



THE DEMOCRAT

MONTROSE.

Thursday, July 1, 1847.

Democratic Nominations.

FOR GOVERNOR.

FRANCIS R. SHUNK,
of ALLEGHENY COUNTY.
FOR CANAL COMMISSIONER,
MORRIS LONGSTRETH,
of MONTGOMERY COUNTY.

The President's Reception.

President Polk, accompanied by Hon. Nathan Clifford, Atty General; Hon. Edmund Burke, Commissioner of the Patent Office; and others, left Washington on Tuesday week for a tour through the Northern States. He arrived at Baltimore the same day, and Philadelphia the day following, in both cities being greeted with a welcome worthy of the Nation's Head, and of their renowned hospitality. Particular lines were discovered, private differences forgotten, and each vied with the other in rendering unto the Chief Magistrate of the Union those compliments and civilities, which his high and dignified position entitled him to. On Friday they proceeded to New York, where extensive preparations were made, and a reception given eminently creditable to the Empire City. It was estimated that two hundred thousand persons were present at their ingress.

The Tarrying Time.

Our neighbor of the Federal organ here, like his illustrious prototype, the world-worner, Miller, has at last discovered that there is a "tarrying time" of short duration, which is just preceding his much hoped-for and anxiously expected millennium of "ruin." We call it "the tarrying time," because the circumstances warrant the cognomen. Did not "Father Miller" predict "ruin" to all those terrible things? So did our sapient contemporary prophecy the most fearful "ruin" to all of the interests and enterprises of our great, and despite of his wisdom and labors, to the contrary, now highly prosperous country. Did the former, after waiting for the fulfilment of his wild and extravagant predictions until the time appointed by him had passed by, and his humbug been exploded, discover all of a sudden that he had made a mistake in regard to the precise time of the dire calamity, and that there was appointed a "tarrying time" as a precursor of the eventful hour, in which we had just entered? So also has the latter, under precisely the same circumstances, discovered that his "favorite hour" of ruin to the country, was put a little further off than he had calculated, that it was to be preceded by a "tarrying time," and that, shortly the much wished-for period of his millennium would be rolled around.

Last week, to cap the climax of all hardness and brazen falsification, owing, no doubt, to the fact that he had been effectually headed in his unblushing attempts to deny having uttered the cry of ruin, he suddenly "tacked up" and singular as it may appear to those not acquainted with his nine-sided course, when in cramped spots, he even denied having denied making such predictions! Startle not, reader, for it is even so, as true as there is a sun in the firmament. And further: he not only denies this, but he even goes "so far as to try to fan the expiring lamp of hope in such a calamity. Indeed he seems quite angry with some one because the time has, as he pretends, been postponed, and with a bravado spirit equalled only by his hardihood, challenged us to prove that this [referring to his predicted "ruin"] to some extent, will not prove true." To some extent! Ah! Then he has given up all hope of being fulfilled "to the very letter," or to any great extent, but to "some extent." Verily, this is a step towards a back-ing out, and an acknowledgement of having been the organ of imposition and deception, or we are no judges. Cannot "show that it will not prove true?" eh? What a valorous opponent! Utter a prophecy, and then "swaggeringly" exult that an adversary cannot prove it false! What courage! What a victory! We shall not try to prove it false—TIME will do that fast enough, besides we have other duties to perform meanwhile. There are several other points of small moment, which we will notice in conclusion. One of them is the assertion of our neighbor that "many manufacturing establishments were compelled to stop" (which we have noticed in another place,) and that "many others projected to be started were abandoned." If this assertion is made merely to make up for the absence of truth, and to bolster his arrant humbugs, this fact alone is a sufficient refutation; but if under the impression, and to produce the impression that they are true, its force would be mightily enhanced by giving the names, dates and places where. How a man of common sense, who has read the papers for the last six months, at all, could make assertions so utterly false, and so often exploded, is a poser. Nothing but an extreme case could have driven any man to such a sort.

