I intended to propose terms of any kind for them, or that he could have supposed me capable of expressing an opinion that it was right to fight such intriguers with their own weapons."

"I had no authority from Mr. Clay or his friends to propose any terms in relation to their votes. NOR DID I EVER MAKE ANY SUCH PROPOSITION; and I trust I would be as incapable of becoming a messenger upon such an occasion, as it was known Gen. Jackson would be to receive such a message."

Even Carterly Beverly, the author of this infamous charge, a short time before his death, perhaps in view of eternity, in a letter to Mr. Clay retracts this foul calumny. In that letter, he says:

"I am most thoroughly convinced that you were MOST UNTRUTHFULLY and there-fore UNJUSTLY TREATED; for I have never seen any evidence to substantiate at all the charge."

The Richmond Enquirer, then as now, the opponent of Henry Clay, after declaring that he had "met the charge as a man ought to meet it," says:

"MR. CLAY IS INNOCENT OF THE CHARGE. WE ARE FULLY PREPARED TO SEE THE COMMITTEE ACQUIT HIM OF THIS IMPUTATION OF BARTERING HIS VOTE FOR AN OFFICE."

The venerated Patriot, John Quincy Adams, on his recent Western tour, being called on by a committee, thus responded to this charge:—

"I thank you, sir, for the opportunity you have given me of speaking of the great statesman who was associated with me in the administration of the General Government, at my earnest solicitation—who belongs not to Kentucky alone, but to the whole Union; and is not only an honor to this State and this Nation, but to mankind. The charges to which you refer, I have, after my term of service had expired, and it was proper for me to speak, denied before the whole country; and as I expect shortly to appear before my God, to answer for the conduct of my whole life, should those charges have found their way to the Throne of Eternal Justice, I WILL IN THE PRESENCE OF OMNIPOTENCE, PRONOUNCE THEM FALSE."

Now, with the recantation of Mr. Beverly, the author of this charge, the testimony of the Patriot Lafayette proving its falsity, as well as that of the Richmond Enquirer, and Messrs. Benton and Buchanan, and the solemn asseverations of John Quincy Adams, that the charge is untrue, can any honest man have the unblushing impudence to reiterate the foul calumny.—*Medina Whig.*

### QUESTIONS FOR THE LOCOS TO ANSWER.

1. Whether James K. Polk's grandfather was not a Tory in the American Revolution?

2. Whether James K. Polk is not the owner of a great number of slaves whom he hires out through the State of Tennessee, thus pocketing all the earnings of poor men, except what suffices for their bare and miserable maintenance?

3. Whether he did not on five several occasions vote against bills for the relief of the surviving officers and soldiers of the revolution?

4. Whether he did not speak and vote against the bill for the occupation of the Oregon territory?

5. Whether he did not vote against a

resolution for the effectual Abolition of the African Slave Trade?

6. Whether he did not, during the sessions of 1827, 1828, and 1830, repeatedly vote and speak against the protection on Wool?

7. Whether the customary resolutions of thanks to the speaker "for the able and impartial manner in which he has discharged his duties," was not in his case opposed on the ground of his partiality and unjust decisions and for the first time in the history of Congress, carried by a party vote, ayes 94, nays 57?

8. Whether he was not, in 1841, defeated when a candidate for Governor of Tennessee, by some 3000 majority?

9. Whether he was not again defeated running for the same office, in 1843, by about 5000 majority?

Whether he was not, in 1840, presented as a nuisance by a Grand Jury of his own State?

11. Whether he has not recently, last year, avowed himself in favor of reducing the Tariff to a uniform duty of 20 per cent, and as the steady opponent of Distribution and a Protective Tariff?

12. Whether he is not in favor of the immediate Annexation of Texas?

13. Whether he was not, in 1825, an advocate of the constitutionality of the general government making internal improvements in the States, and afterwards an opponent?

