

# Jeffersonian Republican.

THE WHOLE ART OF GOVERNMENT CONSISTS IN THE ART OF BEING HONEST.—JEFFERSON.

VOL. 5.

STROUDSBURG, MONROE COUNTY, PA., THURSDAY, AUGUST 22, 1844.

No. 17.

## PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY SCHOCH & SPERING.

TERMS—Two dollars per annum in advance—Two dollars a quarter, half yearly—and if not paid before the end of the year, Two dollars and a half. Those who receive their papers by a carrier or stage drivers employed by the proprietors, will be charged 37 1/2 cts. per year, extra. No papers discontinued until all arrearages are paid, except at the option of the Editors. Advertisements not exceeding one square (sixteen lines) for every subsequent insertion: larger ones in proportion. A special discount will be made to yearly advertisers. All letters addressed to the Editors must be post paid.

## JOB PRINTING.

Having a general assortment of large elegant plain and ornamental type, we are prepared to execute every description of

## FANCY PRINTING.

Cards, Circulars, Bill Heads, Notes, Blank Receipts, JUSTICES, LEGAL AND OTHER

## BLANKS,

## PAMPHLETS, &c.

Printed with neatness and despatch, on reasonable terms AT THE OFFICE OF THE

## Jeffersonian Republican.

## The Tariff of 1842.

### OPINIONS OF THE CANDIDATES.

**HENRY CLAY.** Without intending to express any opinion upon every item of the Tariff, I would say that I think the provisions, in the main wise and proper—Sept. 13, 1843. Letter to a Committee of Georgia Whigs.

**JAMES K. POLK.** I am opposed to the Tariff Act of the late Congress. I am in favor of repealing that act, and restoring the Compromise Tariff of March 2, 1832.—May 15, 1843. Reply to citizens of Tennessee.

## Let it be Remembered,

That James K. Polk is opposed to the excellent Tariff Act of 1842, and to all Protection of American Industry. Also, that George M. Dallas, introduced a Bill into the Senate of the United States to re-charter the U. S. Bank, and voted to pass it by two-thirds, after Gen. Jackson had vetoed it.

## The 'Coon Song.

TUNE—"Dandy Jim of Caroline."

A race, a race! And who will win?  
Who will be out? who will be in?  
Trot out your nags! we'll see who'll take  
From all the Presidential stake.

The people say, they'll go for Clay,  
The true heart's hope, the country's stay,  
So raise the shout, and clear the way,  
For work and worth and Harry Clay!

First Tyler came the boon to crave,  
A laugh and hiss met the traitor knave,  
He lower'd his nose and sneak'd away;  
For he dared not face old Harry Clay.

Next sneaking in, Grimalkin Van,  
Purr'd low, and said "I will if I can,"  
But we whipp'd him once—Lord, how he ran!  
Hang up your fiddle—you're not the man.

Then came Calhoun, now right, now wrong;  
Though six feet two, he's nothing long,  
But short or tall he'll be no higher,  
We've nullified the nullifier!

Buchanan came. A shilling a day!  
Work Locos! How d'ye like your pay!  
Old Conestoga's stalled, they say,  
He's sticking in Kentucky Clay.

Now hobbled in old Madam Cass;  
She's not what she was, alas! alas!  
She might be a pet of the frog-eater's king,  
Where the people rule she's not the thing.

Next came from clouds of froth and smoke,  
The lion's jackall—little Polk;  
His nomination is a joke—  
For who would wear a weed like pole.

Then Clay, with a lion port strides by,  
And shouts of thunder cleave the sky;  
The pure, the bright, the tried and true,  
The laurel wreath belongs to you.

An exchange paper gives the following ef-  
fusion of some inspired poet:  
I kissed the tiny hand I held,  
I pressed that fatty form,  
I would I'd shield her from the blast,  
And from the world's cold storm.

She raised her melting eyes to mine,  
They were filled with drops of wo,  
With quivering lips she faintly said,  
Now, darn ye, let me go!

## Chemistry and Cookery.

There has been a curious application of chemistry to cookery in France. M. Mulot has succeeded in obtaining, by distillation, in a pure colorless and liquid form, all the properties of the various culinary vegetables. Thus he can put you up a bottle of carrots, parsnips, turnips or onions, and you may carry it all over the world, certain of having with you the true flavor of the vegetable. A table spoonful is enough for one pound of meat. The secret lies in the mode of distilling, by which the offensive part of the vegetable is left. It is already an object with commercial men to export these essences, which are termed aromatique, to the French colonies, and with the Government there is an intention of using them extensively in the navy.

