

Shawnee State University

## Digital Commons @ Shawnee State University

---

Scioto Simon Pure (Portsmouth, Ohio), 1844

Historic Portsmouth Newspaper Collection

---

8-26-1844

### Scioto Simon Pure (Portsmouth, Ohio) - August 26, 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) - August 26, 1844" (1844). *Scioto Simon Pure (Portsmouth, Ohio), 1844*. 4.

[https://digitalcommons.shawnee.edu/scioto\\_simon\\_pure/4](https://digitalcommons.shawnee.edu/scioto_simon_pure/4)

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, AUGUST 25, 1844.

NUMBER 7.

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 H. HOOK, of Genoa.

*Dist. Congressional Electors.*

- 1—BELLAMY STORER, of Hamilton;
- 2—WILLIAM BEBB, of Butler;
- 3—ABRAHAM HARTIN, of Green;
- 4—SAMUEL MASON, of Clark;
- 5—DAVID J. COX, of Henry;
- 6—JOHN SCOTT, of Crawford;
- 7—REUBEN W. CLARK, of Clermont;
- 8—DAVID ADAMS, of Ross;
- 9—JOSEPH OLDS, of Pickaway;
- 10—DANIEL S. NORTON, of Knox;
- 11—WASHINGTON W. CONCKLIN, of Marion;
- 12—SAMUEL R. HOLCOMB, of Gallia;
- 13—HARLOW CHAPIN, of Washington;
- 14—JOHN CHURCH, of Guernsey;
- 15—SAMUEL V. BOSTWICK, of Harrison;
- 16—WILLIAM R. SAPP, of Holmes;
- 17—JOHN W. GELD, of Jefferson;
- 18—CHRIS SPINK, 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 GLOVER.

Sheriff

WILLIAM OLDFIELD.

Recorder

ANDREW CRICHTON, Jr.

Commissioner

SILAS W. COLE.

WHIG PRINCIPLES.

ASHLAND, Sept. 13, 1842.

Dear Sir: I received your favor, communicating the patriotic purposes and views of the young men of Philadelphia, and I take pleasure in compliance 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 ob't 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. POLK.

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.

Mr Polk has returned no answer to a respectable inquiry from the Knoxville, Tennessee Clay Club, made June 20th, whether he is in favor of Mr. Tyler's Texas Treaty—and if not, to say on what terms he would have Texas annexed.

Search the history of our public men, and who among them has been engaged in more duels than Henry Clay?

Portsmouth Democrat.

And whilst searching, 'stick a pin there,' whenever you come across the name of James K. Polk. Wonder how many pins you'd use! "what do you say his name is?"

MR. CLAY'S SPEECH.

Delivered in the City of Raleigh, April 13, 1844.

Friends and Fellow-citizens.

Ladies and Gentlemen of North Carolina:

A long-cherished object of my heart is accomplished. I am at your capital; and in the midst of you. I have looked forward to this my first visit to North Carolina with anxious wishes, and with high expectations of great gratification; and I am happy to say that my fondest anticipations have been more than realized. Wherever I have passed on my way to your city, wherever I have stopped, at the depots of railroads, in country, town, or village, it has been my good fortune to receive the warmest demonstrations of respect and kindness, from all parties, from both sexes, and from every age; but nowhere have I met, no where had I expected such a distinguished reception, and such enthusiastic greetings as those with which my arrival here has been attended. I am rejoiced to be with you this day, to stand surrounded by you in the shade of this magnificent capitol, a noble monument of your public liberality and taste; and while my grateful heart has been warmed by the thrilling grasp of each outstretched hand; and my eye cheered by the smiles and beauty of the fair daughters of North Carolina, who have honored this occasion by their presence, I cannot but rejoice, and I do rejoice, that I am an American citizen; and feel that, though far removed from my immediate home and friends, yet I tread here the soil of my own country, am in the midst of my friends and countrymen, and can exclaim, in the language of the Scottish bard, that this, "this is indeed my own, my native land." I own that I have been truly and greatly, but agreeably surprised. I had expected to find some hundreds, perhaps a few thousands, assembled here to meet and greet me. I did not expect to see the whole State congregated together. I did not expect to witness such an outpouring. But here it is! From the mountains and from the seaboard, from the extremities and from the centre, I see around me the sons and daughters of the good old North State—a State, which has earned this estimable title by the purity, simplicity, and efficiency of its institutions: by its uniform patriotism and inflexible virtue; by its quiet, unobtrusive, and unambitious demeanor; and by its steady and firm attachment to the Union, of which it is one of the surest props and pillars—a noble title, of which, although it is not proud, because it is not in its nature to be proud, its sister States may well envy and emulate her. For these hearty manifestations of your respect and esteem I thank you all. I thank my fair countrywomen for gracing this meeting by their countenance and presence. I thank your worthy chief magistrate for the generous manner in which he has represented your hospitality. I thank the various committees for the kindness and attention which I have received at their hands, and particularly the committee who did me the honor to meet me on the borders of your State, and escort me to this city.

I am here, fellow-citizens, in compliance with your own summons. Warm and repeated invitations to visit this State, and my own ardent desire to see it, to form the acquaintance and to share the hospitalities of its citizens, have brought me in your presence. I have come with objects exclusively social and friendly. I have come upon no political errand. I have not come as a propagandist. I seek to change no man's opinion, to shake no man's allegiance to his party. Satisfied and contented with the opinions which I have formed upon political affairs, after thorough investigation and full deliberation, I am willing to leave every other man in the undisturbed possession of his opinions. It is one of our greatest privileges, in a free country, to form our own opinions upon all matters of public concern. Claiming the exercise of it for myself, I am ever ready to accord to others equal freedom in exercising it for themselves. But, inasmuch as the manner in which we may exercise the rights appertaining to us, may exert, reciprocally, an influence upon each other, for

good or evil, we owe the mutual duty of considering fairly, fully, and disinterestedly, all measures of public policy which may be proposed for adoption.

Although, fellow-citizens, I have truly said that I have not come to your State with any political aims or purposes, I am aware of the general expectation entertained here that I should embrace the occasion to make some exposition of my sentiments and views in respect to public affairs. I do not feel at liberty to disappoint this expectation. And yet I must declare, in perfect truth, that I have not and never had any taste for these public addresses. I have always found them irksome and unpleasant. I have not disliked public speaking, but it has been public speaking in legislative halls, on public measures affecting the welfare of my country, or before the tribunals of justice—it has been public speaking in which there was a precise and well-defined object to be pursued, by a train of thought and argument adapted to its attainment.