Again our neighbor scours the idea that better is worth more in this country than it was previously, and attributes it, if it is so, to the Erie Railroad. Yea, a railroad or "the potato rot" or some other "rot" is always at fault when the country is prosperous under a Democratic administration, but if under Whigs' rule the country is prosperous, it is always attributed to the prevalence of "Whig" prin-

iples. If our neighbor will awake from his trance, however, and inquire of the farmers about the County, he will find that many of them are selling their butter *at their doors* for 15cts. per pound—not for the Erie Railroad to swallow down, but—for the New York city market! Moreover, "Whigs"—patrons of his paper—will tell him—at least they have told us—that they this year sold the same quality of wool for three cents a pound more than they got last. "So much for the two columns of swagger" as our neighbor has it, trying to prove to a prosperous people that they are ruined. "One of two things is evidently true, either that our contemporary is oblivious, or else that he aims to deceive and gull his readers by the most arrant humbugs and untruths."

A "Funny" Crawl Off.

The Register-man, "funny" soul, with his usual tact and unscrupulous fondness of humbug to get himself out of a bad fix, stated last week, that the new Tariff had already commenced its foretold work of ruin, and that "many manufacturing establishments were compelled to stop," &c. Will our voracious neighbor name a few of the "many" of those "establishments"? We should like to know their whereabouts, for we confess the account is new to us, and without looks a little suspicious. Will he condescend to enlighten the public upon this point?

Now we remember having seen the statement going the rounds of the Federal press, immediately after the passage of the new law, and pending the last fall's election, that the Vulcan Iron Works, at Troy, N. Y., and we believe one other establishment near Easton [are these our neighbor's "many"]? "had stopped work," as our contemporary alleges; but we happened also to know that it was not the new Tariff exactly, which had not yet gone into operation, but debt which had accumulated under the "glorious Tariff of '42" and the Sheriff, that thus effected the one, and if we remember correctly, the other also. These are the monuments of the impending ruin with whose ghost our Federal contemporary entered and "swaggeringly" conducted the campaign! These "stoppages" at that time were doubtless concerted and advised by the Federal leaders and wire-workers, for political effect. But that as it may, both establishments soon changed hands and are now doing an immense business—the "swaggering," lying bombast of our "funny" neighbor to the contrary notwithstanding. And to give our readers an inkling of the "ruin," which our neighbor once so "swaggeringly" predicted and still hopes for, we annex the following from a New York paper of late date. It will serve both as an item of news, and as a complete extinguisher of our "funny" neighbor's recklessness:

"The Troy Rolling Co. (formerly the Vulcan Co.) have more than doubled the dimensions of their building; and we learn it is their intention to commence operations in a few days as soon as sufficient working stock can be procured. A little further down, but within the limits of the city, other works of the same description, under the superintendence of the Troy and Albany Co., are being built and will be put in operation this season. This will enable them to more than double their business."

And yet these are the times of ruin! Are they not mad to expend so much capital in so "ruinous" an enterprise? Our neighbor certainly ought to send them a file of his paper pending the last election, accompanied by a few copies of his last week's edition. Will he do it?

In conclusion we repeat our challenge for our "ruin"-loving contemporary to name some of the "many" cases of "stoppages" that have come under his observation.

Garbling.

The organ of grannie Irvin, up-street, last week paraded with "great gusto", a garbled extract from the Pottsville *Democratic Press*, in relation to the late visit of Irvin to that place, (doubtless to "come Paddy over" the Irish laborers there) in which the General is spoken of as "plain and unostentatious in his personal appearance." The extract is *verbiage* so far as it goes; but the truth is, our neighbor chose to go no further, because when the *Press* came to speak of his qualifications and prospects, for Governor, it gave him a most tremendous shock, such as our neighbor would hardly relish. We saw the article in the *Press*, and marked it for copy, putting it into our drawer, as usual, but when we came to look for it to lay it before the compositor, lo! it was gone, and we could get no clue to the way and manner of its going until we saw the garbled portion of it in the *Register*!

If the veracious editor of the Federal organ, will affix names and dates to the lie he told in his last issue in relation to the member of the "Shunk party," who is charged with visiting this place on an *electoral tour* for Irvin (?) he may gull a few green ones in style, and elevated in its tone. How very different from the plain, unassuming letters of Capt. Wm. H. Wadsworth for the erection of a meeting house—Anything that you can do for me will be considered as a particular favor by Your friend JAMES IRVIN.