## Courting an Old Maid.

A fashionable young beau made his addresses to a woman, who was well stricken in years, and had been remarkably homely in her youth, but was possessed of the attractions of a large landed property; and as a counterfeiter part is commonly overdone, as well in courtship as in politics, the young spark was exceedingly profuse in his professions of attachment. In the mean time, the old lady was prudently suspicious. At length, while they were walking together, arm within arm, over her lands, and after he had been renewing his ardent passion, she very seriously addressed him as follows: "My glass told me when I was young, that my person was very plain and forbidding; and old age has added wrinkles to my natural deformity; therefore, though I wish to believe you, I can hardly think it possible that such a handsome, accomplished young man as you are should fall in love with an old woman." "Oh! it is possible, it is possible, it is real, replied the gallant—such is my affection for you, that I love the very ground you walk upon." "Indeed!" returned the old woman in warmth, "I suspected it before; I thought that my ground and not my person was the object of your affection, and I am now determined that you shall possess neither the one nor the other."

SEVENTY TWO BUSHELS FROM AN ACRE!—The Fishkill (N. Y.) Standard states that the Messrs. Warring, of Orange county, have raised on the farm of Mr. Peter Van Vliet, near Newburg, seventy-two bushels of oats from an acre of land.

## A short Story, with a Moral.

A young Yankee had formed an attachment for a daughter of a rich old farmer, and after agreeing with his "bonnie lassie," went to the old fellow to ask consent, and during the ceremony, which was an awkward one for Jonathan, he whittled away at a stick. The old man watched the movements of the knife, at the same time continued to talk upon the prospects of his future son-in-law as he supposed, until the stick was dwindled down to nought. He then spoke as follows:—"You have fine property, you have steady habits, good enough looking, but you can't have my daughter! Had you made something, no matter what of the stick you have whittled away, you could have had her; as it is you cannot. Your property will go as the stick did, little by little, until all is gone, and your family reduced to want. I have read your true character, you have my answer." Jonathan conveyed the unhappy news to his fair one, who, after hearing the story burst out "a crying," saying, "Why, you tarnation fool you, why didn't you say you made a litter on, if nothing more! Git out! I'll marry the first feller that points his eye at me—I will so-boo-o-o-o."

## "Another Convert to Locofocoism."

No less a person than Gov. Letcher of Kentucky, has denounced the base calumny in a letter to an Albany paper, in which he declares that Mr. Clay's "election is essential to the best interests of the people, and absolutely necessary to the safety of the Union," that "he has exactly the right head and heart to place his country in its true position, and to protect all its great interests." Hear him as he addresses:—"Why sir, in the darkest hour of Mr. Clay's political fortunes, I had the honor, though quite humble, to be one of his fast friends. I saw, and I knew perfectly well, how cruelly, how villainously and unjustly he was calumniated by the whole combined pack of heartless revilers, who were bent on his destruction if possible. I did not then desert him or his cause; and now in the day of his prosperity, when the people are waiting anxiously for the proper moment, (the fall election,) to award their distinguished benefactor the most glorious triumph ever decreed to mortal man, and at the same time to pronounce a just judgment of condemnation upon his accusers, I shall hardly, on the eve of such a victory, be found going over to the enemy. Respectfully, your ob't serv't,  
R. P. LETCHER.

"Each pleasure has its pang," as the bee said when he shoved his sting into the smellers of the floral admirer.

For some time past we have had it in view to present to our readers the history of the passage of the present Tariff law, to show how unfounded the pretensions of Locofocos are, in claiming any merit for its passage. We find the subjoined article, prepared already to our hand, and give it in preference to anything we can say upon the subject:

From the N. Y. Tribune

## What part had Locofocoism in passing the Present Tariff?

The Whig Congress elected in 1840—41 passed at its Extra Session in the summer of 1841 only a temporary Revenue Tariff bill, imposing duties of 20 per cent. or under on certain articles before free of duty. The subject of a general revision and resuscitation of the Tariff was remitted to the approaching regular Session, as too important and intricate to be adjusted at the Extra Session, when so many other important topics demanded speedy legislation. Besides, the last great reductions of duties under the Compromise Act had not yet taken effect, and the necessity for re-adjusting the Tariff was less imminent than it became in 1842.

On the first Monday in December, 1841, Congress re-assembled for its regular session. The committees were appointed a few days thereafter. On the 16th, the unfinished business coming up, being the reference of the President's Message, Mr. Fillmore, of N. Y., (on whom the initiative devolved as Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means) moved that so much of the Message as related to discriminating duties be referred to the Committee on Manufactures. [This is the committee created expressly to take cognizance of this very subject, to take testimony in relation to all the various articles and interests affected by a Tariff, which the Committee of Ways and Means, having an immensity of work to do with reference to Appropriation bills, state of the Treasury, &c., has no time for.]