Without presuming to prescribe to anybody else the course which he ought to pursue in forming his judgment upon political parties, public measures, and the principles which ought to guide us, I will state my own. In respect to political parties, of which I have seen many in this country, during a life which is now considerably protracted, I believe in the main most of them think, or have persuaded themselves to believe, that they are aiming at the happiness of their country. Their duties and their interests well understood must necessarily urge them to promote its welfare. They are, it is true, often deceived—deceived by their own passions and prejudices, and still more by interested demagogues, who cloak and conceal their sinister designs. Political parties, according to my humble opinion of their legitimate sphere of action, ought to be regarded as nothing more than instruments or means, subordinate but important instruments or means, in effecting the great purposes of a wise administration of Government; highly useful when not factious, and controlled by public virtue and patriotism; but, when country is lost sight of, and the interests of the party become paramount to the interests of the country—when the government is seized by a party, and is not administered for the benefit of the people, and the whole people, but to advance the purposes and selfish aims of itself, or rather of its leaders, then is such a party, whatever may be the popular name it may assume, highly detrimental and dangerous. I am a whig, warmly attached to the party which bears that respected name, from a thorough persuasion that its principles and policy are best calculated to secure the happiness and prosperity of our common country; but, if I thought otherwise, if I were convinced that it sought party or individual aggrandizement, and not the public good, I would instantly and forever abandon it, whatever might be the consequences to myself, or whatever the regrets which I might feel in separating from veteran friends. My opinions upon great and leading measures of public policy have become settled convictions, and I am a whig because that party seeks the establishment of those measures. In determining with which of the two great parties of the country I ought to be connected, I have been governed by a full consideration and fair comparison of the tendency of their respective principles, measures, conduct, and views. There is one prominent and characteristic difference between the two parties which eminently distinguishes them, and which, if there were no other, would be sufficient to decide my judgment; and that is, the respect and deference uniformly displayed by one, and the disregard and contempt exhibited by the other, to the constitution, to the laws, and to public authority. In a country where a free and self government is established, it should be the pleasure and it is the bonnden duty of every citizen to stand by and uphold the constitution and laws, and support the public authority; because they are his constitution, his laws, and the public authority emanates from his will.— Having concurred, by the exercise of his privileges, in the adoption of the constitution and in the passage of the laws, any outrage or vio-

lation attempted of either ought to be regarded as an offence against himself, an offence against the majority of the people. In an arbitrary and absolute Government the subject may have some excuse for evading the edicts and ukases of the monarch, because they are not only promulgated without consulting his will, but sometimes against the wishes and the interests of the people. In that species of government the power of the bayonet enforces a reluctant obedience to the law. With a free people the fact that the laws are their laws ought to supply, in a prompt and voluntary rally to the support of the public authority, a force more peaceful, more powerful, and more reasonable than any derivable from a mercenary soldiery.

It is far from my intention or desire to do the least injustice to the party to which I am opposed; but I think that in asserting the characteristic difference between the two parties which I have done, I am fully borne out by facts, to some of which only on this occasion can I refer, and these shall be of a recent nature.

The first to which I shall call your attention has occurred during the present session of Congress. The variety in the mode of electing members to the House of Representatives of the United States, some being chosen by whole States, and others by separate districts, was long a subject of deep and general complaint. It gave to the States unequal power in the councils of the nation. Mississippi or New Hampshire for example, by a general ticket, securing the election of its members to the House of Representatives all of one political party, might acquire more power in that House than the State of New York, which, electing its members by districts, might return an equal or nearly an equal number of members of both the parties. According to the general ticket system, it is impossible that the elective franchise can be exercised with the same discretion and judgment as under the district system. The elector cannot possess the same opportunity under the one system as under the other of becoming acquainted with and ascertaining the capacity and fidelity of the candidate for his suffrage. An elector, residing in one extreme of the State, cannot be presumed to know a candidate living at a distance from him, perhaps at the other extreme. By the general ticket, the minority in a state is completely smothered. From these and other views of the subject, it has long been a patriotic wish entertained that there should be some uniform mode, both of electing members to the House of Representatives and choosing electors of President and Vice President. I recollect well, some twenty years ago, when public opinion seemed to be almost unanimous upon this subject. Well, the last Whig Congress, in order to prevent the abuses and to correct the inequality arising out of the diverse modes of electing members of the House of Representatives, passed an act requiring that it should be uniform, and by districts. The act was in conformity with an express grant of power contained in the Constitution of the United States, which declares that "the times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may, at any time, by law, make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators." With that reasonable, equal, and just act of Congress, every Whig State, whose Legislature assembled in time after its passage, strictly complied, and laid off their respective States into districts accordingly. But four States, with Democratic Legislatures—Georgia, Mississippi, Missouri, and New Hampshire—refused to conform to the law, treated it with contemptuous neglect, and suffered the elections for members of the House of Representatives to proceed in total disregard of its provisions. This was a new species of nullification, not less reprehensible than that which was attempted formerly in another State, though admitting of a more easy and peaceful remedy. That remedy was to refuse to allow the members returned from the four States to take their seats in the

House of Representatives, which they had no constitutional or legal right to occupy.—That question the present House of Representatives had to decide. But it was predicted, long before they assembled, confidently predicted, that the members from the four refractory States would be allowed to take their seats, the constitution and the law to the contrary notwithstanding. Why was it so predicted? Was it not because it was known, from the general character and conduct of the dominant party in the House, that it would not hesitate to trample under foot both law and constitution, if necessary to the accomplishment of a party object? Accordingly, the question recently came up in the House, and the members from the four States were admitted to their seats.

And what, fellow-citizens, do you suppose was the process of reasoning by which this most extraordinary result was brought about? Congress you have seen is invested with unlimited power to make regulations as to the times, places, and manner of holding elections for Representatives, or to alter those which might have been previously made by the State Legislatures. There is nothing in the grant of the power which enjoins upon Congress to exercise the whole of it or none. Considerations of obvious convenience concur in leaving to the several States themselves the fixation of the times and places of holding those elections.—In that, each State may be governed by its sense of its own convenience without injuriously affecting other States. But it is different with the manner of holding elections—that is, whether it be by general ticket or by the district system. If some States elect by general ticket, it gives to them an undue advantage over those States which elect by the district system. The manner therefore of holding elections was a fit subject, and the only fit subject, contained in the grant of power for Congressional legislation. If Congress had legislated beyond that, it would have overreached the convenience and necessity of the case. But the dominant party in the present House of Representatives have strangely assumed that Congress could not execute a part of the granted power without the whole. According to their logic, the major does not include the minor. In their view, Government cannot execute a part of a power with which it is entrusted, unless it executes the whole of a power vested in it. If this principle be true when applied to a part of the constitution, it would be equally true in its application to the whole constitution. But there are many parts of the constitution that never have been and probably never will be executed; and, if the doctrine of the dominant party in the House of Representatives be sound, all the laws enacted by Congress since the commencement of the Government are null and void, because Congress has not executed all the powers of the Government with which it is entrusted. The doctrine, applied to the enjoyment of private property, would restrain a man from using any part of his property unless he used the whole of it.

