

Shawnee State University

## Digital Commons @ Shawnee State University

---

Scioto Simon Pure (Portsmouth, Ohio), 1844

Historic Portsmouth Newspaper Collection

---

9-2-1844

### Scioto Simon Pure (Portsmouth, Ohio) - September 2, 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) - September 2, 1844" (1844). *Scioto Simon Pure (Portsmouth, Ohio), 1844*. 5.

[https://digitalcommons.shawnee.edu/scioto\\_simon\\_pure/5](https://digitalcommons.shawnee.edu/scioto_simon_pure/5)

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, SEPTEMBER 2, 1844.

NUMBER 8.

CONDUCTED BY THE PORTSMOUTH CLAY CLUBS.

FOR PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

## HENRY CLAY.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT.

## THEODORE FRELINGHUYSEN.

Senatorial Electors.

THOMAS CORWIN, of Warren;  
PETER HITCHCOCK, of Georgia.

Dist. Congressional Electors.

- 1—BELLAMY STORER, of Hamilton;
- 2—WILLIAM BARR, of Butler;
- 3—AARON HARLIN, of Green;
- 4—SAMUEL MAON, of Clark;
- 5—DAVID J. COY, of Henry;
- 6—JOSIAH SCOTT, of Crawford;
- 7—READER W. CLARKE, of Clermont;
- 8—DAVID ADAMS, of Ross;
- 9—JOSEPH OLDS, of Pickaway;
- 10—DANIEL S. NORTON, of Knox;
- 11—WASHINGTON W. CONKLIN, of Mariop;
- 12—SAMUEL R. HOLCOMB, of Gallia;
- 13—HARLOW CHAPIN, of Washington;
- 14—JOHN CROOKS, of Ghent;
- 15—SAMUEL W. BOSTWICK, of Harrison;
- 16—WILLIAM R. SAPP, of Holmes;
- 17—JOHN W. GILL, of Jefferson;
- 18—CYRUS STINE, of Wayne;
- 19—JACOB H. BALDWIN, of Trumbull;
- 20—WILLIAM L. PERKINS, of Lake;
- 21—JOHN FULLER, of Erie.

FOR GOVERNOR.

### MORDECAI BARTLEY.

### Scioto Co. Democratic Whig Ticket.

Auditor  
ELIJAH GLOYER.

Sheriff  
WILLIAM L. OLDFIELD.

Recorder  
ANDREW CRICHTON, Jr.

Commissioner  
SILAS W. COLE.

WHIG PRINCIPLES.

ASHLAND, Sept. 13, 1843.

Dear Sir: I received your favor, communicating the patriotic purposes and views of the young men of Philadelphia, and I take pleasure in complying with your request, in stating some of the principal objects which I suppose engage the common desire and the common exertion of the Whig party to bring about in the Government of the United States. These are—

1. A sound National Currency regulated by the will and authority of the Nation.

2. An Adequate Revenue, with fair Protection to American Industry.

3. Just restraints on the Executive power, embracing a further restriction on the exercise of the veto.

4. A faithful administration of the public domain with an equitable Distribution of the proceeds of the sales of it among all the States.

5. An honest and economical administration of the General Government, leaving public officers perfect freedom of thought and of the right of suffrage; but with suitable restraints against improper interference in elections.

6. An amendment of the Constitution, limiting the incumbent of the Presidential office to a single term.

These objects attained, I think that we should cease to be afflicted with a bad administration of the Government.

I am respectfully,  
Your friend and obedient servant,  
H. CLAY.

Mr. JACOB STRATTAN.

### Tariff or no Tariff—what say the Candidates?

The following are the opinions of the two candidates relative to the present Tariff: CLAY, Poet.

I had resigned my seat in the Senate, when the act of 1842 passed. Without intending to express any opinion upon every item of the Tariff, I WOULD SAY THAT I THINK THE PROVISIONS IN THE MAIN WISE & PROPER. Sept. 14th, 1843. Letter to a Committee of Georgia Whigs.

I AM OPPOSED TO THE TARIFF ACT OF THE LATE CONGRESS. And again— I AM IN FAVOR OF REPEALING THAT ACT, and restoring the Compromise Tariff of March 2, 1832. May 15th, 1843. Reply to Citizens of Tennessee.

### A PROPOSITION.

"COME AND LET US REASON TOGETHER."

As both parties profess great anxiety that the people should be correctly informed of the issues between them, and mutually complain of the unfairness of discussions limited exclusively to either side, it is proposed that arrangements be made, by committees to be appointed for the purpose by either party, to have a fair discussion of principles. We are authorized to invite our opponents to unite with us in getting up such discussion. The preliminaries to be adjusted by the committees appointed as above specified.

MR. CLAY'S SPEECH,  
Delivered in the City of Raleigh, April 13th, 1844.

[Concluded.]

Again, I ask what is to be done in this conflict of opinion between the two extremes which I have stated? Each believes, with quite as much confidence as the other, that the policy which he espouses is the best for the country. Neither has a right to demand that his judgment shall exclusively prevail. What, again, I ask, is to be done? Is compromise or reconciliation impossible? Is this Union to be broken up and dissolved, and the hopes of the world, which are concentrated in its fate, to be blasted and destroyed forever?—No, fellow-citizens, no! The Union must be preserved. In the name of the people of this noble old State, the first to announce the independence of the United States, by the memorable declaration of Mecklenburg, and which has ever since been among the most devoted and faithful to the preservation of this Union; in the name of the people of my own gallant State; and in the name of the whole people of the United States, I feel authorized to say that this Union will not, must not, shall not be dissolved. How, then, can this unhappy conflict of opinion be amicably adjusted and accommodated? Extremes, fellow-citizens, are ever wrong. Truth and justice, sound policy and wisdom, always abide in the middle ground, always are to be found in the *juste milieu*.—Ultraism is ever baneful, and, if followed, never fails to lead to fatal consequences. We must reject both the doctrines of free trade and of a high and exorbitant tariff. The partisans of each must make some sacrifice of their peculiar opinions. They must find some common ground on which both can stand, and reflect that, if neither has obtained all that it desires, it has secured something, and what it does not retain has been gotten by its friends and countrymen. There are very few who dissent from the opinion that, in time of peace, the federal revenue ought to be drawn from imports, without resorting to internal taxation. Here is a basis for accommodation and mutual satisfaction. Let the amount which is requisite for an economical administration of the Government, when we are not engaged in war, be raised exclusively on foreign imports; and in adjusting a tariff for that purpose let such discriminations be made as will foster and encourage our own domestic industry. All parties ought to be satisfied with a tariff for revenue, and discriminations for protection. In thus settling this great and disturbing question in a spirit of mutual concession and of amicable compromise, we do but follow the noble example of our illustrious ancestors in the formation and adoption of our present happy Constitution. It was that benign spirit that presided over all their deliberations, and it has been in the same spirit that all the threatening eras that have arisen during the progress of the administration of the Constitution have been happily quieted and accommodated.

