

the chair that John Bell had used, and had one constructed, which with the ornaments and trappings cost over TWO THOUSAND DOLLARS!

Is it because he was a warm advocate in Congress of the PET BANK System, and reported the bill to establish it? or

Is it because of his PA FRIOATIC revolutionary ancestry? or

Is it because of his own service in the LAST WAR?

Is it because of his service and skill as a DIPLOMATIST?

Is it because of his great popularity before the BALTIMORE CONVENTION met?

Is it because he goes for the immediate ANNEXATION OF TEXAS—WAR with Mexico—ASSUMPTION of the debts of Texas—the extension and perpetuation of SLAVERY, and the violation of the national faith and honor?

Is it because the Madisonian says he is just such a man as JOHN TYLER?

Is it because he is a man of undoubted courage, and produced a CERTIFICATE OF GENERAL JACKSON to prove it?

Is it because he was TWICE beaten for Governor in his own State, after they had TRIED him once?

Is it because he is called by his friends YOUNG HICKORY, to show that he has no merit of his own upon which they can rely?

We repeat, which of these reasons is it that should induce us to vote for James K. Polk?

Progressive Democracy—Republican Independence—The Beauties of Consistency exhibited in obeying orders—The whole forming a Party looking-glass.

PROGRESSIVE DEMOCRACY.

(From the Cincinnati Enquirer.)

The man who WAS a democrat twenty-five years ago, and entertains the principles NOW, that the party DID twenty-five years ago, and has not progressed with the party, but remained stationary, IS JUST TWENTY-FIVE YEARS BEHIND THE TIMES AND THE PARTY.

He is NOT A DEMOCRAT NOW. Nay, the man who stands in relation to some principles now where the democratic party did ONLY TEN YEARS AGO, IS NOT A DEMOCRAT NOW. You must change your ground. If you would be esteemed a Democrat of 1843 you must abandon a portion of your SUPERANNUATED FAITH. Twenty-seven years ago, in '15, the Democratic party, in Congress, under the DEMOCRATIC administration of Madison—ESTABLISHED A BANK OF THE UNITED STATES. A large portion of the party then supposed such an institution unconstitutional, and all appear to have thought its charter sound policy—and it was not till near twenty years after that the party changed ITS PRINCIPLES in regard to a Bank. If you then entertain the same principles which you entertained in common with the party twenty-five years ago, in relation to this question, YOU ARE NOW IN FAVOR OF A BANK OF THE UNITED STATES TO BE CHARTERED BY CONGRESS. If you are, you cannot be a Democrat of 1843, though you were in 1816-'18. Ten years ago the party in Ohio were in favor of STATE BANKS, and actually granted bylaws of the Legislature, many charters. You doubtless believed in common with the party, in these Bank doctrines; you voted with the party. But the DEMOCRACY OF Ohio are now opposed to them. If you still adhere to your political faith of 1833, in relation to these matters, you are NOT DEMOCRAT NOW. Twenty-five years ago, the Democratic party—the whole country—justified and sustained a HIGH TARIFF. Fifteen years ago, 1828 to '33, THE PARTY, as a body, sustained the PROTECTIVE TARIFF of 1828, yet the party AS A PARTY, is now opposed to a TARIFF for PROTECTION. If you stand in reference to this question, as the party DID twenty-five or only ten years ago, you are NOT WITH THE PARTY NOW. I might continue this contrast between the PRESENT and FORMER POSITIONS OF THE PARTY, upon other questions. But the contrast upon the subjects of National Bank, State Bank and Tariff, are sufficient to sustain my position, that ONE CANNOT BE A DEMOCRAT NOW, WHO ENTERTAINS THE SAME OPINIONS HE DID TWENTY-FIVE OR EVEN THIRTY YEARS AGO, ALTHOUGH HE MAY THEN HAVE ACTED WITH THE PARTY, AND BEEN FOR THAT DAY A GOOD DEMOCRAT.

Cooled Down.—The locofoco ardor that first exhibited itself, on the receipt of Mr. Clay's second letter on Texas annexation. They have discovered that there are so many provisions attached to it respecting receiving Texas, which the Engineer left out of the category, that they were entrapped into buzzing for Clay too soon. The Locos cannot stand the 'honor' portion of the letter; it is decidedly against their party principles.

Cincinnati Straightout.

Ole Bull is in retirement at Bristol, (R. I.) He has, it is said, two new compositions in preparation, to be called 'The Falls of Niagara' and 'The Death of Washington.'—*Cin. Times.*

EARTHQUAKE.—Private letters received at New York state that the town of Nicaragua on Lake Nicaragua, Central America, was destroyed by an earthquake in June last. No particulars of the loss of life are given.

Post. Jour.



THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1844.

Whig Principles.

ATLAND, 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 in the Executive power, creating 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 suitable restraints against improper interference in elections.

6. An amendment of the *Constitution*, limiting the incumbency of the *President* office to a single term.

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

I am respectfully,

Your friend and ob'tservant,

HENRY CLAY.

MR. JACOB STRATTON.

Nominations of the National Whig Convention.

For President.