The case of the New Jersey election is familiar with everybody. There the whig members who presented themselves at Washington to take their seats bore with them the highest credentials, under the great seal of the State, demonstrating their right to occupy them.—They had been regularly declared and returned elected members of the House of Representatives, by their regular authorities, and according to the law of the State of New Jersey. Agreeably to the uniform usage which had prevailed in that House from the commencement of the Government, and according to the usage which prevails in every representative body, they had a right to demand to be admitted to their seats, and to hold and occupy them until any objections which might exist against them should be subsequently investigated. In the case of the four States already noticed, it was important to the interests of the dominant party, in order to swell their majority, that the members returned should be allowed to take their seats, although elected contrary to law. In the New Jersey case, it was important to the dominant party, to enable it to retain its majority, to exclude the whig members, although returned according to law. The decision in both cases was adapted to the exigency of party interest, in utter contempt both of constitution and law; and it is worthy of observation that, in the decision against the whig members of New Jersey, members, who boast emphatically of being the patrons and defenders of State rights, concurred in trampling

under foot the laws and authorities of that State.

In connection with the subject on which I am now addressing you, the manner of the admission of Michigan into the Union is worthy of notice. According to the usage which had uniformly prevailed prior to the admission of the States of Michigan and Arkansas, a previous act of Congress was passed, authorizing the sense of the people of the Territory to be taken in convention, and regulating the election of members to that body, limiting their choice to citizens of the United States residing within the Territory. Michigan, without the sanction of a previous act of Congress, undertook upon her sole authority to form a constitution, & demanded admission into the Union. In appointing members to that Convention a great number of aliens, as well as citizens of the United States, were allowed to vote, against the earnest remonstrances of many resident citizens. Under these circumstances, she applied to Congress to be admitted into the Union. No one questioned or doubted that she was entitled to be received whenever she presented herself regularly and according to law. But it was objected against her admission that she had assumed to act, against all usage, without the authority of Congress; and that, contrary to the constitution and laws of the United States, she had permitted aliens to partake of the elective franchise. The danger was pointed out of allowing aliens, unnaturalized and without renouncing their allegiance to foreign sovereigns and potentates, to share in that great and inestimable privilege. But all objections were unavailing; the dominant party, under the hope of strengthening their interests, in spite of all irregularity and in contravention of all law, admitted Michigan as a State into the Union.

In intimate connection with this case the subject of Dorrism may be noticed. Rhode Island had an existing government of long duration, under which her population had lived happily and prosperously. It had carried her triumphantly through the war of the revolution, and borne her into the Union as one of the original thirteen independent sovereign States. Under the operation of it, the people of no one State in the Union, in proportion to her population, had displayed more valor, patriotism, and enterprise. Dorr did not find his ambitious aspirations sufficiently gratified under this venerable government, and he undertook to subvert it. Asserting the principle that every people have a right to alter, modify, and change their Government whenever they think proper—an abstract principle, which, with cautious limitations, may be true—without consulting the established Government and the public authorities, he undertook to beat up for recruits, to hold irregular elections, at which persons qualified and unqualified, dead and living, were pretended to have voted, and thus securing a heterogeneous majority, he proceeded to form a new Constitution and to set up a new Government. In the meantime the legitimate and regular government proceeded in operation, and prepared to sustain itself, and put down the insurrectionary proceeding. Dorr flew to arms and collected a military force, as irregular and heterogeneous as his civil majority had been. But, on the first approach of military force, on the part of the legitimate and regular government, Dorr took to his heels and ignominiously fled, leaving his motley confederates to fare as they might. Now, fellow-citizens, what has been the conduct of the two parties in respect to this insurrection, which at one time appeared to be so threatening? The whigs, everywhere, I believe to a man, have disapproved and condemned the movement of Dorr. It has been far otherwise with our opponents. Without meaning to assert that the whole of them countenanced and supported Dorr, everybody knows that all the sympathy and encouragement which he has received have been among them. And they have introduced the subject into the present House of Representatives. We shall see what they will do with it. You can readily comprehend and feel what would be the effects and consequences of Dorrism here at the South, if Dorrism were predominant. Any unprincipled adventurer would have nothing to do but to collect around him a mosaic majority, black and white, aliens and citizens, young and old, male and female, overturn existing governments, and set up new ones, at his pleasure or caprice! What earthly security for life, liberty, or property would remain, if a proceeding so fraught with confusion, disorder, and insubordination were tolerated and sanctioned?

Then there is repudiation—that dark and

evil spot upon the American name and character—how came it there? The stain has been put there by the democratic majority of the Legislature of Mississippi. Under special pleas and colorable pretexts, which any private man of honor and probity would scorn to employ, they have refused to pay the debts of that State—debts contracted by the receipt of an equivalent expended within the State! The whigs of that State, who are the principal tax paying portion of the population, with remarkable unanimity are in favor of preserving its honor and good faith by a reimbursement of the debt; but the democratic majority persists in refusing to provide for it. I am far from charging the whole democratic party with this shameful public fraud, perpetrated by their brethren in the State of Mississippi. Without the State, to their honor be it said, most of them disapprove it; and within the State there are many honorable exceptions among the democrats.

Other examples might be cited to prove the destructive and disorganizing tendency of the character, conduct, and principles of the Democratic party, but these will suffice for this occasion. If the systems and measures of public policy of the two parties are contrasted, and compared, the result will not be less favorable to the Whig party. With the Whig party there prevails entire concurrence as to the principles and measures of public policy which it espouses. In the other party we behold nothing but division and distraction—their principles varying at different times and in different latitudes. In respect to the tariff, whilst in some places they are proclaiming that Free Trade is the true Democratic doctrine, and the encouragement of home industry federal heresy, in other parts of the Union, they insist that the Democrats are alone to be relied upon to protect the industry of the country, and that the Whigs are opposed to it.