Next, if not superior in importance to the question of encouraging the national industry, is that of the national currency. I do not propose to discuss the point, whether a paper representative of the precious metals, in the form of bank notes, or in other forms, convertible into those metals on demand, at the will of the holder, be or be not desirable and expedient. I believe it could be easily shown that in the actual state of the commercial world, and considering the amount and distribution of the precious metals throughout the world, such a convertible paper is indispensably necessary. But that is not an open question. If it were desirable that no such paper should exist, it is not in the power of the General Government, under its present Constitution, to put it down or prevent its creation and circulation. Such a convertible paper has existed; does exist, and probably will always exist, in spite of the General Government. The twenty-six States which compose the Union claim the right and exercise the right, now not to be controverted, to authorize and put forth such a convertible paper, according to their own sense of their respective interests.

If even a large majority of the States were to resolve to discontinue the use of a paper representation of specie, the paper would nevertheless be created and circulated, unless every State in the Union abandoned its use; which nobody believes is ever likely to happen. If some of the States should continue to employ and circulate such a paper, it would flow into and be current in other States that might have refused to establish banks. And in the end the States which had them not, would find themselves, in self defence, compelled to charter banks. I recollect, perhaps my friend near me, (Mr. B. W. Leigh,) if he be old enough, may also recollect the introduction of banks in our native State. Virginia adopted slowly and reluctantly the banking system. I recollect, when a boy, to have been present in 1772 or 1793, when a debate occurred in the Virginia Legislature on a proposition, I think it was, to renew the charter of a bank in Alexandria—the first that ever was established in that State, and it was warmly opposed and carried with some difficulty. Afterwards, Virginia, finding herself surrounded by States that had banks, and that she was subject to all their inconveniences, whatever they might be, resolved to establish banks upon a more extended scale, and accordingly did establish two principal banks, with branching powers, to secure to herself whatever benefits might arise from such institutions.

The same necessity that prompted, at that period, the legislation of Virginia, would here alter influence States having no banks; but adjacent to those which had. It follows, therefore, that there are, and probably always will be, local banks. These local banks are often rivals, not only acting without concert, but in collision with each other, and having very imperfect knowledge of the general condition of the whole circulation of the United States, or of the state of our monetary affairs with foreign powers. The inevitable consequence must be irregularity in their movements, disorder and unsoundness in the currency, and frequent explosions. The existence of local banks, under the authority and control of the respective States, begets a necessity for a United States Bank, under the authority and control of the General Government. The whole power of government is distributed in the United States between the States and the Federal Government. All that is general and national, appertains to the Federal Government, all that is limited and local to the State Governments. The States cannot perform the duties of the General Government, nor ought that to attempt to perform, nor can it so well execute, the trusts confided to the State Governments. We want a national army, a national navy, a national post office establishment, national laws regulating our foreign commerce and our coasting trade; above all, perhaps, we want a national currency. The duty of supplying the national means of safety, convenience, and prosperity, must be executed by the General Government, or it will remain neglected and unfulfilled. The several States can no more supply a national currency than they can provide armies and navies for the national defence. The necessity for a national institution does not result merely from the existence of local institutions, but it arises also out of the fact that all the great commercial nations of the world have their banks. England, France, Austria, Russia, Holland, and all the great powers of Europe have their national banks. It is said that money is power, and that to embody and concentrate it in a bank is to create a great and dangerous power. But we may search the records of history, and we shall find no instance since the first introduction of banking institutions, of any one of them having sought to subvert the liberties of a country, or to create confusion and disorder. Their well-being depends upon the stability of laws and legitimate and regular administration of government. If it were true that the creation of banks is to embody a moneyed power, is not such a power in the hands of the General Government necessary to protect the people against the moneyed power in the form of banking institutions in the several States; and

in the hands of foreign Governments? Without it, how can the commerce of the United States cope and compete with the commerce of foreign powers, having national banks. In the commercial struggles which are constantly in operation between nations, should we not labor under great and decided disadvantage if we had no bank and they had their banks? We all recollect a few years ago, when it was alleged to be the policy of the Bank of England to reduce the price of our great southern staple; in order to accomplish that object, the policy was adopted of refusing to discount the notes and bills of any English houses engaged in the American trade. If a bank of the United States had been in existence at that time, it could have adopted some measure of counteraction; but there was none, and the Bank of England effected its purpose.

It has been asked—What, will you have banks merely because the monarchies of Europe have them? Why not also introduce their Kings, Lords, and Commons, and their aristocracy? This is a very shallow mode of reasoning. I might ask in turn why have armies, navies, laws regulating trade, or any other national institution of laws, because the monarchies of the old world have them? Why eat, or drink, clothe or house ourselves, because monarchs perform these operations? I suppose myself the course of true wisdom and of common sense to be, to draw from their arts, sciences, civilization, and political institutions, whatever is good, and avoid whatever is bad.

Where, exclusive of those who oppose the establishment of a Bank of the United States upon constitutional ground, do we find the greatest opposition to it? You are, fellow citizens, perhaps not possessed of information which I happen to have acquired. The greatest opposition to a Bank of the United States will be found to arise out of a foreign influence, and may be traced to the bankers and brokers of Wall street, in New York, who are wielding a foreign capital. Foreign powers and foreign capitalists see with satisfaction whatever retards the growth, checks the prosperity, or arrests the progress of this country. Those who wield that foreign capital find from experience that they can employ it to the best advantage in a disordered state of the currency, and when exchanges are fluctuating and irregular. There are no sections of the Union which need a uniform currency, sound and everywhere convertible into specie on demand, so much as you at the South and we in the West. It is indispensable to our prosperity. And if our brethren at the North and the East did not feel the want of it themselves, since it will do them no prejudice, they ought, upon principles of sympathy and mutual accommodation, to concur in supplying what is so essential to the business of other sections of the Union. It is said that the currency and exchanges have improved and are improving, and so they have and are. This improvement is mainly attributable to the salutary operation of the tariff of 1812, which turned the balance of foreign trade in our favor. But such is the enterprise and buoyancy of our population that we have no security for the continuation of this state of things. The balance of trade may take another direction, new revolutions in trade may take place, seasons of distress and embarrassment we must expect.—Does any body believe the local banking system of the United States is competent to meet and provide for these exigencies? It is the part of a wise government to anticipate and provide as far as possible for all these contingencies. It is urged against banks that they are often badly and dishonestly administered, and frequently break, to the injury and prejudice of the community. I am far from denying that banks are attended with mischief and some inconvenience, but that is the lot of all human institutions. The employment of steam is often attended with the most disastrous consequences, of which we have had recent melancholy examples. But does any body on that account think of proposing to discontinue the agency of steam power either on the land or the water? The most that is thought of is, that it becomes our duty to increase vigilance



and multiply precautions against the recurrence of accidents. As to banks, the true question is, whether the sum of the inconvenience of dispensing with them would not be greater than any amount of which they are productive. And in any new charters that may be granted, we should anxiously endeavor to provide all possible restrictions, securities, and guarantees against their mismanagement which reason or experience may suggest.

