

REPORTER.

Wednesday, July 31, 1844.

DEMOCRATIC NOMINATIONS.

For President in 1844,
JAMES K. POLK,
OF TENNESSEE.

For Vice President,
GEORGE M. DALLAS,
OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Electors for President and Vice President.

WILSON, McCANNISS, Senatorial.
Asa Demock,
1. George F. Lehman, 13. George Schnabel.
2. Christian Kneass, 14. Nath'l B. Eldred.
3. William H. Smith, 15. M. N. Irvine.
4. John Hill, (Chila), 16. James Woodburn.
5. Samuel E. Leech, 17. Hugh Montgomery.
6. Samuel Camp, 18. Isaac Ankney.
7. Jesse Sharpe, 19. John Matthews.
8. N. W. Sample, 20. William Patterson.
9. Wm. Heidenrich, 21. Andrew Burke.
10. Conrad Shimer, 22. John McGill.
11. Stephen Baldy, 23. Christian Meyers.
12. Jonah Brewster, 24. Robert Orr.

For Governor,
HON. HENRY A. MUHLENBURG,
OF DEER.

For Canal Commissioner,
JOSHUA HARTSHORNE,
OF CHESTER.

The Course of the Argus and Certain men of the Whig Party.

It is with extreme reluctance, that we are induced to take any further notice of the Federal Organ at this place; nor would we do so at this time, but for the fact, that certain men of that party, claiming *high respectability*, have become the endorsers and retailers of the gross falsehoods, which weekly find their way to the public through the medium of that prostitute and utterly reckless press. We have no hesitation in saying, that in the *coinage of base falsehoods*, the Argus of this place is without its parallel in the State or Union. There is not one single principle of truth or honor which restrains its licentiousness.—It is given up wholly and solely, to the business of misrepresentation, detraction and falsehood; and we regret to be compelled to say, we are fully satisfied, that certain Whig partisans at this place, claiming *character*, are base and wicked enough to give circulation to its lies, and even to make copious additions to them. The Argus, and certain of the leaders of the federal party, adopt in full the tactics which their leader, Henry Clay, laid down in the United States Senate as lawful to be pursued towards Democrats—namely, to treat them as "PIRATES," whom it was lawful to destroy by any means fair or foul. This is the code of morals which has governed that paper, and certain *very respectable Whigs* in their course touching certain resolutions passed by the Democratic Association of this borough; and particularly toward the mover of them—David Wilmot, Esq.

We have heretofore given a full, triumphant and *unanswered* defence of those resolutions; but it was before the base attempt had been made by the Argus to give to them a *religious* character, by charges and insinuations the most gross and outrageously false. A more particular statement of the circumstances under which they were offered and passed, would perhaps be proper, as the whole course of the Argus has been to carry the idea that they were artfully drawn up by the mover, and offered with a view to operate upon a particular class of voters.

On the 21st of May last, the Democratic Association of the borough of Towanda held a regular and stated meeting. Aaron C. Allen occupied the whole evening in an address; when he closed, Mr. Wilmot, who had been reading some papers, got up and stated that he held in his hand certain resolutions which had been offered before the Luzerne county Association, by the Hon. Andrew Beaumont, late member of Congress, and which had passed that Association *unanimously*—that he would read them, and move their adoption by our Association, if they spoke the sentiments of its members. He did read them—moved their adoption, which motion was seconded by E. W. Baird Esq., and they passed with *one dissenting voice only*.

If there is any thing wrong in these resolutions, we have yet failed to see it. Let our readers read the resolutions, which they will find upon the first page

of this paper. Is the first objectionable to the Whigs? Do they deny that the Declaration of Independence is the great confession of public faith of the friends of liberty in the United States, as embodying the principles of human freedom? This is asserted in the first resolution.—Does the Argus call this "trucking to foreign influence?" Is this "Irish Catholicism?"