That is a great practical and administrative question, in respect to which there is happily now prevailing among the Whigs, throughout the whole Union, a degree of unanimity as unprecedented as gratifying. From New Orleans to this place, I have conversed with hundreds of them, and I have not met with a solitary one, who does not assent to the justice and expediency of a tariff for revenue, with discriminations for protection. On this interesting question, fellow-citizens, it is my purpose to address you with the utmost freedom and sincerity, and with as little reserve as if I were before an audience in the State of Kentucky. I have long given to this subject the most impartial and deliberate consideration of which my mind is capable. I believe that no great nation ever has existed, or ever can exist, which does not derive within itself essential supplies of food and raiment and the means of defence. I recollect no example to the contrary in ancient or modern times. Although Italy did not itself afford all those supplies to Ancient Rome, the deficiency was drawn from her subjugated provinces. Great Britain, although her commerce encompasses the world supplies herself mainly from the little island under her immediate dominion. Limited and contracted as it is, it furnishes her with bread and other provisions for the whole year, with the exception of only a few days; and her manufactures not only supply an abundance of raiment and means of defence, but afford a vast surplus for exportation to foreign countries.

In considering the policy of introducing and establishing manufactures in our country, it has always appeared to me that we should take a broad and extensive view, looking to seasons of war as well as peace, and regarding the future as well as the past and present. National existence is not to be measured by the standard of individual life. But it is equally true both of nations and of individuals, that, when it is necessary we must submit to temporary and present privations, for the sake of future and permanent benefits. Even if it were true, as I think I shall be able to show it is not that the encouragement of domestic manufactures would produce some sacrifices, they would be compensated, and more than counterbalanced by ultimate advantages secured, combining together seasons of peace and of war. If it were true that the policy of protection enhanced the price of commodities, it would be found that their cheapness prevailing in a time of peace, when the foreign supply might be open to us, would be no equivalent for the dearthness in a period of war, when the supply would be cut off from us. I am not old enough to recollect the sufferings of the soldiery and population of the United States during the war of Independence, but history and tra-

dition tell us what they were; they inform us what lives were sacrificed, what discomforts existed, what hardships our unclad and unshod soldiers bore, what enterprizes were retarded or paralyzed. Even, during the last war, all of us, who are old enough to remember it, know what difficulties, and at what great cost, the necessary clothing and means of defence were obtained. And who does not feel conscious pride and patriotic satisfaction that these sufferings in any future war, will be prevented, or greatly alleviated, by the progress which our infant manufactures have already made? If the policy of encouraging them wisely, moderately, and certainly, be persevered in, the day is not distant when, resting upon our own internal resources, we may be perfectly sure of an abundant supply of all our necessary wants, and, in this respect, put Foreign Powers and Foreign wars at defiance. I know that, from extreme suffering and the necessity of the case, manufactures, in the long run, would arise and sustain themselves, with encouragement from the Government, just as an unaided infant child would learn to stand, and to walk; but, in both instances, great distress may be avoided, and essential assistance derived from the kindness of the parental hand.

The advantages arising from a division of the labor of the population of the country are too manifest to need being much dwelt upon. I think the advantages of a home, as well as foreign markets, is equally manifest; but the home market can only be procured by diversified pursuits, creating subjects of exchanges, at home as well as abroad. If one portion of the population of a country, be engaged in the business of manufacturing, it must derive its means of subsistence from the agricultural products of the country in exchange for their fabrics. The effect of these mutual exchanges is beneficial to both parties and to the whole country.

The great law which regulates the prices of commodities, is that of supply and demand. If the supply exceeds the demand, the price falls; if the demand exceeds the supply, the price rises. This law will be found to be invariably true. Any augmentation of supply is beneficial to the consumer; and, by establishing manufactures in the United States, an additional supply is created. Again, another principle, universally admitted to be beneficial to consumption, is, the principle of competition. If Europe alone, supply the American consumption of manufactures, Europe will enjoy a monopoly in that supply. That monopoly, it is true, will be subject to the competition which may exist in Europe; but it would be still restricted to that competition. By the existence of manufactures in the United States, an additional competition is created, and this new competitor enters the American Market, contending for it with the previous European competitors. The result is, an increase in the aggregate of supply and a consequent reduction in price. But it has been argued that the fabrics manufactured in America take the place only of so many which had been before manufactured in Europe; that there is no greater consumption in consequence of the home manufacture, than would exist without it; and that it is immaterial to the consumer whether the theatre of manufacture be Europe or the United States. But I think this is an extremely contracted, fallacious view of the subject. Consumption is greater in consequence of the existence of manufactures at home. They create a demand for labor, which would not exist without it, and the employment for labor creates an ability to consume, which would not exist without it. How could the American labor employed in manufactures at home, supply its consumption of European commodities, if it were deprived of that employment? What means of purchase would it possess? It is in vain to point to Agriculture; for every department of that is producing superabundantly. It cannot be questioned that the chief cause of reducing the price of Cotton is the excess of production. The price of it would rise, if less were produced, by diverting a portion of the labor employed in its cultivation to some other branch of industry. This new pursuit would furnish new subjects of exchange, and those who might embark in it, as well as those who would continue in the growth of Cotton, would both be benefited by mutual exchanges. The day will come and is not distant, when the South will feel an imperative necessity voluntarily to make such a diversion of a portion of its labor. Considering the vast water power, and other facilities for manufacturing, now wasting and unemployed at the South, and its possession at

home, of the choice of the raw material, I believe the day will come when the Cotton region will be the greatest manufacturing region of Cotton in the world.

The power of consuming manufactured articles being increased, in consequence of the domestic establishments of manufactures by the wages of labor which they employ, and by the wealth which they create, there is an increase also in the use and consumption of Cotton and other raw materials. To the extent of that increase, the Cotton grower is directly and positively benefited by the location of manufactures at home instead of abroad.