Such are my views of the question of establishing a bank of the United States. They have been long, and honestly, and sincerely entertained by me; but I do not seek to enforce them upon any others. Above all, I do not desire any Bank of the United States attempted or established, unless and until it is imperatively demanded, as I believe demanded it will be, by the opinion of the people.

I should have been glad, fellow-citizens, if I had time and strength to make a full exposition of my views and opinions upon all the great measures and questions that divide us and agitate our country. I should have been happy to have been able to make a full examination of the principles and measures of our opponents, if we could find out what they are, and contrast them with our own. I mean them no disrespect; I would not use one word to wound the feelings of any one of them; but I am really and unaffectedly ignorant of the measures of public policy which they are desirous to promote and establish. I know what they oppose. I know that they stand in direct opposition to every measure which the Whigs espouse. But what are their substitutes? The Whigs believe that the Executive power has, during the two last and the present administrations, been intolerably abused; that it has disturbed the balance of the Constitution; and that by its encroachments upon the coordinate branches of the Constitution, it has become alarming and dangerous. The Whigs are therefore desirous to restrain it within constitutional and proper limits. But our opponents, who assume to be emphatically the friends of the people, sustain the Executive in all its wildest and most extravagant excesses. They go for vetoes in all their variety; for sub-treasuries, standing armies, Treasury circulars. Occupying a similar ground with the Tories of England, they stood up for power and prerogative against privilege and popular rights. The Democrats or Republicans of 1798-'9, taught by the fatal examples of all history, were jealous and distrustful of Executive power. It was of that department that their fears were excited, and against that their vigilance was directed. The Federalists of that day, imbibing the opinion from the founders of the Constitution, honestly believed that the Executive was the weakest branch of the Government, and hence they were disposed to support and strengthen it. But experience has demonstrated their error, and the best part of them have united with the Whigs. And the Whigs are now in the exact position of the Republicans of 1798-'9. The residue, and probably the larger part of the Federalists, joined our opponents, and they are now in the exact position of the Federalists of 1798-'9—with this difference, that they have shut their eyes against all the lights of experience, and pushed their federal doctrines of that day far beyond the point to which they were ever carried by their predecessors.

But I am trespassing, too long on your patience, and must hasten to a close. I regret that I am too much exhausted, and have not time to discuss other interesting subjects that engage the public attention. I should be very glad to express to you my views on the public domain, but I have often, on the floor of the Senate and other public occasions, fully exposed them. I consider it the common property of the nation, and the whole nation. I believe it to be essential to its preservation, and the preservation of the funds which may accrue from its sales, that it should be withdrawn from the theatre of party politics, and from the temptations and abuse incident to it whilst it remains there. I think that fund ought to be distributed, upon just and liberal principles, among all the States, old as well as new. If that be not done, there is too much ground to apprehend, at no very distant day, a total loss of the entire domain. Considering the other abundant and exhaustless resources of the General Government, I think that the proceeds of the sales of the public lands may be well spared to the several States, to be applied by them to beneficent local objects. In their hands, judiciously managed, they will lighten the burden of internal taxation, the only form of raising revenue to which they can resort,

and assist in the payment of their debts, or hasten the completion of important objects, in which the whole Union, as well as themselves, are interested, and will be benefited.

On the subject of abolition, I am persuaded it is not necessary to say one word to this enlightened assemblage. My opinion was fully expressed in the Senate of the United States a few years ago, and the expression of it was one of the assigned causes of my not receiving the nomination as a candidate for the Presidency in November, 1839. But, if there be any one who doubts or desires to obtain further information about my views in respect to that unfortunate question, I refer him to Mr. Mendenhall, of Richmond, Indiana.

I hope and believe, fellow-citizens, that brighter days and better times are approaching. All the exhibitions of popular feeling—all the manifestations of the public wishes—this spontaneous and vast assemblage deceive us, if the scenes and memorable event of 1840 are not going to be renewed and re-enacted. Our opponents complain of the means which were employed to bring about that event. They attribute their loss of the public confidence to the popular meetings and processions, to the display of banners, the use of log cabins, the Whig songs, and the exhibition of coons, which preceded the event of '40. How greatly do they deceive themselves! What little knowledge do they display of human nature! All these were mere jokes of the campaign.—The event itself was produced, by a strong, deep, and general conviction pervading all classes, and impressed by a dear bought experience, that a change of both measures and men was indispensable to the welfare of the country. It was a great movement of the people. Our opponents were unable to withstand, and were borne down by a popular current, far more powerful than that of the mighty father of waters. The symbols and insignia, of which they complain, no more created or impelled that current, than the objects which float upon the bosom of the Mississippi give impetus to the stream. Our opponents profess to be great friends of the poor, and to take a great interest in their welfare, but they do not like the log cabins in which the poor dwell! They dislike their beverage of hard cider. They prefer sparkling champagne; perhaps their taste is correct, but they ought to reflect that it is not within the poor man's reach. They have a mortal hatred to our unoffending coon, and would prefer any other quadruped. And, as for our Whig songs, to their ears they appear grating and full of discord, although chanted by the loveliest daughters, and most melodious voices of the land! We are very sorry to dishonour our Democratic friends, but I am afraid they will have to reconcile themselves, as well as they can, to our log cabins, hard cider, and Whig songs. Popular excitement, demonstrating a lively interest in the administration of public affairs, is far preferable to a state of stillness of sullen gloom, and silent acquiescence, which denotes the existence of despotism, or a state of preparation for its introduction. And we need not be disturbed, if that excitement should sometimes manifest itself, in ludicrous, but innocent forms. But our opponents seem to have short memories. Who commenced that species of display and exhibition of which they now so bitterly complain? Have they already forgotten the circumstances attendant on the campaigns of 1828 and 1832? Have they forgotten the use which they made of the hog—the whole hog, bristles and all? Has the scene escaped their recollection, of bursting the heads out of barrels, not of hard cider, but of beer, pouring their contents into ditches, and then drinking the dirty liquid? Do they cease to remember the use which they made of the hickory, of hickory poles, and hickory boughs? On more occasions than one, when it was previously known, that I was to pass on a particular road, have I found the way obstructed by hickory boughs, strewed all along it. And I will not take up your time by narrating the numerous instances of mean, low and vulgar indignity, to which I have been personally exposed. Our opponents had better exercise a little philosophy on the occasion. They have been our masters, in employing symbols and devices to operate upon the passions of the people. And, if they would reflect and philosophize a little, they would arrive at the conclusion, that, whenever an army or a political party achieves a victory over an adversary, by means of any new instrument or stratagem, that adversary will be sure, sooner or later, to employ the same means.