The second resolution declares that like those who signed "that immortal charter, (the Declaration of Independence) we hold as self evident, that all men are created free and equal, no matter what country gave them birth—that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights—that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." Almost the whole of this resolution as will be seen is in the *language* of the Declaration of Independence. Is this resolution objectionable to the friends of Henry Clay? Do the horror-stricken and newly-made pious leaders of the whig party in this village discover Catholicism and a truckling to foreign influence in this resolution? nearly the whole of which, is *word for word* the language of the Declaration of Independence. It may be that the Argus will shortly denounce the signers of that "Immortal charter" as "base truckling to alien influence."

The third resolution asserts, "That those who achieved our Independence, proclaimed this country the asylum of oppressed man"—Did they do so, gentlemen Whigs? Or is this a loco foco lie? Is this resolution true or false? Let the pure and spotless patriots of the Argus answer. It may be, from them we shall learn, that the patriots of the revolution were *political* native Americans, and in favor of abridging the equal rights of the *naturalized citizen*.

The fourth resolution asserts "That the society denominated the "Native American Association" is a libel upon the character of our country—a libel upon the Declaration of Independence, and upon the characters of those who subscribed that memorable charter; that its spirit is anti-Republican, anti-American, anti-christian, and a most foul and treasonable plot against liberty." If what is asserted in the three first resolutions be true and correct in principle, then all contained in the above follows as true and correct also.

If all men are "created free and equal"—if the rights of liberty and pursuit of happiness are inalienable, as declared in the declaration of Independence—if those who achieved our Independence did proclaim this country the "asylum of oppressed man;" and if these principles have been embodied in the American constitution, and constituted a part of our unvarying policy, then the organization of a party based entirely and exclusively upon principles of proscription to the *naturalized citizen*, (not the foreign alone), and aiming at an abridgment of his equal rights, is all that is declared to be in the 4th resolution. Let us hear Henry Clay upon this subject. Perhaps the whigs will listen composedly to the language of their stainless chief, while they grow rabid at the language of the Hon. Andrew Beaumont.

In a speech delivered by Clay near Lexington June 9th, 1842, on the occasion of the great Barbecue when the "virgin heifer" was roasted, he makes use of the following language: "When foreigners are *naturalized*, and incorporated as citizens in our community, they are entitled to ALL the privileges within the limits of the constitution, which belong to a "native born" citizen; and if necessary, they should be protected at home and abroad—the *thunder of our artillery should roar as loud and effectually in their defence as if their birth were upon American soil*." Oh! horror of horrors! Henry Clay playing the "Demagogue!" Henry Clay "trucking to alien influence," and catering after Irish Catholic votes! Here is asserted by Henry Clay, and in stronger language, every principle embodied in the resolutions; yet the resolutions are denounced as a "base truckling to foreign influence," and those who aided in their passage as wanting American feeling, while Clay remains the pure patriot—the first of American statesmen.

But there is higher authority upon this subject than Henry Clay—Moses by command of God, delivered to the children of Israel divers laws, recorded

in the 19th chapter of Leviticus. The 33d and 34th verses, promulgate the following law: "And if a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not vex him. But the stranger that dwelleth with you, shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt—I am the Lord your God."

It would be well for men, who cannot take the first step backward in the line of their descent, without stumbling upon an English Tory, or German Jew, to read the above text, twice, before they denounce as destitute of proper American feeling, those who passed resolutions, every principle of which is embodied in the Declaration of Independence and the American Constitution, or clearly deducible therefrom.

We would like to know if the men who composed the last two Democratic National conventions were demagogues, and if they too, were guilty of "trucking to alien influence." Let us hear what they say.

Resolved, That the liberal principles embodied in the Declaration of Independence, and sanctioned in the Constitution, which makes ours the land of Liberty and the Asylum of the oppressed of every nation, *have ever been cardinal principles in the Democratic faith*; and every attempt to abridge the present privilege of becoming citizens and owners of soil among us, ought to be resisted with the same spirit which swept the alien and sedition laws from our statute book."