Mr. Atherton, of N. H. (now U. S. Senator from that State,) rose in opposition, and moved to amend by substituting the Committee of Ways and Means. He said the adoption of Mr. Fillmore's resolution would be countenancing the principle of Protection to the fullest extent.

Mr. Wise [who had deserted the Whigs early in the Extra Session] said he should have moved the amendment if Mr. Atherton had not. This reference had always been a test question—the advocates of Protection voting to refer to the Committee on Manufactures—the friends of Free Trade for the Committee of Ways and Means.

Messrs. Tillinghast of R. I., Randolph of N. J., etc., spoke on the side of Mr. Fillmore and Protection, and so the debate proceeded for nearly three weeks, when Mr. John C. Clark, of N. Y., seeing that the Free Traders were ready to talk away the whole session if allowed, called the previous question. It was sustained by the House, and the main question ordered, being on the adoption of Mr. Atherton's amendment. The House divided as follows:

YEAS (Against Protection) 95; SEVENTY-ONE LOCO-FOCOS, TWENTY-FOUR SOUTHERN WHIGS.

NAYS (For Protection) 104; NINETY WHIGS, FOURTEEN LOCOS.

Of the fourteen Locofocos who voted for Protection, 11 were from Pennsylvania, and 1 each from Massachusetts, New York, and Maryland. Mr. Parmenter, of Mass., is a heavy manufacturer; Mr. Williams, of Md., represents a great manufacturing district. The only Locofoco from this State who voted for Protection was a Mr. Partridge, of the Tioga district. Sixteen Locofocos of this State recorded their votes deliberately against the principle of Protection. The debate had taken a wide range, but had all along proceeded on the assumption that to vote for Mr. Fillmore's proposition was to support Protection, to vote for Mr. Atherton's was to oppose it. There was no question of details, of too much or too little Protection to one branch of industry or to another. And thus all the Locofocos, except those of Pennsylvania and three scattering, recorded their votes against Protection—while several Southern Whigs, including W. Cost Johnson, of Md., Stuart and Summers of Va., &c., voted for the Atherton amendment though themselves Protectionists, because they believed a contrary vote would be misrepresented to their constituents, and knew the Ways and Means was an equally reliable Committee with that of Manufactures.

Mr. Fillmore's motion now prevailed without further struggle, and the whole subject referred to the Committee on Manufactures, by whom, after some months spent in hearing and digesting testimony, the bill, which is the basis of the present Tariff, was framed and reported. Mr. Forward, the able and faithful Secretary of the Treasury, also submitted a good bill, equally Protective with the former, and in some respects more so. Both these bills were now referred to the Committee of Ways and Means, which reported the bill as it passed, with slight amendments, after a long and thorough discussion, on the 16th of July, by the following vote:

YEAS—116, all Whigs but Parmenter, of Mass.

NAYS—112, Ninety-seven Locos, Thirteen Whigs, and two Virginia Tyler men.

So the bill passed the House, having but one Locofoco vote, and no need of that.

The bill now went to the Senate, and after a thorough discussion, passed that body by the following vote:

YEAS—Twenty-five—all Whigs.

NAYS—Twenty-three—Twenty Locos (all they had) three Southern Whigs.

So the Whig Tariff bill passed both Houses with only one Locofoco vote, and that not wanted. So much for the assertion that the Whigs had not strength to pass a Protective Tariff bill without Locofoco aid!

—This bill John Tyler vetoed, as no President before him had ever vetoed a Tariff bill. His pretext was objection to the clause by which the Land Distribution was continued in force, by repealing that section of the act which provided that it should cease "whenever duties should be raised above 20 per cent. And now the question was presented to the Whigs—"Shall we clip and pare our measures to suit the afflictive dispensation in the Presidential Chair? or shall we go home and leave him without revenue until he is willing to sign such a Tariff as the People's Representatives think proper?" To pursue the latter course was the natural impulse of a large if not the larger part of the members, including those most ardent in favor of Protection.

A temporary revenue bill was got up, but it went very hard. At length on the 23d of August, Mr. McKennan, of Penna., moved to strike out this bill and substitute the old vetoed Tariff bill, with the exception of two clauses, one of which continued in force the land distribution and the other imposed a revenue duty of 20 per cent. on tea and coffee. This motion prevailed in Committee of the House—99 to 67—and the transformed bill was reported to the House.