I am truly glad to see our opponents return-

ing to a sense of order and decency. I should be still happier, if I did not fear that it was produced by the mortification of a past defeat, and the apprehension of one that awaits them ahead; rather than any thorough reformation of manners. Most certainly, I do not approve of appeals to the passions of the people, or of the use of disgusting or unworthy means to operate on their senses or their understanding. Although I can look and laugh at the employment of hogs and coons, to influence the exercise of the elective franchise, I should be glad to see them entirely dispensed with. I should greatly prefer to see every free citizen, of the United States deliberately considering and determining how he can best promote the honor and prosperity of his country, by the exercise of his inestimable privileges, and coming to the polls unaffected by all sinister exertions, and there independently depositing his suffrage. I should infinitely prefer to see calumny, falsehood and detraction totally abandoned, and truth, sincerity, honor and good faith alone practiced in all our discussions; and I think I may venture to assure our opponents that, whenever they are prepared to conduct our public discussions and popular elections, in the manner and upon the principles which I have indicated, the Whig Party will be as prompt in following their good example, as they were slow and reluctant to intimate their bad one. The man does not breathe who would be more happy than I should be, to see all the parties united, as a band of brothers, to restore our beloved country to what it has been, to what it is so capable of being, to what it ever should be, the great model of self-government, the boast of enlightened and liberal men throughout the world, and, by the justice, wisdom and beneficence of its operation, the terror and dread of all tyrants. I know and deplore, deeply deplore, the demoralization which has so extensively prevailed in our country, during a few past years.—It should be to every man, who has an American heart a source of the deepest mortification, and most painful regret. Falsehood and treachery, in high places, speculation and fraud among public servants, distress, embarrassment and ruin, among the people, distracted and disheartened at home, and treated with contempt and obloquy abroad, compose the sad features, during the period to which I have adverted of our unfortunate national picture. I should rejoice to see this great country once more itself again, and the history of the past fifteen years shrouded, in a dark and impenetrable veil. And why shall we not see it? We have only to will it, to revive and cultivate the spirit which won for us, and bequeathed to us, the noble heritage which we enjoy. We have only to rally around the institutions and interests of our beloved country, regardless of every other consideration, to break, if necessary, the chains of party, and rise, in the majesty of freemen, stand out and stand up, firmly resolved to dare all and do all, to preserve, in unsullied purity, and perpetuate unimpaired, the noble inheritance which is our birth-right, and sealed to us with the blood of our fathers.

One word more fellow-citizens, and I am done. I repeat that I had anticipated much gratification from my visit to your State. I had long anxiously wished to visit it, to tread the soil on which American independence was first proclaimed, to mingle with the descendants of those who were the first to question the divine rights of Kings, and who themselves, are surpassed by none in devotion to the cause of human liberty, and to the constitution and the Union, its best securities. Only one circumstance has happened to diminish the satisfaction of my journey. When I left my residence in December, I anticipated the happiness of meeting among others, your GASTON, then living. I had known him long and well, having served with him more than a quarter of a century ago in the House of Representatives. He united all the qualities which commanded esteem and admiration—bland, pure patriotic, eloquent, learned and pious, and was beloved by all who knew him. Whilst we bow in dutiful submission to the will of Divine Providence, who, during the progress of my journey, has called him from his family and from his country, we cannot but feel and deplore the great loss which we have all sustained. I share it largely with you fellow-citizens, and it is shared by the whole Union. To his bereaved family and to you, I offer assurance of my sincere sympathy and condolence.

We are about, fellow-citizens, finally to separate. Never again shall I behold this assembled multitude. No more shall I probably ever see the beautiful city of the Oaks. Never

more shall I mingle in the delightful circle of its hospitable and accomplished inhabitants. But you will never be forgotten in this heart of mine. My visit to your State is an epoch of my life. I shall carry with me every where, and carry back to my own patriotic State a grateful recollection of the kindness, friendship and hospitality which I have experienced so generously at your hands. And whatever may be my future lot or destiny, in retirement or public station, in health or sickness, in adversity or prosperity, you may count upon me as a humble but zealous co-operator with you, in all honorable struggles to replace the Government of our Country, once more, upon a solid, pure and patriotic basis. I leave with you, all that is in my power to offer, my fervent prayers that one and all of you may be crowned with the choicest blessings of Heaven, that your days may be lengthened out to the utmost period of human existence; that they may be unclouded, happy and prosperous, and that, when this mortal career shall terminate, you may be translated to a better and brighter world.

Farewell, fellow-citizens, ladies and gentlemen—an affectionate farewell to all of you!

## THE SIMON PURE.

MONDAY EVENING, SEPTEMBER 2, 1844.

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

### FIVE HUNDRED WHIGS IN COUNCIL AT HARRISONVILLE.

Although Saturday was a very unpleasant day, yet the warm-hearted Whigs of Harrisonville turned out to the number of five hundred persons. We cannot for want of room give an extended account of the meeting. We noticed in procession a wagon drawn by twenty-two horses. Upon one of the leaders was fastened a rocking chair from the post, of which gaily fluttered two little banners, and in which sat a whig, pouring forth a good old fashioned song.

The meeting was organized about half after twelve, when an address was made by J. V. Robinson Jr., after which the multitude adjourned to the tables that were bountifully supplied with substantial food. When the repast was concluded, they returned to the stand and heard Mr. Blatchley sing a song of his own composition, in which the "Poke-weed crew" were "handled without gloves." C. Q. Tracy Esq. then took the stand and addressed the crowd. We can only say that the right feeling animates the Whigs of Harrisonville, and when the election arrives they "will be there." We hope other townships will follow this worthy example.

### WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE?

The great objection of the locofocos against a protective or discriminating tariff is, as they claim, that the duty levied upon the imported article is paid by the consumer. And while they make this objection, they admit at the same time that they are in favor of a revenue tariff—that is, of laying a sufficient duty upon all imported articles to defray the expenses of Government. Well; now so far as the pockets of the consumer are concerned, what we ask is the difference? The amount of revenue to be raised in each case, bear in mind, is precisely the same. Under the protective system, it is raised by taxing a part of the articles higher, and the other part lower—and under the revenue system, by taxing all articles alike, or as nearly so as can be done, keeping in view the amount to be raised. Then to a purchaser of two articles, does it matter whether he pays twenty cents upon each, or ten cents upon one and thirty upon the other?