There is a beautiful specimen of "vigorous intellect," of scholarship, and Federal intelligence truly! The most ordinary school-boy in Pennsylvania, could indite a better letter; one more correct, in language, classical in style, and elevated in its tone. How very different from the plain, unassuming letters of Capt. Wm. H. Wadsworth for the erection of a meeting house—Anything that you can do for me will be considered as a particular favor by Your friend JAMES IRVIN.

Utter a prophecy, and then "swaggeringly" exult that an adversary cannot prove it false! What courage! What a victory!

We shall not try to prove it false—TIME will do that fast enough, besides we have other duties to perform meanwhile. There are several other points of small moment, which we will notice in conclusion. One of them is the assertion of our neighbor that "many manufacturing establishments were compelled to stop" (which we have noticed in another place,) and that "many others projected to be started were abandoned." If this assertion is made merely to make up for the absence of truth, and to bolster his arrant humbugs, this fact alone is a sufficient refutation; but if under the impression, and to produce the impression that they are true, its force would be mightily enhanced by giving the names, dates and places where.

How a man of common sense, who has read the papers for the last six months, at all, could make assertions so utterly false, and so often exploded, is a poser. Nothing but an extreme case could have driven any man to such a sort.

A LARGE STRAWBERRY.—We were shown, a day or two since, a strawberry, raised in the garden of Judge J. S. Scott, in this village, which measured three and a quarter inches in circumference. The original plant, which was obtained by the Judge last August, was from the garden of Mr. Hoovey, of Massachusetts, and being derived from the seed, is known as "Hoovey's Seedling."

The Washington Union states that the proclamations of Gen. Scott is entirely his own. The administration gave no instructions on the subject—made no suggestions, and knew nothing at Washington?" Nothing is more false,

A Few Plain Questions.

The organ grinder of the Federalists, up-street, labored through the greater portion of two brevier columns, last week, vainly attempting to shift the responsibility of withholding supplies and reinforcements from Gen. Taylor (for which he has abused and calumniated the President to the utmost of his capability) from his own party to the friends of Mr. Polk.—

This is a characteristic effort, and we suppose will be adhered to with his usual mulish pertinacity. Yet we cannot forbear asking a few plain questions upon the subject, hoping that they may renew his memory a little, and at the same time not be deemed too impudent.

1. Were they the friends, or the enemies of Mr. Polk, who, after having voted for a resolution, declaring that "war existed by the act of Mexico," consumed almost the entire session in declaiming against it as the President's order, thereby encouraging distrust and treason in our own country, and a deep settled and irrevocable hatred on the part of her, feeble, abasing abuse upon our own soldiers and offering aid and comfort" to their inhuman adversaries?

2. Was it a friend, or an enemy of Mr. Polk, who said on the floor of Congress, that "if your President asks of me men and money to prosecute this war, with God's assistance and my own faculties, he shall have neither?"

3. Were they the friends, or the enemies of Mr. Polk, who, after having voted for a resolution, declaring that "war existed by the act of Mexico," consumed almost the entire session in declaiming against it as the President's order, thereby encouraging distrust and treason in our own country, and a deep settled and irrevocable hatred on the part of her, feeble, abasing abuse upon our own soldiers and offering aid and comfort" to their inhuman adversaries?

4. Was it a friend, or an enemy of Mr. Polk, who, after having voted for a resolution, declaring that "war existed by the act of Mexico," consumed almost the entire session in declaiming against it as the President's order, thereby encouraging distrust and treason in our own country, and a deep settled and irrevocable hatred on the part of her, feeble, abasing abuse upon our own soldiers and offering aid and comfort" to their inhuman adversaries?

5. Was it a friend, or an enemy of Mr. Polk, who, after having voted for a resolution, declaring that "war existed by the act of Mexico," consumed almost the entire session in declaiming against it as the President's order, thereby encouraging distrust and treason in our own country, and a deep settled and irrevocable hatred on the part of her, feeble, abasing abuse upon our own soldiers and offering aid and comfort" to their inhuman adversaries?

6. Was it a friend, or an enemy of Mr. Polk, who, after having voted for a resolution, declaring that "war existed by the act of Mexico," consumed almost the entire session in declaiming against it as the President's order, thereby encouraging distrust and treason in our own country, and a deep settled and irrevocable hatred on the part of her, feeble, abasing abuse upon our own soldiers and offering aid and comfort" to their inhuman adversaries?