But suppose it were true that the shifting to a certain extent of the theatre of manufactures, from foreign countries to our own, did not increase the consumption at all, and did not augment the demand for cotton, there would be no just ground of complaint, with the Cotton planter, and the most he could say is, that it would be a matter of indifference to him. All that would happen to him would be the substitution of a certain number of American customers for an equal number of European customers. But ought it to be, can it be a matter of indifference to him, whether any portion of his fellow-citizens in the United States are in a state of prosperity or adversity? If, without prejudice to him, his own countrymen can acquire a part of the wealth which arises out of the prosecution of manufacturing industry instead of the foreigner, ought he not to rejoice at it? Is it to him a matter of no consequence that a certain amount of wealth, created by manufactures, shall be in his own country, instead of being in foreign countries? If here, its influence will be felt, directly or indirectly, in all the departments of human business, and in a greater or less degree in all parts of the country. It becomes a clear addition to the aggregate wealth of the nation, increasing its resources, and forming a basis of taxation and revenue in seasons of war and peace, if necessary.

But the advantage resulting from domestic manufactures, in producing an American competition with the European competition, augmenting the supply of manufactured articles, and tending consequently to a reduction of prices, is not the sole advantage, great as that is. A double market is produced both in the purchase of fabrics for consumption, and in the sale of productions of Agriculture. And how superior is the home to any other market in the conditions of proximity, its being under our own control, and its exemption from the contingency of war! It has been argued however, that we sell no more than we do if we were deprived of the home market. I have shown that to be otherwise. The importance of opening new markets is universally admitted. It is an object of the policy of all nations. If we could open a new market for 400,000 bales of cotton with any foreign power; would we not gladly embrace it? Every one knows the benefits which arise out of various markets. And those who reside in the neighborhood of large cities or market towns, are sensible of the advantage. It is said that our manufacturers absorb only about 400,000 bales of Cotton, which is a very small part of the total crop. But suppose that were thrown upon the market of Liverpool, already overstocked and glutted? It would sink the price far below what it now is. France consumes also about 400,000 bales. If the market of Havre were closed, and that quantity were crowded into the market of Liverpool, would not the effects be ruinous to the cotton grower? Our American market is growing, annually increasing, and, if the policy of the country can only become firmly fixed, the time will come, I have no doubt, when the manufacture of Cotton in the United States will exceed those of England. I do not desire to see any market closed, domestic or foreign. I think it our true interest to cultivate and cherish all. But I believe it to be our indispensable duty to afford proper encouragement to our own.

But it must be borne in mind, although Cotton is by far the most important of our agricultural products, it is not the only one. Where should we find a market for our Indian corn, if it were not for the existence of our manufactures? We should absolutely have none. My friend, Mr. Pettigrew, who sits before me, can find no market for his corn in North Carolina, because his neighbors, like himself, are occupied in producing it. Nor can he find any in foreign countries. But he meets with a good, sure and convenient market in Boston, Providence and other northern Capitals. Where should we seek a market for the flour, provisions, and other raw agricultural produce now

consumed by our manufacturers? If their present business were destroyed, they would be employed themselves in producing cotton, corn, provisions & other agricultural produce, thus augmenting the quantity and inevitably leading to a decline of prices.

It has been contended that the effect of affording legal encouragement to domestic manufactures is, to enhance the price of commodities and to impose a tax upon the consumer. This argument has been a thousand times refuted.

It has been shown again and again, that the price of almost every article, on which the system of encouragement has effectually operated, has been reduced to the consumer. And this was the necessary consequence of that law of supply and demand, and that principle of competition to which I have before adverted. It was foretold long ago by myself and other friends of the policy. But it is in vain we appeal to facts. It is in vain that we take up article by article, and comparing present with former prices; show the actual and gradual reduction. The free trader has mounted his hobby, and he has determined to spur him on, rough shod, over all facts, obstacles and impediments that lie in his way. It was but the other day I heard one of these free trade orators addressing an audience, and, depicting in the most plaintive and doleful terms, the extreme burdens, and oppressive exactions arising out of the abominable tariff. Why, says he, fellow-citizens, every one of you that wears a shirt, is compelled to pay six cents a yard more for it than he would otherwise do, in order to increase the enormous wealth of Northern capitalists. An old man in the crowd, shabbily dressed, and with scarcely anything but a shirt on, stopped the eloquent orator, and asked him how that could be? For said he, 'I have a good shirt on, that cost only 54 cents per yard, and I should like to know how I paid a duty of 6 cents.' These ingenious and indefatigable theorists, not only hold all facts and experience in contempt, but are utterly inconsistent in themselves. At one time, they endeavor to raise the alarm that the tariff would put an end to all foreign commerce, and thus drying up our principal sources of revenue on imports, it would become necessary to resort to direct taxes and internal taxation. In process of time, however, their predictions were falsified, and the system was found to produce abundant revenue. Then, they shifted their ground; the Treasury, said they, is overflowing, the tariff is the cause, and the system must be abandoned. If they had taken the trouble to enquire, they might have ascertained that, although England is the greatest manufacturing nation in the world, in amount, extent and variety, she nevertheless draws a vast revenue from customs.

Allow me to present you fellow-citizens, with another view of this interesting subject. The Government wishes to derive a certain amount of revenue from foreign imports. Let us suppose the total annual amount of imports to be \$100,000,000, and the total annual amount of revenue to be raised from it to be \$20,000,000. Is it at all material, whether that \$20,000,000 be spread in the form of duties, equally over the whole 100,000,000, or that it be drawn from some 50,000,000 or more of the imports, leaving the rest free of duty? In point of fact, such has been the case for several years. Is not a compensation found, for the duty paid upon one article, by the exemption from duty of another article? Take the wearing apparel of a single individual, and suppose you have a duty of \$2 to raise upon it; is it of any consequence to him whether you levy the whole \$2 upon all parts of wearing apparel equally, or levy it exclusively upon his coat and his shirt, leaving the other articles free? And if, by such discriminations as I have described, without prejudice to the consumer, you can raise up, cherish, and sustain domestic manufactures, increasing the wealth and prosperity, and encouraging the labor of the nation, ought it not to be done?

We are invited, by the partisans of the doctrine of free trade, to imitate the liberal example of some of the great European powers. England, we are told, is abandoning her restrictive policy, and adopting that of free trade. England adopting the principles of free trade! Why, where are her Corn laws? Those laws which exclude an article of prime necessity—the very bread which sustains human life—in order to afford protection to English agriculture. And on the single article of American tobacco, England levies annually an amount of revenue equal to the whole amount of duties levied annually by the United States upon

all the articles of import from all the foreign nations of the world, including England. That is her free trade! And as for France, we have lately seen a State paper from one of her high functionaries, complaining, in bitter terms of the American Tariff of 1832, and ending by formally announcing to the world that France steadily adhered to the system of protecting French industry!