14. Whether he was not, in 1834 '5, an opponent of the Sub-Treasury, and afterwards an advocate for it?—*Phœnix Forum.*

MR. McDUFFIE.—The speech of this gentleman from the general account, (we did not hear it or wish to hear it,) on Tuesday night, was the most ultra in doctrine, and in spirit, and the most directly levelled at the root of the existing institutions of this country, of any ever made within its wide limits. It was not less false in doctrine, than bitter in personal bearing, exasperated in temper and feeling, treasonable in meaning and intention, and impotent in style and execution. He fell, all say, far below expectation—saying where he should have enlightened, denouncing where he was most bound to praise, simulating where it was most imperative on him to be candid, and throughout, disclosing to the sagacious auditor, purposes and designs which he would not and durst not avow. Affecting to be a friend to the Union, he argued against its value and utility, and attempted to prove its injustice and oppression. Assuming to wish the continuance of the Union, he tried to show that none but Slaves would desire its continuance for a moment. Talking of fraternity and brotherly love, he exhibited a state of feeling more hostile to our brethren of the North than England ever had for France, or the Mussulman for the Christian. Deceiving upon Free Trade, Political economy, and kindred subjects, he bronched the wildest theories which were surely ever addressed to cultivated reason!

For example he said that the South paid every thing, and that the North did not work at all! The people of the North, he said, did nothing but travel and divert themselves, the South furnishing (under the Tariff,) the expense, and paying for the fiddler! He represented the South [Cotton] as laboring for the North almost exclusively, while the North, and especially the Ladies, were travelling to and fro, hither and thither, in such crowds, that he, Mr. McDuffie, could with difficulty obtain a seat in the Rail-Road Car! In short, the idea he presented was that he and his cotton growers, who have negro girls to fan the gnats off them, were HARD at work all the time, especially when the Cotton was growing, while Brother Jonathan north of the Potomac was living upon their labor, and fiddling, frolicking and junketing! A more extraordinary set of opinions we do not believe ever entered the head of a sane man—if sane he can be called who has studied Cotton and Cotton Bales Theories until he has become as mad as Don Quixote was rendered by the romance of Amadís de Gaul, and Don Cirongilio of Thrago!

Mr. McDuffie has made no impression here, except that his once fine powers have sunk under physical disease, except that his heart in spite of his professions is in utter enmity with the union of these States, and that if he could, he would dissolve it now, not in participation of the evil to come, but in respect to that, which as he pretends, already exists and weighs down the vital energies of the Southern States!

[Richmond Paper.

"A Northern man with Southern feelings," is said to be a Yankee with the yellow liver.

# THE VOICE OF OUR PRESIDENTS IN FAVOR OF PROTECTION.

## George Washington

In his first annual Message, after signing the first Tariff bill, he said: "I have signed a law which will protect manufactures," says:

"The safety and interest of the people require that they should promote such manufactures as tend to render them independent of others for essentials, particularly for military supplies."

## Thomas Jefferson

In his Message to Congress, of December 15, 1802, thus enumerates the proper objects of our Government:

"To cultivate peace and maintain commerce and navigation, in all their lawful enterprises; to foster our fisheries as nurseries of navigation, and for the nurture of man; and protect the manufactures adapted to our circumstances; to preserve the faith of the nation by an exact discharge of its debts and contracts, expend the public money with the same care and economy we would practice with our own, and impose on our citizens no unnecessary burdens; to keep in all things within the pale of our constitutional powers, and cherish the federal union as the only rock of safety; these fellow citizens, are the landmarks by which we are to guide ourselves in all our proceedings. By continuing to make these the rule of our action, we shall endeavor to our countrymen the true principles of their Constitution, and promote an union of sentiment and of action equally auspicious to their happiness and safety."

Again, in his Message of 1806, apprehending a Surplus Revenue, he says:

"To what other objects shall these surpluses be appropriated, and the whole surplus of impost after the entire discharge of the public debt? Shall we suppress the impost, and give that advantage to foreign over domestic manufacturers?"

He proceeds to say, that on a few articles he thinks the impost may be suppressed, but that with regard to the great mass of them,

The "patriotism" of the people would "prefer its continuance and application to the great purposes of public education, roads, rivers, canals, and such other objects of public improvement as it may be thought proper to add to the Constitutional enumeration of federal powers."