HENRY CLAY,

OF KENTUCKY.

For Vice President.

THEODORE FRELINGHUYSEN,

OF NEW JERSEY.

Senatorial Electors.

HENRY S. LANE, of Montgomery Co.

JOSEPH G. MARSHALL, of Jefferson.

District Electors.

1st Dist. John A. Breckenridge, of Warwick;

2d " James Collins, of Floyd;

3d " John A. Matson, of Franklin;

4th " Samuel W. Parker, of Fayette;

5th " Hugh O'Neal, of Marion;

6th " George G. Dunn, of Lawrence;

7th " Richard W. Thompson, of Vigo;

8th " A. L. Holmes, of Carroll;

9th " Horace P. Bidle, of Cass;

10th " L. G. Thompson, of Allen;

Carlisle Mass Meeting.

Whigs of old Knox! remember at the Whig Mass Meeting at Carlisle on the 16 and 17th of October. Go up in your strength, and join with your brethren of Sullivan in their rejoicing over the redemption of our State from locofoco misrule—and in their determination to accomplish a more glorious victory still in November next.

Washington Mass Meeting.

On Saturday last, agreeably to previous notice, the Barbecue for Knox, Daviess and Martin counties, came off, and it would have made the hearts glad of those who were not there, if they had witnessed as we did, the congregated thousands met together to show their zeal for the patriotic and statesman Henry Clay, and the glorious Whig cause. At a reasonable computation, there were present not less than five thousand persons, many of whom were ladies. At an early hour the people began to assemble, and continued pouring in from all quarters until the streets were completely crowded. At the proper time the marshals formed a procession, and proceeded to the place designed for speaking. Mr. Ewing, of Vincennes, and Mr. Phelps, of Louisiana, each addressed the immense crowd, who were often interrupted by deafening shouts, dictated by hearts that seemed to pulsate with one harmonious thrill of overflowing enthusiasm. The speech of Mr. Ewing was truly excellent—in fact, it was a sublime, grand effort.

After the speaking was over, we were marched to a beautiful grove a little below town, where the dinner tables were spread with an abundance of every thing the heart could desire. Many of us were in a hurry to get home, and started immediately after dinner, consequently we did not witness the manner in which the proceedings closed, but we are told that many addresses were delivered in the evening which struck terror into the very heart of locofocoism. We have not space to give even an outline of the proceedings of the day, but will probably say more about it hereafter. All in all, it was a great gathering.

We must here take occasion, however, to kindly thank the citizens of Washington, for the hospitable manner in which we were treated. Never have we seen more whole-souled, noble-hearted set of Whigs in our life, and we but speak the sentiments of all who were present.—We found their latch strings out, and every one ready and willing to do things as they ought to be done.

Falsified Exposed.

The Locos tell the people that James K. Polk voted, when in Congress, for the Revolutionary Pension Bills, and that Mr. Clay voted against some amendments to these Bills, giving the volume and page for Mr. Clay's votes, but no volume or page for Mr. Polk's votes—thus trying to make the impression that Polk favored and Mr. Clay opposed Revolutionary Pensions. Now the well informed Locos know that this is all a lie—that James K. Polk voted against all the Revolutionary Pension Bills but one, and that was a *private Bill* to pension *certain persons* named in the Bill, some of whom happened to live in his District. They can show that he voted for some amendments to these Bills, but he voted for these amendments, not as the friend of the old Soldiers, but to prevent the passage of the Bills by which they were to receive Pensions—Mr. Clay, who has always voted for the Revolutionary Pension Bills, knowing the object for which such amendments were offered, voted against them, whenever he thought their adoption would endanger the passage of the Bills. Mr. Clay was the true friend of the Revolutionary patriots—he wished them to be pensioned, and wished the Bills granting them pensions to pass, and was determined their passage should not be defeated by permitting their enemies to overload them with amendments. The certificate below shows what constitutes of truth locofoco statements of facts.

There was a bitter locofoco in Congress from Alabama, by the name of Clement C. Clay, who always voted with Polk against the Revolutionary Pension Bills, and who some of the lying locofoco leaders wish to palm off on the ignorant of their party as Henry Clay. Now Mr. Clay, the Whig candidate, was not in Congress at all when most of these votes referred to were given by James K. Polk, and never did serve in the same body with Mr. Polk. In 1831 Henry Clay was elected to the United States Senate by the Legislature of Kentucky, and James K. Polk and this Clement C. Clay were then in Congress members of the House of Representatives, had been members of the House of Representatives for several years before that time, and continued to be members of the House of Representatives for several years after that time. The Hon. Henry Clay has not been a member of the House of Representatives of Congress since the 4th day of March, 1825.

The undersigned, having been called upon to examine the votes of Messrs. Clay and Polk upon the various Bills to pension Revolutionary Soldiers and others, the same having been referred to in part in the Sun of the 14th inst., in the following article:

KEEP IT BEFORE THE PEOPLE.