This resolution was passed by the Democratic National Convention of 1840, and re-adopted and re-asserted by that of 1844, which nominated Polk and Dallas. It will be seen that the resolution goes farther than those passed by the Borough Association, in this, that it declares that the present laws of naturalization should not be abridged, while upon that subject the resolutions drawn by Mr. Beaumont are silent.—They refer only to those who are citizens, and whose equal rights as citizens were threatened by the organization of a party based upon principles of proscription to all whose birth had been in a foreign land.

The last of these resolutions makes some assertions of fact, to wit—"that the Native American party had its origin with the federal whig party—that the whig party had openly identified themselves with it, in a recent Charter Election in the City of New York." Whether these allegations are true or false is a question to be settled by evidence; and which ever way it might be settled, the principles asserted in the resolutions would remain the same. The Tribune, the leading organ of the whigs in the Union, charged that the "Native American party" originated with the Loco Focos at Tammany Hall, and denounced it in unmeasured terms. Some of the leading Democratic Journals of New York denied the charge of the Tribune, and asserted that the whigs had been mainly instrumental in originating that party. The resolutions allege the latter, and if erroneously, it is the wrong statement of a fact and not the assertion of a wrong principle. The other fact charged; "that the whigs had openly and manifestly identified themselves with the "Native" party in the recent Charter Election in New York City, will we presume, not be denied. The democrats in that Election gave their candidate for Mayor 20,000 votes—the whigs gave their 5,000, and Harper the Native candidate had 24,000, showing conclusively that party it was that went off to the Native Americans.

A despicable and unprincipled effort has been made, to connect the resolutions in some way with the late riots in Philadelphia. With what justice and truth this has been done, the public will see by reference to the resolutions in which not the remotest allusion is made to the riots; none could be, since full accounts could not have been reached Wilkes-Barre at the time they were written by Mr. Beaumont and passed by the Luzerne Association. But the Argus boldly charges that Mr. Wilmot in offering them sought to make the whig party chargeable with those riots.—This we pronounce utterly and absolutely false; without the shade of truth or foundation. We were present, and well recollect what he said, and all he said, touching those riots. It was this. He said, "that he looked upon the recent scenes of riot and blood-shed in

the city of Philadelphia, as the legitimate fruits of the introduction of a *wrong principle* into our political strife." This was what he said, and all he said touching those riots. Beyond this he made no reference or allusion to them; yet in its recklessness of truth, the Argus accused him of charging upon the whig party the entire responsibility of those lawless proceedings; nay more, that while he denounced the "church burners, he upheld the murderers." Again we pronounce it, wholly and unqualified false—a sheer wicked falsification, put forth for the purpose of prejudicing the public mind against a political opponent. What Mr. Wilmot said was spoken in a public meeting, in the presence of numerous witnesses, and we defy them to adduce a single reputable witness who will state that he said anything more touching those riots, than what we have substantially given. He denounced no one—he excused no one. He spoke of the riots only in the general terms which we have substantially quoted.

But the most scandalous and shameful course of the Argus, is its repeated insinuations made in connection with its comments on these resolutions that Mr. Wilmot is a Catholic. His subscription of 20 dollars, made eighteen months since, towards the building of a Catholic Church in this village, is paraded in the paper, and the wonder significantly expressed, "whether he ever subscribed as much for a Protestant Church." Again the Argus says, "we understand that he really pretends to be a Catholic himself." This is beautiful, this is worthy of a public journal. Nice truly, this attempt to excite the religious feeling of community against a citizen, merely because he takes an open and fearless course in sustaining the principles and candidates of the democratic party. In 1840, pending the Hard cider campaign, the Argus kept it stereotyped that Mr. Wilmot was a drunkard, a sot, a bloater, that he had illegitimate children about the country. Now it seems, he is to be held up as a Catholic; or if it would suit the vile purposes of that press any better, a Jew, or Mormon, or believer in Mahomet. What will honorable and high minded men think of such a course? such a shameful attempt to call into action the religious feelings of community, and bring an additional element of strife into these heated political contests which engender enough of acrimony and bitter feeling. Why publish the subscription of Mr. Wilmot alone, to the Catholic Church alone? why not state also, (what he could learn as easily if not as willingly as tell a falsehood,) that Mr. W. paid \$50 towards one Protestant church, is a regular and liberal contributor to its support and has assisted according to his means in the building of them all, though a member of none? Why not tell the public, that at the same time Mr. Wilmot subscribed 20 dollars towards building a Catholic Church, that C. L. Ward, Esq. subscribed one hundred and fifty. That Harry and Mahlon C. Mercur's subscribed twenty, that Burton Kingsbury, subscribed fifteen or twenty, that John C. Adams subscribed ten; as also several other of the citizens of this place, who have never been suspected of Catholicism for so doing. The answer is obvious. The object of the Argus was to hold up Mr. Wilmot as a Catholic and try to poison the public mind against him. C. L. Ward, Harry Mercur, Mahlon Mercur, Burton Kingsbury, and John C. Adams are whigs. One of them can subscribe 150 dollars for a Catholic Church, and it is nothing more than the gift of a liberal and generous spirit; but if Mr. Wilmot gives 20, that is Demagoguism, Catholicism, a catering after votes, or any other thing that is vile.