In his last annual Message sent to Congress, on the 8th of November, 1806, Mr. JEFFERSON says:

"The suspension of foreign commerce produced by the injustice of the belligerent powers, and the consequent losses and sacrifices of our citizens, are subjects of just concern. The situation into which we have thus been forced has impelled us to apply a portion of our industry and capital to internal manufactures and improvements. The extent of this conversion is daily increasing, and little doubt remains that the establishments formed and forming will, under the auspices of cheaper materials and substance, the freedom of labor from taxation with us, and of protecting duties and prohibitions, become permanent."

## James Madison

In his Message of November 15th, 1811, thus speaks:

"Although other subjects will present themselves immediately on your deliberations, a portion of them cannot but be well bestowed on the just and sound policy of securing to our manufactures the success they have attained, and are still attaining, under the impulse of causes not permanent, and to our navigation, the fair extent of which is, at present, abridged by the unequal regulations of foreign Governments. Besides the reasonableness of saving our manufactures from sacrifices which a change of circumstances might bring upon them, the national interest requires that, with respect to such articles at least as belong to our defence and primary wants, we should not be left in a state of unnecessary dependence on external supplies."

## President Monroe

In his Inaugural Address, March 15th, 1817, he says:

"Our manufactures will likewise require the systematic and fostering care of the Government. Possessing as we do all the raw materials, the fruit of our own soil and industry, we ought not to depend, in the degree we have done, on supplies from other countries. While we are thus dependent, the sudden event of war, unsought and unexpected, cannot fail to plunge us into the most serious difficulties. It is important, too, that the capital which nourishes our manufactures should be do-

mestic, as its influence in that case, instead of exhausting, as it may do, in foreign hands, would be felt advantageously on agriculture and every other branch of industry. Equally important is it to provide at home a market for our raw materials, as, by extending the competition, it will enhance the price and protect the cultivator against the casualties incident to foreign markets."

## John Quincy Adams

In his Message of December 2d, 1823, thus vindicates the power and policy of Protection:

"Is the self-protecting energy of this nation so helpless, that there exists in the political institutions of our country no power to counteract the bias of this foreign legislation; that the growers of grain must submit to this exclusion from the foreign markets of their produce; that the shippers must dismantle their ships, the trade of the north must stagnate at the wharves, and the manufacturers starve at their looms, while the whole people shall pay tribute to foreign industry, to be clad in a foreign garb; that the Congress of the Union are impotent to restore the balance in favor of native industry; destroyed by the statutes of another nation? More just and more generous sentiments will, I trust, prevail."

"If the Tariff adopted at the last session of Congress shall be found by experience to bear oppressively upon the interests of any section of the Union, it ought to be, and I cannot doubt will be, so modified as to alleviate its burdens. To the voice of just complaint, from any portion of their constituents, the Representatives of the States and the people will never turn away their ears. But so long as the duty of the foreign shall operate only as a bounty upon the domestic article—while the planter, and the merchant, and the shepherd, and the husbandman, shall be found thriving in their occupations, under the duties imposed for the protection of manufactures—they will not repine at the prosperity shared with themselves by their fellow citizens of other professions, nor denounce as violations of the Constitution the deliberate acts of Congress to shield from the wrongs of foreign laws the native industry of the Union."

## General Jackson

In his Message of December 7th, 1830, thus asserts the Constitutional power:

"The power to impose duties on imports originally belonged to the several States. The right to adjust these duties, with a view to the encouragement of domestic branches of industry, is so completely incidental to that power, that it is difficult to suppose the existence of the one without the other. The States have delegated their whole authority over imports to the general Government, without limitation, or restriction, saving the very inconsiderable reservation relating to their inspection laws. This authority having thus entirely passed from the States, the right to exercise it for the purpose of protection does not exist in them; and, consequently, if it be not possessed by the general Government, it must be extinct. Our political system would thus present the anomaly of a people stripped of the right to foster their own industry, and to counteract the most selfish and destructive policy which might be adopted by foreign nations. This surely cannot be the case. This indispensable power, thus surrendered by the States, must be within the scope of the authority on the subject expressly delegated to Congress. In this conclusion I am confirmed as well by the opinions of President Washington, Jefferson, Madison and Monroe, who have each repeatedly recommended the exercise of this right under the Constitution, as by the uniform practice of Congress, the continued acquiescence of the States, and the general understanding of the people."