Now commenced the struggle in earnest.—The previous question was moved and seconded. Mr. McKennan's amendment in Committee was adopted by the House—Yeas 102, Nays 99. The question next arising on the engrossment of the bill, the vote stood Yeas 101, Nays 101. The Speaker, (White) voted in the negative, and the bill was lost. But Mr. Thompson, of Ia., moved a re-consideration, which prevailed, 106 to 98; and now the vote on passing the bill stood, Yeas 103, Nays 102. It was now insisted by the opponents of the bill that the Speaker should vote. After consulting the rules, he concluded that it was his duty to do so, and voted again in the negative, making a tie. Messrs. Stanley of N. C. and Andrews of Ky., now voted in the affirmative, and the bill was carried by the following vote:

YEAS—105: Whigs 85, Locofocos 20, viz: 10 from New York, 9 from Pennsylvania, 1 from Massachusetts—not one from any other State.

NAYS—103: Thirty-five Whigs, Sixty-five Locos, three Tyler men.

Among the Nays were Messrs. Clinton, Doug. Egbert, John G. Floyd, McKeon, Roosevelt and Wood of this State.

—The bill now went to the Senate, and on the 27th passed that body, as follows:

YEAS—24: Twenty Whigs and Four Locofocos—viz. Messrs. Buchanan and Sturgeon of Pennsylvania, Williams, of Maine, and Wright of N. Y.

NAYS—23: Fourteen Locos, Eight Whigs, and Mr. Rives.

Thus it will be seen that the Tariff bill was not so strong in either House after it had been so shaped as to receive some Locofoco support as it had been before, when opposed by their whole party. We had 115 Whigs in the House and 25 in the Senate, (though Tennessee was without Senators) in favor of the original bill; we got but 105 in the House and 24 in the Senate after we had been compelled to cobble it to suit our adversaries and John Tyler. Our majority, too, was reduced one-half in each House.

There can be nothing meaner, nothing essentially more false, than the Locofoco assertion that such Whigs as Mangum, Clayton, J. Q. Adams, A. L. Foster, A. L. Linn, Speaker White, and the Kentuckians generally, voted against the Tariff. There are no more thorough Protective Tariff men than these. They voted, not against the Tariff, but against the surrender of the Land Distribution, and the prostration of the proper independence of Congress at the footstool of Executive usurpation. It was because they believed the Land Distribution essential to the stability of the Tariff policy that they refused to surrender it to the caprice of John Tyler.

On the other hand, most of the Locofocos who voted for the bill declared, with Silas Wright, that they did so on compulsion—that the Government must have revenue, protesting against its protective features. Some of them published cards in the newspapers denouncing and defaming it.

These are facts of the plainest notoriety. No body will attempt to contradict them. Judge, then reader! if they do not mean to deceive who claim for the Locofocos any share of the credit of passing the present Tariff!

## Mr. Clay's Private Character.

It is in the last degree humiliating to be constrained to believe that there can exist anywhere, in a country that has been for near half a century so adorned and blessed with his services, a necessity for recognizing the vicissitudes on such a man as Henry Clay, which so continually defile the columns of a degenerate press. But there are those, it would seem, who reflect so little as not to feel that such base abuse of one who has been so trusted, honored and adored by a long succession of the first and best men in the Republic, who has become so illustrious by his unequalled services in the most conspicuous stations in the world, for near 40 years the observed of all observers—must be the mere slaver of personal or party malice.

To satisfy some such 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. Goble was constrained by the advice of a number of political friends to ask permission that it might be given to the public.

NEWARK, July 9th, 1844.

REV. DR. BASCOM,  
President of the 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 any thing but an honest and upright citizen—a Sabbath breaker—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. 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 ob't serv't,  
DR. J. G. GOBLE. H. B. BASCOM.

Dr. Goble subsequently wrote again to Mr. Bascom, asking permission to publish this reply, which permission was freely given to the following note:

TRANSLYVANIA UNIVERSITY,  
Lexington, Ky., August 7th, 1844.

My Dear Sir:—In your letter of the 9th July you called upon me for information respecting the "private character" of my neighbor, Mr. Clay, assuring me, that "many conscientious, upright men" in your section had been induced by the representations of his enemies, to regard Mr. Clay as "any other but an honest and upright citizen—a Sabbath breaker—profane—gambler," &c. Your letter added, at the same time, that "no public use" would be made of my reply, should one be received from me.

This appealed to, I expressed to you freely, in relation to the private character of Mr. Clay, what I regarded as due to him, to myself, and the community in which we live. I need scarcely add, that called upon, under similar circumstances, I should most cheerfully attest the good character of any of my neighbors, without reference to political relations or distinctions, nor do I believe any of them would hesitate calling on me, to this effect, should it be found necessary.

In a second letter, just received from you, you ask permission to use my first at discretion, and as no injustice can be done to any one by allowing you to do so, altho' my letter was written as private, I know of no good reason why I should withhold the permission you ask, and I therefore accord it. Very respectfully,  
Dr. J. G. Goble. H. B. BASCOM.