"Strange that such difference there should be, 'T'wixt tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee!"

The editors of the 'Portsmouth Democrat' are indulging in literature. The following sentiment occurs in a late paper: Truly did the ancients say—'Those whom the Gods love die young.' What monstrous ages our cotemporaries are destined to attain! Probably the Methuselahs may live until the tory blood is extinct in the Polk race.



LOOK AT THIS.

The average of the tariff of Great Britain upon our products is 289 per cent; whereas the average of our tariff on British products is only 32 per cent. The English government collects by imposts upon our exports to it more annual revenue than we get from the whole world. For example, in the years 1833, '39, and '40, our revenue from the tariff was \$52,796,227; while for the same years England collected from our tobacco and cotton above \$73,638,828! In the years '39, '40, and '41, the balance of trade in favor of Great Britain was two hundred and thirty-seven millions, two hundred and twenty-seven thousand, four hundred and fourteen dollars. (\$237,227,414!) From 1831 to '39, inclusive, the balance of trade was against us (for the want of an adequate tariff) to the enormous amount of \$235,278,605. Thus it appears that British "free trade" has a remarkable tendency to bring the money of the whole world directly to England; thus it is that London is the bank of the world, and always has money 'to let.' British 'Free Trade' is a tariff with an average of 289 per cent. An American tariff, averaging 32 per cent., is a 'high Protective Tariff,' so say British locofocos. Look to it American seecien.

Keep it before the People!

We hope every good reader of the Simon Pure will treasure up in his mind the fact that Polk is in favor of the Sub-Treasury, and as certain as he and his friends get the power, that credit-destroying, rich-favoring, and poor-depressing measure of the 22 despots of Europe, will be again forced upon this country. Yet where is the loco-federal paper or orator that dares to say one word about it! They love to bêtate and lie about a national bank, but the moment you ask them what substitute they propose for it, they are *mum*. If you persist in knowing whether they are in favor of the Sub-Treasury, a plan to encourage official plunder, they will leave you in double quick time. We have not seen a locofoco paper nor heard a loco stumper during the canvass thus far, even remotely allude to the subject, yet they can't and dare not deny that both the party and its candidate are in favor of that thrice condemned scheme of mischief, and will revive it if they get the power.

POLK AND THE SUB-TREASURY.

It is worthy of notice that not a Locofoco paper in the 'country ventures to utter a syllable with reference to the Sub-Treasury. They dare not discuss it! Nor dare they disown it, for in the event of their success, their is nothing on earth more absolutely certain than that it will be immediately established as the law of the land. The following passage from a letter written by J. K. Polk in reply to the inquires of a committee in Tennessee, defines his position on this point very distinctly—*Courier and Eng.*

"To your fourth interrogatory, in the following words, viz:

"Are you in favor of the Sub-Treasury system passed by Congress in 1839, and repealed in 1841?"

I answer that I am; and for my views given at some length on the subject, I refer you to my two published addresses "to the people of Tennessee," the one bearing date on the 3d of April, 1839, and the other on the 25th of March, 1841. JAMES K. POLK.

JAMES K. POLK—*Let the poor man read.*—James K. Polk is the owner of a large number of slaves whom he hires out to work under strange masters for \$100, and \$150 a year—from the products of their sweat and toil he lives in princely ease, and nurses his pampered appetites. Yet this same Polk while a member of Congress refused by his recorded vote, to appropriate some 30 cords of wood belonging to Congress, to the poor of Washington. This was during a long and unusually cold winter, while the poor were all freezing. The piercing frosts and howling winds of winter that swept around the frail tenements of the poor, failed to move the sympathies of this slaveholding nabob. If this is the kindness of James K. Polk to the poor, in the hour of their extremity, he is unworthy of a poor man's vote.—*Richland Bugle.*

"THE SIMON PURE BAGGED."

So says that pink of locofocoism the 'Portsmouth Democrat,' after a most wonderful attempt at a reply to an article in the 'Simon' on the subject of the Tariff and 'Distribution.' Our article was one in answer to the argument of Tod and Brough, and published by the 'Democrat' under the head of editorial. The 'splendid intellect of the 'genius' who presides over the destiny of the 'Democrat' was so well known in our community, that we did not suppose it necessary to say, that the 'argument' to which we replied was not an original one in that paper, but one from Tod & Brough, echoed back by the 'Democrat.' As such we replied to it, admitting the facts assumed by them, not because they were true, but that they might avail themselves of their weight in the argument; then offsetting those facts, by the benefit to be derived to all classes, (the 'lower' always excepted,) and especially the actual laborer from the tariff, and the claim of right which the States set up to the proceeds of the sales of the public lands, and claiming that our facts preponderated over theirs, and that therefore it was wise and good to go with the weight of argument, and adopt these great measures. Now, what is the reply of the 'Democrat?' There is no denial of the benefits which we claimed would flow from the tariff—no denial of right in the States to the benefit of the proceeds of the sale of our public lands, not even a comparison of these facts with the facts assumed by them, and yet by profound logic they have been enabled to 'bag the Simon Pure.' But we are not surprised at this: we live in an age of wonders. As to their learned criticism on our article, we have not a word to say. We are not blessed with the modern Democratic power of vision, by which we are enabled to see what is not to be seen; but as they possess that happy faculty, if they say so, their criticism must be very just. When we penned the article referred to, we wrote to suit the intelligent mind, we never anticipated that we could make things clear to the dull and beclouded intellect of the editors of the 'Democrat.' We speak this, because we think it more liberal to call a man a fool than a knave; and when an attempt is made to palm off among a people of sense, the reply of the 'Democrat' as 'bagging the Simon Pure,' we conclude at once that the perpetrator was either a fool or a knave. But enough of this. If that article is a specimen of their logic, they either cannot argue fairly, or will not; and if either be true, they must excuse us, if we refuse to discuss matters with them. Let the Tod's, the Brough's of their party come forth, and we are there—but we cannot stop to skin fleas for their hide and tallow.

The Locofocos are all on hand, because the whigs talk sometimes about 'applying the proceeds of the sales of our public lands, as soon as they are distributed among the States, to the payment of State debts. The reason assigned is, that if we pay off the State debts, the rich man who now pays \$300 tax, would save that \$300, and would consequently be \$300 better off in the world; while the poor man, who only pays \$1 taxes, would save the \$1, and would only be \$1 better off; and this they say would be unequal. Suppose we would take our portion of the 'distribution fund,' and apply it to school purposes; now, every body knows that the poor men as a class far exceed the rich, and as the old adage has it, 'a poor man for children,' if we applied the money to school purposes, this very class would be the one to be peculiarly benefited by the distribution scheme. What say you my dear lover of the poor man? Here is a scheme by which you can educate every poor man's child in the country, are you not in favor of it? Dare you oppose it?