But, fellow-citizens, I have already detained you too long on this interesting topic, and yet I have scarcely touched it. For near thirty years it has agitated the nation. The subject has been argued and debated a thousand times, in every conceivable form. It is time the policy of the country should become settled and fixed. Any stable adjustment of it whatever it may be, will be far preferable, to perpetual vacillation. When once determined, labor, enterprise and commerce can accommodate themselves accordingly. But in finally settling it, the interest of the whole Union, as well as all its parts, should be duly weighed and considered, in a paternal and fraternal spirit. The Confederacy consists of 26 States besides territories, embracing every variety of pursuit, every branch of human industry. There may be an apparent, there can be no real conflict between these diversified interests. No one State, no one section, can reasonably expect or desire that the common government of the whole should be administered, exclusively according to its own peculiar opinion, or so as to advance only its peculiar interests, without regard to the opinion or the interests of all other parts. In respect to the Tariff, there are two schools holding opposite and extreme doctrines. According to one, perfect freedom in our foreign trade, with no, or very low duties, ought to prevail. According to the other the restrictive policy ought, on many articles, to be pushed, by a high and exorbitant Tariff, to the point of absolute prohibition. Neither party holds itself up as an unerring standard of right and wisdom. Fallibility is the lot of all men, and the wisest know how little they do know. The doctrine of free trade is a concession to foreign powers, without an equivalent, to the prejudice of native industry. Not only without equivalent, but in the face of their high duties, restrictions and prohibitions applied to American products, to foreign powers, our rivals, jealous of our growth and anxious to impede our onward progress. Encouragement of domestic industry is a concession to our own fellow-citizens; to those whose ancestors shared in common with our ancestors, in the toils of the revolution; to those who have shared with us in the toils and sufferings of our day, to those whose posterity are destined to share with our posterity in the trials, in the triumphs and the glories which await them. It is a concession to those who are bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh, and who in some other beneficial form do make and are ready to make equivalent concession to us. It is still more; it is a concession by the whole to the whole; for every part of the country possesses a capacity to manufacture, and every part of the country more or less does manufacture. Some parts have advanced farther than others, but the progress of all is onward and forward.

[Conclusion next week.]

## THE SIMON PURE.

MONDAY EVENING, AUGUST 26, 1844.

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

### IS IT SO?

That the opponents of protection are friends of the British and are favoring their interests in preference to those of their own countrymen, there can be no doubt. Those who oppose a policy that would encourage the industry of our own citizens, reveal the hidden sources of our wealth, give employment to our laborers, and diversify the pursuits of our citizens so that each branch of industry would foster and encourage others, oppose their country's prosperity, their country's greatness. The man who can so feel and so act, rejoices in the adversities of his neighbor, and not one drop of patriotic blood courses in his veins. We have within our country the essential means of greatness, all the elements that constitute a nation's wealth—immense forests, inexhaustible mines of coal, lead, iron, &c. We have the capital and the

hands requisite to produce it for the market seeking employment, and yet there are those who stand up and oppose a system the object of which is to demonstrate our capacity, to take a proud rank as a manufacturing as well as an agricultural people, and who thus advocate the interests of Great Britain and other foreign nations, by striving to remove every barrier, so that they may flood our country with the fruits of their pauper labor, and thus crush our manufacturers and mechanics, or reduce the price of labor here to the standard of Europe. Where is that spirit that inspired our fathers to struggle for independence, when it was the determination of England that we should not make for ourselves a "hob nail?" There were, in the days of the Revolution, those who clung to the English interests, and opposed the efforts of the patriots who won our independence, and they were called Tories. There are Tories now, and the following extract from a Canadian paper published when South Carolina in 1833 threatened Disunion, will find an echo in the breasts of such as oppose the "AMERICAN SYSTEM."

"South Carolina and Georgia have respectively taken the stand, from which no force at the command of the manufacturing States can remove them. Hence all apprehensions of danger to the future prosperity of GREAT BRITAIN are dispelled. New and never failing markets will be thus opened for the products of her industry, which taking a fresh start, will conduct her to the acme of national strength and greatness."

After this follows a little English exultation at the prospect of a dissolution of the Union, and a fervent hope that its doom might be sealed forever! Such American freemen, is the feeling towards you, your country, and her welfare, as it exists in British breasts. That paragraph was written when South Carolina was rank with nullification and disunion on account of the protection of American industry. It glories in prospect of the destruction of our then comparatively infant manufactures. It was prompted by an English heart and written by an English pen. Yet now, we see, and read sentiments not less opposed to American interests, nor advocating less those of England. Judge ye, whether those who so think, and so write, and so speak, are at heart Americans. The same party who takes this stand against your country's welfare and glory, are struggling to elect to the Presidency the GRANDSON OF A TORY, who is pledged to destroy the protection of your industry. Choose ye which you will support, British interests or American interests, a British President or an American President, one in whose veins there is tory blood or one who never had any other than an American patriot's feelings, and whose heart's deepest throb is in his country's cause.

### WHIG MEETING AT AETNA FURNACE, LAWRENCE COUNTY.

This gathering of the people on Wednesday last proved to be one of the most enthusiastic and spirited of the season, in which we have had the pleasure of participating. The spot itself selected for the meeting was wild and picturesque, and when contrasted with the life and gaiety of the hundreds of happy souls that mingled their voices in huzzas for Clay and the Union, the display of banners, the strains of rich and mellow music, presented one of the most imposing scenes that it has been our fortune to witness. The meeting was called to order at 11 o'clock, and was first addressed by S. Sprigg, esq. in a neat and appropriate manner, contrasting the claims of Henry Clay and James K. Polk for the Presidency. Next followed an address from O. F. Moore at some length, on the important issues between the two parties, the Tariff and the annexation of Texas. At the close of this address dinner was announced, and all were soon around the table, ready to partake of the sumptuous repast that had been prepared by the committee. Dinner over, and all were soon assembled around the speaker's stand again.