The same sentiments, in different language, were repeatedly and strongly expressed by each of these Presidents.

## Martin Van Buren

In his letter to ———, gives the "go-by" to the Tariff. He singularly differs with all our Presidents on the great question of Protection:

ALBANY, Feb. 28, 1843.  
My Dear Sir: I thank you very kindly for your friendly letter. I have at no time, nor any where hesitated to express my decided disapprobation of the Tariff Act, of the last session, as well in respect to the principle

upon which it is founded, as to its details. In good time you will have my views in respect to that and other subjects before the public. In the mean time believe me to be,  
Your friend and ob't servant,  
M. VAN BUREN.

## John Tyler

In his Message of December, 1841; favors us with the following:

"In imposing duties for the purpose of revenue, a right to discriminate as to the articles on which the duty shall be laid, as well as the amount, necessarily & properly exists. Otherwise, the Government would be placed in the condition of having to levy the same duties upon all articles—both productive as well as the unproductive. The slightest duty upon some might have the effect of causing their importation to cease; whereas others, entering extensively into the consumption of the country, might bear the heaviest, without any sensible diminution in the amount imported."

"So, also, the Government may be justified in so discriminating, by reference to other considerations of domestic policy connected with our manufactures. So long as the duties shall be laid with distinct reference to the wants of the Treasury, no well-founded objection can be raised against them."

"Who will now assert that Protection is unconstitutional? or that it taxes the other classes of community for the especial benefit of the Manufacturers?"

## James K. Polk's Opinions.

The Vermont Watchman justly observes that it is rather a questionable compliment to the nominee of the Locofoco Convention, that the organs of his party find it absolutely necessary to commence the campaign by publishing his biography. The inference is certainly fair that he is unknown to his own party—is not distinguished either for talents or services; or indeed by a single memorable act. Nor do we think the biography itself any better compliment; instead of a simple record of remarkable deeds, such as the life of a truly great man affords, and which need but be named to command admiration—the locofoco biography of Polk is rather a forced attempt to make as great a man as possible out of scanty materials. It passes for a newspaper puff, and as such will do; but we apprehend that the people will prefer to know something of the principles and acts of one whom they are invited to elevate to the most responsible and honorable of earthly stations. We have on various occasions given Mr. Polk's opinions, but that they may all be seen together, we have "strung on one string" his published votes and assertions on leading questions of the day.

### ON THE TARIFF.

"My own opinion is that Wool should be duty free."—(Congressional debates, vol. 9 p. 1117.)

We are at no loss for his opinion on the present tariff. The following extracts are taken from one of Polk's speeches when he was the defeated candidate for Governor, delivered to the people of Madison, at Jackson, on Monday, the 5th of April, 1843.

"He was opposed to direct taxes, and to prohibitory and protective duties, and in favor of such moderate duties as would not cut off importations. In other words, he was in favor of reducing the duties to the rates of the Compromise Act, where the Whig Congress found them on the 30th of June 1842."

"The difference between the course of the political party, with which he (Mr. Milton Brown) acts and myself is, whilst they are the advocates of distribution and Protective Tariff—measures which I consider ruinous to the interests of the country, and especially to the interests of the Planting States—I have steadily and at all times opposed both."

### ON THE PUBLIC LANDS.

In Dec 1845, Mr. Polk took his seat in Congress for the first time. Jan. 23, 1846, he made his first speech; and it was in favor of giving certain lands to Tennessee, to be disposed of by that State for the benefit of education.—(Congressional debates, vol. 1, part 1, page 1075.)

So far, so good, and his speech then, was for a good Whig principle, but it was a selfish feeling which prompted him, for while he was willing to take lands for Tennessee, he afterwards showed himself opposed to making the grant liberal to the rest of the States:

Jan. 4, 1832, a vote was taken to lay on the table (i. e. to kill) a resolution to distribute the proceeds of the public lands among the States, in just proportions, for the purposes of internal improvement and education. Mr.