Do you know any other reason why Polk was nominated than because he told

the Cincinnati abolitionists that he was in favor of the unconditional annexation of Texas! If not, we'll tell you another; he had been beaten twice for governor of his own State, which was one defeat more than Mr. Van Buren had suffered, and this gave him so much the stronger claim upon the sympathies of the spoils hunting convention at Baltimore. (By the bye, some of our loco friends have lost money betting against the truth of Polk's being twice defeated for Governor!) Now, there is one man whose claims upon the locofoco party to stand as their next Presidential candidate are unequalled by any thing since the birth of "progressive" democracy—we mean, of course, Marcus Morton of Massachusetts, who has been regularly beaten for twenty one years in succession, except twice—he was elected by one vote! In order to be prompt in the rendition of "justice to Mr." Morton, we now nominate him as locofoco candidate for President in 1848!

"LAY ON, MACDUFF."

"Never call a locofoco a democrat." Who is it that gives this instruction to the whigs? A sprout that has recently arrived to manhood—but a short time ago released from his diapers—now has the brazen impudence to pen the sentence above quoted. Never call such a man as father Kinney or Judge Corwine democrats! Who said so? Why a very insignificant little, presumptive nobody, and a fit advocate for Henry Clay. Never call a democrat any thing but a locofoco—insult and abuse every one who believes whig principles are wrong. Verily thou art a filthy little sheet, Simon!—*Portsmouth Democrat.*

The above referred production, and evidence of the locofoco claim to a portion of the "deceency," was called from the sleepy tool who 'does' for the 'Democrat,' by an article in one of our 'Simon Pure's,' containing the sentence upon which he has based himself to pour forth this flood of annihilating matter. By laying our hands upon his 'capital in trade,' we have galvanized the man 'Friday,' who usually seems utterly unconscious of passing events, and to be 'putting in his time' after the most approved 'Rip Van Winkle' system. In taking from him the name in which he gloried, we have made him and the party to which he is attached 'poor indeed; and its impotence to them could not have been more conclusively shown, than it is by the impotent rage of this imbecile 'living skeleton,' at the prospect of losing it: If the somnambulist had the perception of an owl, he would have discovered that he was unwittingly acknowledging the appropriateness of the name 'locofoco,' as applied to his party, in the sentence "never call father Kinney or Judge Corwine democrats!" We have only said, 'never call a locofoco a democrat.' If it be an irresistible inference that we alluded to these 'beacon lights,' as we suppose they are considered, from their names being thus dragged in to arouse the indignation of the 'utterly,' it is not our fault.—We are averse to the practice of bandying the names of individuals in political newspapers, unless the men are before the people as candidates for offices, except in extreme cases.—Judge Corwine is a candidate for elector, and we are therefore justified in using his name, particularly as the example is set us by the 'Democrat.' This same Judge Corwine, be it understood, is the man whom, upon undoubted testimony, we charged with having declared that "he would never vote for a foreigner, when a native born American could be had;" and the charge has not been, and dare not be denied. Is this 'democracy,' 'Friday?' Thus much in reply to the objections to our 'advice,' which we here again reiterate, and will so long as misapplied and inappropriate terms jar upon our ears. We have no desire to engage with the suppliant tool of 'the party' in a war of personal epithets, for we have an indistinct remembrance of a truism of Sancho Panza's, that warns us from such an encounter. But we hazard the opinion that if every man who

reads the extract from the 'Democrat' should be asked to whom the adjectives there so lavishly used most appropriately apply, the universal response would be, 'the man of the Democrat, if indeed he should be thought of at all. Inasmuch as we have recently arrived to (!) manhood, we have the advantage over him of the 'Democrat,' who has never experienced its proud feelings, and in whose crutching gait there is none of its conscious dignity. We wish we had better authority to the point that we are a fit 'advocate for (!) Henry Clay.' Such an impression would, if it were possible, enable us to endure with a still greater degree of fortitude the revilings of this 'personification' of meanness. It has been suggested that 'Friday' is not the author of this paragraph. We think, however, that it is too characteristic to belong to another. 'I will not, at all events, be the first instance in which an accessory has expiated the offence of the assassin. Whigs! 'never call a Locofoco a democrat.'

THE "UNIVERSAL WHIG POLE."

Whigs, from Maine to Louisiana, take your telescopes, and look at the "Universal Whig Pole." It towers to an elevation of an unknown number of rods, and from it floats a streamer, inscribed "Clay, Frelinghuysen, & Bartley." A proud monument of Whig enthusiasm, not a defect mars its symmetry. It breathes the whirlwinds with graceful ease, and tempests only make more palpably appear its grandeur and sublimity. Three cheers for the "Universal Whig Pole." Hurra! Hurra! Hurra!!!

The 'Democrat' puts forth the following, which, though not credited, does not bear the ear-marks of the editors: "Unanticipated pleasures are the greatest involuntary feeling, often the purest, always the brightest. The why and the wherefore but dim their lustre, lessen the spell, displaying the splendor of fancy by the dullness of reality. The beautiful delusion will not last long; its reign must be brief: let it die a natural death: it will soon rest in the tomb of all the Capulets." If we should assign an author to this, who has experienced the truth of a part, and will soon realize the rest, we would name James K. Polk.

ILLINOIS—"ALONE IN HER GLORY."

ILLINOIS.—The Whigs have probably gained some Members of the Legislature, but the State is Locofoco by about the same majority as at the State election in 1840. Then the State went Loco by over 5,000; but at the Presidential election succeeding the Whigs rallied, polled a great vote, and cut down the majority to 1,939. They may do better now, but for the present the State may be set down as decidedly Loco. The new Congressional delegation stands:

- I. ROBT SMITH, over Jno. Reynolds, both L.
- II. JOHN A. McCLERNAND; no opposition,
- III. ORLANDO B. FICKLIN, by a large maj.
- IV. JNO. WENTWORTH, no serious opposition
- V. STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS, by a small maj.
- VI. JOSEPH P. HOGE, over M. P. Sweet, W.
- VII. DR. D. BAKER, W. over Jno. Calhoun.

All Locos elected but Mr. BAKER, who takes the place of Hon. JOHN J. HARDIN, declined. The Whigs hoped to beat Douglass and Hoge; but Douglass is said to be re-elected by 250, while Hoge is saved by the great Mormon vote cast unanimously for him. The vote of Nauvoo stands, Hoge 1,275, Sweet twenty! So Mormonism goes the whole for Polk, Texas & Co. So we will call Illinois a Polk State, until the Whigs carry it for Clay.

New York Tribune.

A locofoco orator in this place, a few evenings since, said, that politically speaking, a protective tariff is the root of all evil.—Wonder if "Polk is as good a tariff man as Clay himself!"