That Henry Clay and Theodore Frelinghuyzen both voted against the proposition to amend the Pension act of 1832, so as to extend its provisions to the soldiers who fought under Wayne, Clarke, St. Clair, Harmer and Hamtramck; and to those who were in service under the authority of the United States against any tribe of Indians, prior to the 1st of January, 1795.—See Congress Debates, Vol. 8, part 1, page 950.

That Henry Clay voted against a proposition to amend the same bill so as to extend its provisions to the widows of soldiers of the Revolution. See same volume, same page.

That James K. Polk voted in '26, for the bill for the relief of the surviving officers of the Army of the Revolution.

That James K. Polk voted in '29, for the bill to provide for certain persons engaged in the land and naval service of the United States in the Revolutionary war.

That James K. Polk voted in '32, for the bill granting pensions to those who defended our frontiers in the Indian wars from 1776 to 1795—and for the bill supplementary to the act for the relief of certain surviving officers and soldiers of the Revolution."

Find upon referring to Congressional Debates, vol. 8, part 1, p. 930 and not 950 as the Sun has it, (there being nothing on page 950 about Revolutionary Pensions) that on the 14th day of May, 1832, the Senate resumed the consideration of this effect was offered by Mr. Wickliffe to the Pension Bill when before the House, which was rejected by a large vote, and was afterwards voted against by Mr. Clay in the Senate to save the Bill from defeat. Mr. Polk voted against the Revolutionary Militia Pension Bill that passed the House that year.—See Cong. Debates, Vol. 8, part 2, page 2713.

JAMES K. POLK

Voted against the old patriots of the Revolution on March 13, 1828, on the passage of the Bill for the relief of the surviving officers of the Revolutionary war. Cong. Debates, vol. 4, part 2, page 2670.

March 18, 1830. He voted against the Revolutionary Pension Bill. Vol. 6, part 1, page 629. Cong. Debates.

March 19, 1830. Mr. Polk spoke some time against the Bill, and voted against it. Same vol. page 635.

February 17, 1831. He voted against the Bill for the relief of Revolutionary Soldiers. Same vol. 7, page 730.

May 2, 1832. He voted against the Revolutionary Pension Bill. Same, vol. 8, part 2, page 2713.

July 5, 1832. He spoke against and course voted against the *invalid* Pension Bill. Same vol. part 3, pages 3864 and 3855.

We have examined the public Records, and find the votes of Mr. Clay and Mr. Polk as stated above, and any one who doubts it can call and examine the Records for himself.

THOS. BISHOP,

D. S. BONNER,

H. DECKER,

H. D. WHEELER,

THOS. C. BAILEY,

O. B. WETZELL,

GEO. D. HAY.

JOHN H. MASSEY.

Vincennes, Sept. 18, 1844.

N. B. In 1831, Mr. Polk advocated and voted for an amendment to the Revo-

us neither to volume, page nor any thing else but the year. The editor of the Sun says that James K. Polk in 1826 voted for the Bill for the relief of the surviving officers of the Army of the Revolution, and an amendment to this Bill for the benefit of the widows of officers and soldiers who fell or died in the Revolutionary war.

This is not true. We have examined the Congressional Debates of that year, and

find that there was but one Bill to pension Revolutionary officers and soldiers introduced into and acted upon by the House during that session.

On the 24th day of April, 1826, the House took up this Bill for the relief of the surviving officers of the Army of the Revolution. See Congress Debates, vol. 2, part 2, page 2520.

On the next day Mr. Reed moved to amend the Bill by adding a section appropriating a certain amount for the benefit of the soldiers of the Revolution.

Mr. Mitchell of Tennessee moved to amend the Bill, some of whom happened to live in his District.

They can show that he voted for some amendments to these Bills, but he voted for these amendments, not as the friend of the old Soldiers, but to prevent the passage of the Bills by which they were to receive Pensions.

Mr. Clay, who has always voted for the Revolutionary Pension Bills, knowing the object for which such amendments were offered, voted against them, whenever he thought their adoption would endanger the passage of the Bills.

See same vol. pages 2559 and 2574.

The Bill and amendments were then reported from the committee of the whole House to the House.

On the 27th day of April the House resumed the consideration of said Pension Bill, and Mr.

Mitchell of Tennessee moved to postpone the consideration thereof till the 1st day of July next—that was until after the adjournment of Congress, for they had passed a resolution to adjourn and did adjourn on the 22d day of May.

This motion was not adopted. See same vol. page 2575.

May 1st Mr. Mitchell moved to amend the Bill by providing for the surviving widows of said officers and soldiers who fell, or otherwise died in the Revolutionary war, and the widows of such as shall have died at any time before eighteen months from the passage of this act.

Mr. Buchanan of Pennsylvania objected to the wide extent of this amendment and the mover agreed to modify it so as to confine its operation to the widows of the officers who had served the same period with the officers relieved, but had since died.

So it was then adopted. The above two are the only amendments respecting the widows of Revolutionary officers and soldiers that were offered and voted on, and from which it appears that there was no opposition to pension the widows of soldiers voted on.

See page 2588, same volume.

May 2d a motion was made to recom-

mit the Bill and amendments to the Committee on Revolutionary Pensions, which prevailed by the following vote: yeas 90,