to hear the address of our able representative, the Hon. Samuel F. Vinton. Mr. V. spoke principally upon the subject of the tariff, and we thought while hearing his overwhelming arguments on this subject, that a fool indeed must that man be who would still oppose a protective tariff, and especially in that manufacturing region where he then spoke. He spoke at considerable length and fully sustained his high reputation for being one of our most able and effective stumpers. Mr. V. had served with Mr. Polk in Congress, and said that he knew it to be a base slander upon Mr. Polk to call him the advocate of a protective tariff. He had heard Mr. P. speak and had seen him vote, and he knew that all his speeches and all his votes were "directly in opposition to the protective system." The meeting adjourned between 4 and 5 o'clock in the evening, and each started for his home, satisfied with himself, and satisfied with whig principles as they had been set forth. No difficulty or accident occurred during the day to mar the pleasure of the meeting. While we are proud to say this, we have to regret however the repeated provocation that was given by a few of our loco friends, who attended seemingly for no other purpose than to kick up a row and disturb the meeting. We trust that the "peace and order" of the self-styled democratic party are disposed to frown upon conduct of this kind, and yet we did not see one loco loco in all the crowd who was not chuckling over the studied, deliberate attempts to disturb the meeting. We love to have that deluded portion of our countrymen come out to hear the "truth," but we solemnly protest against the attendance of any loco loco at a whig meeting, who does not come to hear, but on the contrary to prevent others from doing so. We must not forget to notice the smiles and cheers that greeted our band and glee club. Music in that wild region of iron ore was a new thing, and well did it tell upon the souls of those who "had music in them." All were delighted with the rich melody of the music itself, and many a high compliment was paid to the gentlemanly deportment of those who uttered the "sweet sounds." The ladies too attended, to give grace and dignity to the meeting. We thank them for their smiles, they cheer us on to victory. As well might loco locoism attempt to cloud this world in utter darkness, without first plucking the sun from the heavens, as to stand up against the whigs, while we are cheered and supported by the light and smiles of woman. Go on then whigs of Lawrence! Burgess may yet for a while delude a few of the sovereigns, but truth is with you, and you must triumph.

#### TEXAS, AGAIN!

We call once more upon the democratic press of our town for light on the subject of the Annexation of Texas. Will you still be mum? You know you are deceiving the people in not telling them that "Texas" is the only affirmative principle advocated by your party. You know you are basely deluding the unfortunate of your party, who rely for all their light upon your sheet, men who will not look upon a whig paper. Now, we call upon you, if you are honest, and wish to obtain votes for James K. Polk fairly and honestly, to tell the people what his views are on this vitally interesting question. The people must not be gulled, they shall not be. If you are so shamefully dishonest as to conceal—yes, sir, deliberately conceal, from the honest portion of the democratic party this Texas scheme, of which James K. Polk is the great advocate, and which even now is fraught it may be with the dissolution of the old confederacy, your infamy shall not go unnoticed.

#### LAUGHABLE.

While a portion of the loco loco papers are full of suspicious looking certificates and affidavits, for the purpose of proving that Ezekiel Polk, the grandfather of James K., the hopeful candidate for the Presidency, was a patriot

of the revolution—and that therefore Jemmy had descended from a noble race, (a fact by the bye that could only be proven by his biographer, by showing that Jemmy's grand uncle was a whig of the revolution;) another portion, and these are sustained by the distinguished and learned men of the party in our own town, utterly deny that old Ezekiel was Jemmy's grandfather at all. We are not disposed to visit upon the head of poor Jemmy the sins of his old grand sire; and we only refer to the fact that Ezekiel Polk was a tory of olden times, to show that this young fellow, instead of descending from a patriot sire, as his friends wished to make the world believe, had descended in a direct line from a tory of the revolution. Now, for the sake of filial affection, let not the son deny the blood that binds him to a father.

The Democrat says, that "on the evening the tall hickory pole was elevated, that moment all the cocks in town commenced with one united voice, vying with each other which could crow the loudest." A part of this phenomenon may be explained—it is understood that evening, in loco loco parlance, means somewhere about the dark hour of midnight, and that "that moment" was four o'clock in the morning. "I won't go home, &c."

The "Democrat" seems much surprised, that the big whig pole should have grown thirteen feet since the recent elections. Is that any more difficult to believe than that you have 5,000 majority in Indiana?—Sam Medary asserted that you had, and forthwith you publish it for a fact. But when we state what may be somewhat curious in the vegetable creation, aside from the potent influence of whig enthusiasm, it is disbelieved and thought a whig lie. The case being altered it alters the case.

"Democrats wish to extend the area of freedom." Yes—and "progressive democrats" would do so, by levelling with the dust and scattering wide the materials of our manufacturing establishments, that make us an independent people. This was the language of the whale, when it had swallowed Jonah, "room for more."

Wise said to Polk, "you are the petty tool of a tyrant." (Wise sometimes spoke the truth very plainly.) and Jim did not fight. He has the certificate of Gen. Jackson that he is courageous, and perhaps with this disposition to be considered brave, we ought to let him off. It may be that the color of his grand dad's coat so haunts his disturbed fancy, as to make it hazardous that he should run the risk of seeing blood. "Two of you hold him and one me, boo, Jim's mad."

#### Indiana Erect—The Victory!

The following circular from the Indiana State Central Committee, puts all doubts to rest, and leaves nothing more to wish from Indiana. Gloriously has she sustained the good cause and redeemed herself, against fearful odds. The voice of her sisters is, go and do likewise!

WHIG CENTRAL COMMITTEE ROOM,  
Indianapolis, Aug. 10, 1844.

The Whig State Central Committee have the gratification of announcing to their political brethren that INDIANA IS REDEEMED and has again taken her true position among the patriotic WHIG STATES of the Union.

The returns are in, and the grand result is, that we have carried the LEGISLATURE, as well as the POPULAR VOTE, and the flag of the UNITED STATES floats in triumph over our beloved State.

We had to contend against fearful odds, but we have overcome all obstacles, and the STATE IS SAFE. A majority of ten last year against us on joint ballot to reverse—the Executive power, patronage, and personal exertions against us—the foreign vote too generally induced to vote against us, under the impression that it was their interest to do so, in which they must soon see they have been deceived by our opponents—the Texas question has been used with great power and ingenuity against us, but we think without serious effect—the system of boasting and bragging has been brought to bear upon the wavering by

our opponents, and many have been deceived by it, including some of our friends in other States, who have echoed back the sound with doubts and forebodings—still the patriotic whigs of Indiana have sustained themselves in a manner worthy of their former reputation and their glorious cause.