It is supposed that the Comet, lately discovered by Professor Sears C. Walker of Philadelphia, is nothing more nor less than the lantern which every night is hoisted upon the "universal Whig pole."



**MR. CLAY ON ANNEXATION.**

To prevent all misconception of his opinions on this Texas question, Mr. Clay has written another letter, in which his former positions are explained and made so clear and explicit that the dullest intellect cannot avoid understanding him well. He also explains a difference, (which has sometimes puzzled pretty well informed whigs to explain,) between the propriety of treating with Texas for annexation while she is at war with Mexico, as Mr. Tyler did, and offering to treat with Mexico for the annexation of Texas while that country was warring for independence with Spain, as Mr. Adams, through Mr. Clay, did. This difference Mr. Clay makes plain and satisfactory, and every one wishing to understand it should carefully read this letter.

As a historical paper this letter is valuable; as a political expose it is invaluable. Some timid whigs think Mr. Clay writes too many letters, and some not very profound locos affect to chuckle at this. We ask all such if there is a sentiment in this letter which they do not cordially adopt. Mr. Clay has been all his life engaged upon great questions of State, in importance like this,—and is it to be supposed by little croaking wiseacres that he has not wisdom now sufficient to deal with this Texas question properly? Preposterous!

The difference between the two parties upon this Texas question, as explained by this letter, is great and vital, and we invite our readers to note it: Mr. Polk and his party declare in favor of the immediate annexation of Texas, regardless of consequences! while Mr. Clay says he would personally favor such annexation when it can be done consistently with the peace, honor, and consent of the Union. Mr. Clay goes for the Union first, and Texas if it can be got honorably afterwards; Mr. Polk goes for Texas first, Union or no Union. What lover of his country can hesitate in choosing between the two?

The subjoined letter from Mr. CLAY, addressed by him to JOHN M. JACKSON and THOMAS M. PETERS, Esq. of Alabama, is copied from the Tusculum North Alabamian, of August 16.

ASHLAND, 27th July, 1844.

Gentlemen:—I have received your favor, informing me that my views, as disclosed in my letter from Raleigh, on the question of Annexation of Texas, are misconceived, if not misrepresented in your quarter; and that it is supposed that I have changed my opinion from what it was in 1819. I endeavored to express myself in that letter as explicitly as I could, and I do not think now that it can be fairly misinterpreted.

In 1819, when I addressed the House of Representatives, the Executive had negotiated the treaty with Spain, by which Texas was ceded to that power, but Congress had not then given any sanction to the cession. I believe now, as I thought then, that the Treaty-making power is not competent, without the concurrence of Congress, to cede away any Territory belonging to the United States. But Congress, by repeated acts, subsequently manifested its approbation of the treaty; and these acts rendered it as valid and obligatory upon the United States, as if Congress had given its assent, prior to the conclusion of the treaty. At that period of 1819, Texas as claimed by us, was unpeopled. No hostile incursions had been made into it by citizens of the United States. In 1825 and 1827, there were but few inhabitants of Texas, consisting of some colonists, planted there under the authority of Mexico.—At neither of the three periods above mentioned had any State or section, in this Union, manifested any opposition to Texas composing a part of it. It has been said that Mr. Adams' administration offered to negotiate with Mexico for Texas, notwithstanding the existence of a war between Spain and Mexico, and that it could not therefore have believed that the acquisition of Texas, at that time, would have involved the United States in war with Spain. Hence it is argued that the ratification of the late treaty could not have compromised our peace.

Mr. Adams thought it desirable to obtain Texas. Two foreign powers claimed it.—Mexico was in possession, and Spain was doing nothing to assert and enforce her claim. Her representatives had even gone so far as to stipulate, in a convention, to acknowledge the Independence of Mexico,

although the convention was not ratified by Spain.

Mr. Adams had a right to authorize the negotiation of a treaty for the acquisition of Texas with both or either of the powers claiming it. It was natural that he should begin with that power which had the possession of Texas. Spain had interposed no obstacle. She had made no declaration that he would regard the acquisition of Texas as an act of war. In point of fact, no overture was formally made to Mexico to purchase Texas, no negotiation was opened, no treaty was concluded. If a negotiation had commenced, or if a treaty had been signed, and Spain had protested, the prudent and cautious policy which characterized Mr. Adams' administration, would undoubtedly have prompted him to quiet Spain, and accommodate the matter previous to the annexation of Texas to the United States; and without plunging them in war with Spain. How totally different are all the circumstances under which, with Mr. Adams' authority, I authorized the overture to Mexico, from those which attended the recent treaty of Mr. Tyler! So far from Mexico being silent, she repeatedly and solemnly declared that she would consider annexation as war with her. Texas was no longer an uninhabited country. It had been wrested from the dominion of Mexico by citizens, many of whom were armed from the United States. The war between Mexico and Texas had not been terminated by any treaty of Peace. Mr. Tyler not only did not consult Mexico, but he announced that her assent to the annexation was altogether unnecessary. And he proceeded to conclude a treaty, embracing a large extent of Territory, and a numerous population, not comprehended in the Texas which the United States ceded to Spain in 1819.

In the meantime too, a powerful opposition had arisen in the United States against the annexation of Texas to them. Several States had declared, through their Legislatures, against it; and a number of others, if not whole sections of the Union, were believed to be adverse to it. This was the opposition to the measure, to which, in my Raleigh letter, I alluded, when I spoke of a "considerable and respectable portion of the confederacy." I did not refer to persons, but to States or sections.

Under such circumstances, I cannot but regard the annexation, at this time, as compromising the honor of my country, involving it in a war, in which the sympathies of all christianity would be against us, and endangering the integrity of the Union. I thought, then, and still believe, that national dishonor, foreign war, and distraction and division at home, were too great sacrifices to make for the acquisition of Texas.

But, gentlemen, you are desirous of knowing by what policy I would be guided, in the event of my election as Chief Magistrate of the United States, in reference to the question of the annexation of Texas. I do not think it right to announce in advance, what will be the course of a future administration, in respect to a question with a foreign power. I have, however, no hesitation in saying that, far from having any personal objection to the annexation of Texas, I should be glad to see it without dishonor, without war, with the common consent of the Union, and upon just and fair terms. I do not think that the subject of slavery ought to affect the question, one way or the other. Whether Texas be independent, or incorporated in the United States, I do not believe it will prolong or shorten the duration of the institution. It is destined to become extinct, at some distant day, in my opinion, by the operation of the inevitable laws of population. It would be unwise to refuse a permanent acquisition, which will exist as long as the globe remains, on account of a temporary institution.