We are done for the present, with this falsifying Federal sheet. It will continue its work of falsehood and detraction, assailing any and every democrat who dare be active in support of his principles and candidates. Its character however is too well understood at home, for it to seriously injure those it assails. A man must have lived to but little purpose, whose good name and fame could be shaken by the attacks of a paper so notoriously infamous as the Bradford Argus.

Mr. Polk never fought a duel, and is strictly a moral man in the true sense of the term—can the Whigs say as much for Henry Clay?

The Coon Organ of this County.

The columns of the Reporter will bear testimony, that we have thus far pursued a course mild and pacific towards our opponents; endeavoring always to avoid personalities towards them. We had resolved to try the effect of this kind of treatment and make some sacrifice of feeling in order to preserve through the excitement of this political campaign, harmony among each other, as citizens and neighbors of the same county and village. We find, however, that no such disposition exists with our opponents, especially with their press, and that unless we take a defensive stand, our course would be justly liable to the charge of pusillanimity.—The federal organ of this place and its editorial scribbles, as well as the federal orators who travel the county, have kept up a shameful attack upon the principles and private reputation of our candidates and our friends, until further forbearance would be criminal.

The Argus for about six weeks past has been without interruption, attempting to provoke a quarrel with one of our fellow citizens, and distinguished democrats; waiting in vain for that gentleman to take notice of them, the last Argus appears fully charged with a volley of lies, which had been kept in reserve, expecting the attack would be made on them. One article headed "Mr. Wilmot's Resolutions," written by some one else, than the known editors, contains a series of falsehoods, as barefaced, shameless and infamous as ever appeared in print.—Falsehoods penned, with a perfect knowledge that they were such. A few readings of the liturgy may answer to the author's conscience, after this batch of unprovoked calumnies, but with the upright, he is before another tribunal.

The Argus, together with a party in a hopeless minority, has for weeks been publishing incendiary articles, in expectation of raising the protestants of this county against the few Catholics that are in it; with the contemptible design of getting votes for Henry Clay from the protestants. In a conversation which we had with a prominent and leading whig of this county, on the impropriety of this attempt to start up a religious warfare, he told us that they, the whigs would make capital enough out of it to beat David Wilmot. Imagine if you can, reader, anything more wicked, or more base. Do the whigs hope for victory on such terms? are they willing to stir up a religious quarrel to catch votes? is their prospect so desperate? They talk about demagoguism,—who are playing the part of the vilest demagogues? heaven save our country from the consequences of such a crusade as the Argus from week to week, is laboring to provoke. But more of this at another time. Our opponents have given us through the Argus, and through their orators, to understand the only terms upon which we can meet them in this campaign.—Be it so; we did not provoke it, but have always endeavored to avoid it.

If the war must go into Africa, so be it; if the families of this borough and elsewhere become divided and neighbors severed, we must share our part of the misfortune. We are resolved, rather to make this sacrifice, than any longer to endure in silence, the shameless insolence that is from day to day, and from week to week heaped upon this press, our friends, and our candidates.