7. Was it a friend, or an enemy of Mr. Polk, who, after having voted for a resolution, declaring that "war existed by the act of Mexico," consumed almost the entire session in declaiming against it as the President's order, thereby encouraging distrust and treason in our own country, and a deep settled and irrevocable hatred on the part of her, feeble, abasing abuse upon our own soldiers and offering aid and comfort" to their inhuman adversaries?

8. Was it a friend, or an enemy of Mr. Polk, who, after having voted for a resolution, declaring that "war existed by the act of Mexico," consumed almost the entire session in declaiming against it as the President's order, thereby encouraging distrust and treason in our own country, and a deep settled and irrevocable hatred on the part of her, feeble, abasing abuse upon our own soldiers and offering aid and comfort" to their inhuman adversaries?

9. Was it a friend, or an enemy of Mr. Polk, who, after having voted for a resolution, declaring that "war existed by the act of Mexico," consumed almost the entire session in declaiming against it as the President's order, thereby encouraging distrust and treason in our own country, and a deep settled and irrevocable hatred on the part of her, feeble, abasing abuse upon our own soldiers and offering aid and comfort" to their inhuman adversaries?

10. Was it a friend, or an enemy of Mr. Polk, who, after having voted for a resolution, declaring that "war existed by the act of Mexico," consumed almost the entire session in declaiming against it as the President's order, thereby encouraging distrust and treason in our own country, and a deep settled and irrevocable hatred on the part of her, feeble, abasing abuse upon our own soldiers and offering aid and comfort" to their inhuman adversaries?

11. Was it a friend, or an enemy of Mr. Polk, who, after having voted for a resolution, declaring that "war existed by the act of Mexico," consumed almost the entire session in declaiming against it as the President's order, thereby encouraging distrust and treason in our own country, and a deep settled and irrevocable hatred on the part of her, feeble, abasing abuse upon our own soldiers and offering aid and comfort" to their inhuman adversaries?

12. Was it a friend, or an enemy of Mr. Polk, who, after having voted for a resolution, declaring that "war existed by the act of Mexico," consumed almost the entire session in declaiming against it as the President's order, thereby encouraging distrust and treason in our own country, and a deep settled and irrevocable hatred on the part of her, feeble, abasing abuse upon our own soldiers and offering aid and comfort" to their inhuman adversaries?

13. Was it a friend, or an enemy of Mr. Polk, who, after having voted for a resolution, declaring that "war existed by the act of Mexico," consumed almost the entire session in declaiming against it as the President's order, thereby encouraging distrust and treason in our own country, and a deep settled and irrevocable hatred on the part of her, feeble, abasing abuse upon our own soldiers and offering aid and comfort" to their inhuman adversaries?

14. Was it a friend, or an enemy of Mr. Polk, who, after having voted for a resolution, declaring that "war existed by the act of Mexico," consumed almost the entire session in declaiming against it as the President's order, thereby encouraging distrust and treason in our own country, and a deep settled and irrevocable hatred on the part of her, feeble, abasing abuse upon our own soldiers and offering aid and comfort" to their inhuman adversaries?

15. Was it a friend, or an enemy of Mr. Polk, who, after having voted for a resolution, declaring that "war existed by the act of Mexico," consumed almost the entire session in declaiming against it as the President's order, thereby encouraging distrust and treason in our own country, and a deep settled and irrevocable hatred on the part of her, feeble, abasing abuse upon our own soldiers and offering aid and comfort" to their inhuman adversaries?

16. Was it a friend, or an enemy of Mr. Polk, who, after having voted for a resolution, declaring that "war existed by the act of Mexico," consumed almost the entire session in declaiming against it as the President's order, thereby encouraging distrust and treason in our own country, and a deep settled and irrevocable hatred on the part of her, feeble, abasing abuse upon our own soldiers and offering aid and comfort" to their inhuman adversaries?

17. Was it a friend, or an enemy of Mr. Polk, who, after having voted for a resolution, declaring that "war existed by the act of Mexico," consumed almost the entire session in declaiming against it as the President's order, thereby encouraging distrust and treason in our own country, and a deep settled and irrevocable hatred on the part of her, feeble, abasing abuse upon our own soldiers and offering aid and comfort" to their inhuman adversaries?