We do not deem it necessary to give more than the aggregate result of the members elected to the Legislature, as compared with the result last year; as that is the best test we can give of the political complexion of the State, as evinced by the last election. We feel justified in declaring that the State will cast her vote in November for CLAY and FRELINGHUYSEN by thousands, when all local and minor considerations will be merged in the great contest for prosperity and happiness of the people and the preservation of our glorious Union. We say to our friends everywhere that INDIANA IS REDEEMED.

| Result in 1843:           | Whig. | Democrat. |
|---------------------------|-------|-----------|
| Senate                    | 25    | 25        |
| House                     | 45    | 55        |
|                           | 70    | 80        |
| Dem. maj. on joint ballot |       | 10        |
| Result in 1844:           | W.    | D.        |
| Senate                    | 25    | 25        |
| House                     | 55    | 45        |
|                           | 80    | 70        |
| Whig maj. on joint ballot | 10    |           |
| Whig gain on joint ballot | 20    |           |

O. H. SMITH,  
Chairman.

T. J. BARNETT,  
Secretary.

[From the Newark Daily Advertiser, August 14.]  
**Mr. Clay's Private Character.**

A gentleman of this city, our friend Dr. J. G. GOBLE, being the corresponding Secretary of a Clay Club, thought proper to write to the Rev. Dr. BASCOM, of the Methodist Episcopal Church who resides near Mr. Clay, and who is the distinguished President of the Transylvania University, at Lexington, Ky. The letter was not written with any view to publication, but Dr. B.'s prompt reply was so direct, full and satisfactory that Dr. Gobble was constrained by the advice of a number of political friends to ask permission that it might be given to the public. This, it will be seen by the correspondence which we have the pleasure to subjoin, has been readily granted:

NEWARK, July 9th, 1844.

REV. DR. BASCOM,  
President Transylvania University.

Rev. and Dear Sir—You will, I trust, pardon the liberty I take in writing to you when I state that my object is to ascertain from you some testimony concerning the private character of Hon. Henry Clay. I do this at the solicitation of many conscientious, upright men, who appear to have been led to regard Mr. C. as anything but an honest and upright citizen: a Sabbath breaker—gambler—profane swearer, &c. I would respectfully ask if these things be so. It is not my wish to draw from you a letter for publication, and no public use will be made of your answer, my object being to ascertain how far these representations which are constantly repeated by the democratic papers of the North are warranted by truth.

Your answer to the interrogatories will much oblige  
Yours, very respectfully,

J. G. GOBLE.  
Corres. Sec'y Clay Club.

TRANSLYVANIA UNIVERSITY,  
LEXINGTON, Ky., July 24th, 1844.

My Dear Sir:—In reply to your letter of the 9th inst. I owe it to truth, virtue, and the claims of society, without any reference to the political strifes of the day, to say I have been in intimate and confidential intercourse with the Hon. H. CLAY, both in public and private life, for more than twenty years, and know the charges enumerated in your letter, against the private character of Mr. Clay, to be UTTERLY and BASELY FALSE. Mr. Clay, as is known to the whole nation, offers no claim to Christian piety, in the parlance of our churches, but in view of the ordinary accredited principles of good moral character, no charge can be brought against him, without violating the obligations of truth and sound justice. To each interrogative charge, therefore, contained in your letter, and reaching me in the shape of a question, I return for answer that I regard one and all of them as shamefully unjust, because NOT TRUE, in whole or in part.

Very respectfully, your obt. serv't,  
H. B. BASCOM.

D. E. G. GOBLE.

After this full, explicit and unequivocal testimony of one of the most distinguished divines of our country, we trust no reader will feel that there can be any farther necessity of pursuing the reckless slanderers of Mr. Clay.

#### ANOTHER RENUNCIATION.

"The cry is still they come!"

For the Simon Pure.

Mr. Clark.—Sir.—Be so good as to publish in the Simon Pure, that I have not left the Democratic party, but they have left me. They can't get the Polk juice down my throat, that was manufactured at the Baltimore Convention. I go for Henry Clay, as the only true representative of the Democratic party.

JAMES THOMPSON.

Washington Township, August 20, 1844.

#### INTERESTING LETTER OF GEN. HAMILTON.

The following letter in reply to one from the Hon. John White to Gen. J. Hamilton, is extracted from Mr. White's recent speech, vindicating Mr. Clay from the charge of a corrupt bargain with J. Q. Adams in 1824:

Oswichee Bend, Russell Co. Ala.,  
May 26th, 1844.

Dear Sir: I have had the honor to receive your favor of the 17th inst. There is nothing in the nature of your communication which requires an apology for your addressing me.

If I had in my possession such a letter from General Jackson, as has been most erroneously supposed, I should, under his very emphatic card of the 3d inst. in the Nashville Union, have felt myself released from all reserve as to its publication. You will have perceived ere this reaches you, from my reply to that gentleman, that he never in the confidence which once subsisted between us, transmitted me such a paper.

Indeed, I have very frequently heard him express opinions altogether at variance with the alleged retraction. His belief, and that generally of the party to which I was then attached, I did not share, in reference to the charge of "bargain and corruption," which in 1825 was so freely preferred against Mr. Clay and Mr. Adams, and which constituted the electioneering staple of our party, during the four years' war which ended in our triumph in 1829.

It would, in my humble opinion, have been an act of supererogation on the part of Mr. Clay, to have made a bargain for what, by the force and gravity of political causes and geographical considerations, was inevitable without either his crime or his participation—an offer of a seat in Mr. Adams's cabinet. In accepting it, I have always understood he acted in conformity with the advice of some of the most influential supporters of Mr. Crawford, whose friends then occupied a position of neutrality between the two great parties of Gen. Jackson and Mr. Adams, although they soon after, it is true, became belligerents on our side. I sincerely believe that Mr. Clay's acceptance of the office that subjected him to such obloquy, was the result of a sense of the duty which he owed to the country to aid by his counsels him whom he had assisted to place in power. He certainly relinquished for the Department of State a position in the House of Representatives, far more desirable, and of more influence and authority, which was much better adapted to the peculiar and transcendent vein of his signal ability for distinction in a popular assembly.

I know that this view of the case runs counter to the opinions of my old chief (who, if he puts himself at the head of the annexation movement, will be my chief again), and to those of many esteemed friends, with whom I was proudly and victoriously associated in the struggle of 1828 and '29. But they must pardon me for adhering to opinions (however valueless, long since entertained and frequently expressed.) And now when I have no sort of connexion with any party in the country, (except on one isolated question, associated, as I believe, with the best interests of the whole Union and the vital security of the South) I hope I may be allowed, without an impeachment of my own motives, and certainly without any adhesion, either expressed or implied, to the politics of Mr. Clay, to do justice, as far as my humble opinion can afford it, to his public reputation and his unsullied personal honor.

I remain, dear sir, with esteem, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

J. HAMILTON.

Hon. JOHN WHITE,  
House of Representatives.