More Falsehoods.

Certain Whig orators about this borough, have recently taken much pains to call on a worthy class of religious professors in the neighboring towns, and tell them that Col. Polk is a Catholic and a Tory. We have the evidence by us to show that this kind of mean and hollow-hearted system of lying has been resorted to. What can be more contemptible? This is a part of the system of operations which the whigs are persisting in to make this not only a political campaign, but a campaign of war between different religious sects. Of what religion has Henry Clay to boast, that a religious man should prefer him? Has he not from manhood to old age, turned his back with contempt upon all laws of God and man? Has he not trampled with perfect impunity upon every social and moral obligation—a gambler, a libertine and a duellist? Yet forsooth, pious men are called upon to vote for him and not for Col. Polk. We challenge the whigs of this county to produce a single instance in which Col. Polk has done that which makes him even liable to reproach.

As to his religion, it has nothing to do with his position; but we are formed by fellow-members of his Congress, that from early life he has been an exemplary member of the Presbyterian Church, and so remain, his torism next week, when it will be seen that it does not run in his blood.

Argus vs. Canal Commissioners.

The editor of the Argus states things which he knows about the Canal Commissioners and one thing he does not know—and then asks, "der, have you paid your STATE TAX?"

His readers ought to be surprised to find he knows anything without this astounding pretension of knowledge in proportion to ignorance six to one, with the trick of types showing that one to be no common thing which he does "NOT know." The tinent question about taxes means, says,—excuse us for seeking a mean in this last: choice number of a distinguished, in its way; for there places to study such things, "And there philosophers may, sitting, read "And to some end apply the dollest part that question may mean, "all knowledge comes of the common school and the schools are supported by public treasury; why then don't hasten to pay your taxes? for another genius may

"Waste its fragrance on the desert," while the collector is looking along for the want of knowing six things one he does NOT know." But too for the infirmities of genius derided! as we sigh over genius wasted. Of the six things this wiseacre knows one only has a word of truth, (worlding, to find given its shadow once, in the remarkable intelligence that Canal Commissioners receive THIRTY DOLLARS a day. And here we would require that, in calling the action to so extravagant a per diem, knowing one should have given credit for already saving enough to state, by their economical and efficient management of the public works, to say, to salary a hundred men at same rate. We regret that their expected arrival and the hurry of duties prevented the friends of honest administration from bestowing them, by "parties" or otherwise, honors so especially their due. bless and honor them in our heart. So must all who have mourned over finances of Pennsylvania. We they will allow us an opportunity of ing them proofs of this regard, by a tinuance of public trusts, (from we regret Mr. MILLER is about to draw—for a short time,) as well as personal hospitalities whenever their ties may not enjoin their present demeanor.

But, to return—ad nauseam—to sapient editor, we can not wonder at one thing he does "NOT know"; the Argus, with its hundred peacock tail eyes, may exclaim, with Titus "I see—I see—what soon you'll see" and yet the matter-of-fact father who "The Spanish fleet thou canst not see—"

—It is not yet in sight!"

We have made a charitable conjecture meaning, which seems however foreign to this witless and inhospitable bludgeon by the peculiar English, below common-school standard, in which throws off his bile.

Col. Polk's Tariff Letter.

In publishing Mr. Polk's letter on the subject of the Tariff, several were accidentally omitted which denoted the force, and meaning of Polk's candid and clear exposition of his views. We publish the paragraph entire as corrected:—

"I am in favor of a tariff for revenue such a one as will yield a sufficient amount to the Treasury to defray expenses of the Government economically administered. In adjusting details of a revenue tariff, I heretofore sanctioned such moderate discriminating duties, as would produce the amount of revenue needed, at the same time afford reasonable dental protection to our home industry. I am opposed to a tariff for protection merely, and not for revenue."

After we had made the above correction the Argus came to hand with a choice bit of abuse for this misanthropic types "little better than forged." Mr. Powell is a printer, and therefore understands the liability of a compositor to omit members of sentences between words repeated. If like common calumniator, we had so character that our types repeated