18. Was it a friend, or an enemy of Mr. Polk, who, after having voted for a resolution, declaring that "war existed by the act of Mexico," consumed almost the entire session in declaiming against it as the President's order, thereby encouraging distrust and treason in our own country, and a deep settled and irrevocable hatred on the part of her, feeble, abasing abuse upon our own soldiers and offering aid and comfort" to their inhuman adversaries?

19. Was it a friend, or an enemy of Mr. Polk, who, after having voted for a resolution, declaring that "war existed by the act of Mexico," consumed almost the entire session in declaiming against it as the President's order, thereby encouraging distrust and treason in our own country, and a deep settled and irrevocable hatred on the part of her, feeble, abasing abuse upon our own soldiers and offering aid and comfort" to their inhuman adversaries?

20. Was it a friend, or an enemy of Mr. Polk, who, after having voted for a resolution, declaring that "war existed by the act of Mexico," consumed almost the entire session in declaiming against it as the President's order, thereby encouraging distrust and treason in our own country, and a deep settled and irrevocable hatred on the part of her, feeble, abasing abuse upon our own soldiers and offering aid and comfort" to their inhuman adversaries?

21. Was it a friend, or an enemy of Mr. Polk, who, after having voted for a resolution, declaring that "war existed by the act of Mexico," consumed almost the entire session in declaiming against it as the President's order, thereby encouraging distrust and treason in our own country, and a deep settled and irrevocable hatred on the part of her, feeble, abasing abuse upon our own soldiers and offering aid and comfort" to their inhuman adversaries?

22. Was it a friend, or an enemy of Mr. Polk, who, after having voted for a resolution, declaring that "war existed by the act of Mexico," consumed almost the entire session in declaiming against it as the President's order, thereby encouraging distrust and treason in our own country, and a deep settled and irrevocable hatred on the part of her, feeble, abasing abuse upon our own soldiers and offering aid and comfort" to their inhuman adversaries?

23. Was it a friend, or an enemy of Mr. Polk, who, after having voted for a resolution, declaring that "war existed by the act of Mexico," consumed almost the entire session in declaiming against it as the President's order, thereby encouraging distrust and treason in our own country, and a deep settled and irrevocable hatred on the part of her, feeble, abasing abuse upon our own soldiers and offering aid and comfort" to their inhuman adversaries?

24. Was it a friend, or an enemy of Mr. Polk, who, after having voted for a resolution, declaring that "war existed by the act of Mexico," consumed almost the entire session in declaiming against it as the President's order, thereby encouraging distrust and treason in our own country, and a deep settled and irrevocable hatred on the part of her, feeble, abasing abuse upon our own soldiers and offering aid and comfort" to their inhuman adversaries?

25. Was it a friend, or an enemy of Mr. Polk, who, after having voted for a resolution, declaring that "war existed by the act of Mexico," consumed almost the entire session in declaiming against it as the President's order, thereby encouraging distrust and treason in our own country, and a deep settled and irrevocable hatred on the part of her, feeble, abasing abuse upon our own soldiers and offering aid and comfort" to their inhuman adversaries?

26. Was it a friend, or an enemy of Mr. Polk, who, after having voted for a resolution, declaring that "war existed by the act of Mexico," consumed almost the entire session in declaiming against it as the President's order, thereby encouraging distrust and treason in our own country, and a deep settled and irrevocable hatred on the part of her, feeble, abasing abuse upon our own soldiers and offering aid and comfort" to their inhuman adversaries?

27. Was it a friend, or an enemy of Mr. Polk, who, after having voted for a resolution, declaring that "war existed by the act of Mexico," consumed almost the entire session in declaiming against it as the President's order, thereby encouraging distrust and treason in our own country, and a deep settled and irrevocable hatred on the part of her, feeble, abasing abuse upon our own soldiers and offering aid and comfort" to their inhuman adversaries?

28. Was it a friend, or an enemy of Mr. Polk, who, after having voted for a resolution, declaring that "war existed by the act of Mexico," consumed almost the entire session in declaiming against it as the President's order, thereby encouraging distrust and treason in our own country, and a deep settled and irrevocable hatred on the part of her, feeble, abasing abuse upon our own soldiers and offering aid and comfort" to their inhuman adversaries?

29. Was it a friend, or an enemy of Mr. Polk, who, after having voted for a resolution, declaring that "war existed by the act