Polk voted in the affirmative.—Con. Debates, vol. 8, part 2, page 1479.

July 5, 1832, the vote was taken on postponing (i. e. defeating) Mr. Clay's Land Bill, and Mr. Polk voted in the affirmative.—Same, part 3, page 3553.

### ON RELIEVING JAMES MONROE.

It is well known that JAMES MONROE's personal sacrifices of his property to carry on the war, was one of the principal causes which induced the nation, by a feeling of gratitude, to place him in the Presidential chair. After a life spent in the public service, he left the chair and returned home a poor man. He left the nation indebted to him for patriotic services, both in a debt of gratitude and a debt of dollars. James K. Polk, voted against paying the debt due to that venerable patriot, James Monroe.

May 12, 1826, the bill for the relief of James Monroe, being under consideration, Mr. Polk voted against it.—Con. Deb. vol. 2, part 2, page 2631.

January 31, 1831, Mr. Polk opposed the claim, (vol. 7, page 516,) and voted against it, (pages 575, 614.)

### ON INTERNAL IMPROVEMENTS.

February 20, 1827, Polk voted against the bill making an appropriation for internal Improvements.—Con. Deb. vol. 3, p. 1352.

Many other votes of the same kind are recorded to Mr. Polk's discredit.

### ON REVOLUTIONARY PENSIONS.

March 13, 1828, on the passage of the bill for relief of surviving officers of the revolutionary war, Mr. Polk voted in the NEGATIVE. Con. debate, vol. 4, part 2, page 2570.

Subsequently on a bill to pay certain militia, &c., he voted in the affirmative.

March 16, 1831, he voted AGAINST the revolutionary pension bill.—Same, vol. 6, part 1, page 629.

March 19, "Mr. Polk spoke some time against the bill," and voted against it.—Same, page 635.

Feb. 17, 1831, he voted AGAINST the bill for the relief of revolutionary soldiers. Same, vol. 7, page 730.

May 2, 1832, he voted AGAINST the revolutionary pension bill.—Same, vol. 8, part 2, page 2713.

### ON THE SLAVE TRADE.

March 3, 1831, Mr. Mercer introduced the following resolution:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested to renew and to prosecute from time to time such negotiations with the several maritime powers of Europe and America as he may deem expedient for the effectual abolition of the African slave trade, and its ultimate denunciation as Piracy, under the law of nations, by the consent of the civilized world!

On passing this resolution the ayes were 118, noes 32. Mr. Polk voted in the negative.—Cong. Deb. vol. 7, page 850.

We may, at a future time, continue this chronology, by which it will be seen that Mr. Polk has through his whole political career been actuated by no liberal, enlarged, patriotic or American feelings. Is such a man fit to succeed to the chair of Washington?—Philadelphia Forum.

The editor of the Jonesborough (Penn.) Whig, a few days since, wrote home the following letter from Washington, which fully accounts for the FUROR with which the Messrs. Ritchie have entered upon the annexation question:

"Persons at a distance may be at a loss to know why it is, that the Richmond Enquirer is so devoted to the cause of Texas, as to lose sight of every thing else in its advocacy of that single measure. I will give the reasons in a single word. Old Tom Ritchie owns about FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS worth of land in Texas. His son, William Ritchie, has a debt of THIRTEEN THOUSAND DOLLARS due him, for money loaned, from the Government of Texas, and which he has a right of taking in land at 50 cents per acre. Last of all, TOM GREEN, the son-in-law of old Ritchie, who has availed himself of the Bankrupt Law in America, owns an estate of TWO HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS in Texas! Now under these circumstances, almost any one would be for annexation, and I mention these facts, that Ritchie & Co. may not have credit abroad for more patriotism than they are entitled to, in their zeal for annexation."

The Locos of Woonsocket were to bury the Declaration of Independence on the 4th, in consequence of the imprisonment of T. W. Dorr. The Providence Journal says: "The Declaration of Independence will probably survive this melancholy ceremony."