In the contingency of my election, to which you have adverted, if the affair of acquiring Texas should become a subject of consideration, I should be governed by the state of fact, and the state of public opinion existing at the time I might be called upon to act. Above all, I should be governed by the paramount duty of preserving this Union entire, and in harmony, regarding it as I do, as the great guaranty of every political and public blessing, under Providence, which as a free people, we are permitted to enjoy.

I am, gentlemen, respectfully,  
Your obedient servant,  
H. CLAY.

Bennett's New York Herald has gone over body and breeches to Polk. Whigs would do well to remember this fact, as that paper is great for Free Trade Statistics. Free traders can prove any thing by it!

**THE VICTORY!**



We joyously announce that Indiana is ours! Proclaim it on the wings of the Press—Indiana is ours! She has taken up her line of march with the Whig army and the gallant triumph that streams from her capital now, is but an earnest of the good tale which we shall herald in November.

**INDIANA.**

Make way for the Hoosier State  
SENATORS.

	1843.		1844.	
	W.	L. F.	W.	L. F.
Old Senators,			15	15
Clark,	0	1	0	1
Davies & Martin	0	1	0	1
Jefferson	1	0	1	0
Madison & Han.	1	0	0	1
Orange & Crawford	0	0	1	1
Ripley,	1	0	1	0
Rush,	1	0	1	0
Switzerland,	1	0	1	0
Washington,	0	1	0	1
Wayne & Ran' h	1	1	2	0
Vanderburg, &c.	1	0	0	1
Parke,	1	0	1	0
Gibson,	0	1	0	1
Allen,	0	1	0	1
Elkhart,	1	0	0	1
Green & Owen,	0	1	1	0
Morgan,	0	1	0	1
Vermillion,	1	0	1	0
Lawrence & Vigo	1	1	1	0
	10	10	25	25

The Senate last year stood 24 W. to 26 L. F.

**REPRESENTATIVES.**

Allen	0	1	1	0
Adams & Jack.	0	1	0	1
Brown,	0	1	0	1
Blackford,	0	1	0	1
Boone,	1	1	0	1
Bartholomew,	0	1	1	0
Benton, &c.,	0	1	0	1
Cass,	1	0	1	0
Clay,	0	1	0	1
Crawford,	0	1	0	1
Carroll,	0	1	0	1
Clijnton,	0	1	0	1
Clark,	0	2	0	2
Décatúr,	1	0	1	0
Dearborn,	2	1	0	3
Delaware,	1	0	1	0
Dubois,	0	1	0	1
Davies,	0	1	1	0
Elkhart,	0	1	0	1
Fayette,	2	0	2	0
Fontaine,	0	1	0	1
Floyd,	1	0	1	0
Franklin,	0	2	0	2
Fulton &c.	0	1	1	0
Gibson,	0	1	0	1
Grant,	1	0	0	1
Green,	0	1	1	0
Henry,	2	0	2	0
Hancock,	1	1	0	1
Hamilton,	2	0	1	0
Hendricks,	1	0	1	0
Harrison,	0	2	2	0
Jennings,	1	0	1	0
Jefferson,	2	1	3	0
Johnson,	0	1	0	1
Jackson,	0	0	0	1
Knox,	0	1	1	0
Kosciusko, &c.	0	1	1	0
Lagrange & Noble	1	0	1	0
Lawrence,	0	2	0	1
La Porte,	2	0	2	0
Lake & Porter,	0	1	0	1
Randolph	1	1	1	0
Ripley	1	0	1	0
Switzerland	0	1	0	1
Shelby	0	1	0	1
Sullivan	0	1	0	1
St. Joseph	1	0	1	0
Seaborn & D'Kabo	1	0	1	0
Scott	0	1	0	1

Miami & Wabash	0	0	1
Marion,	2	0	2
Morgan,	0	1	1
Monroe,	0	1	0
Madison,	0	1	1
Martin,	0	1	0
Montgomery,	2	1	1
Owen,	0	1	0
Orange,	0	1	0
Pike	0	1	0
Perry	0	1	1
Parke	2	0	2
Putnam	0	2	3
Posey	1	0	0
Rush	2	0	2
Spencer	0	1	1
Tippecanoe	2	1	3
Union	1	0	1
Vanderburgh	1	0	0
Vigo	3	0	3
Vermillion	0	1	0
Warrick	0	1	0
Washington	0	2	0
Wayne	3	0	3
Warren	1	0	1

45 55 55 45

The House last year stood 45 W. to 55 L. F.

**WHIG SONG.**

Written for the Cincinnati Clay Glee Club.  
The big men of Baltimore were surely in a joke,  
When they ought to make a President of such a man as Polk.  
Oh! we're all sick of poke root, sick,  
Sick of poke root,  
We're all sick of poke root, at our house at home.  
We cannot go his principles, we cannot go his creed,  
We can not go him any how—we do not like like the breed!  
Oh! we're all sick of poke root, &c.  
To show he's for the Tariff, they make a mighty fuss,  
But his votes are all against it, and he'll never do for us.  
Oh! we're all sick of poke root, &c.  
So poor was he in capital, he stole the Tyler pet,  
And he goes it strong for Texas, and her sixty million debt.  
Oh! we're all sick of poke root, &c.  
To cure the ills that threaten us, and poke-Poke away,  
All the old whigs and young whigs will go for Harry Clay.  
Oh! we're all sick of Poke root, &c.  
So turn out and tumble out, all ready for the fight,  
And we'll show Polk and Dallas men they cannot come it quite.  
Oh! we're all sick of poke root, &c.

For the Simon Pute.

**ANOTHER RENUNCIATION.**

Mr. Clark.—Will you oblige an old man, 67 years old—a true whig—with a line or two in your paper?  
My father was a soldier of '76, and I am going to support his principles in the coming elections, up to the notch. They cannot fool this old coon with their gold and silver—they cannot buy my vote for all the mint drops, as they call them. I am an old man, and have to work for my living—but give me a good sound currency is all I ask. I have three boys, and all of them are for Clay and a protective tariff. When the United States Bank was in operation, I could get plenty of work and my money; but now I have to do the best I can for my family. Give us Clay, and a sound currency, and all is safe.

ARCHIBALD HINKLEY.

Union township, August 30, 1844.

**FREE TRADE AND DIRECT TAXATION.**  
We raise a million a year in Ohio by direct taxation on lands, stock, &c. for the support of the State Government. The Polk-Whig party, through the Plebian tracts which we noticed a short time since, go for free trade and direct taxation! These tracts have been endorsed by Cal. Medary of the Ohio Statesman. It will require say \$26,000,000 to support the General Government. Of this Ohio will have to pay, say one-tenth, or \$2,600,000! An enormous sum! Farmers, mechanics, property holders! how say you? Are you willing to vote for Polk, in order to increase your taxes from one to three millions six hundred thousand dollars? To three times more than you now pay? Answer at the ballot-box.  
Cin. Gaz etc.