

INDIANA STATE SENTINEL.

PUBLISHED BY J. P. CHAPMAN.

THE PRICE OF FREEDOM IS ETERNAL VIGILANCE.

G. A. & J. P. CHAPMAN, EDITORS.

Volume II....Number 24.

INDIANAPOLIS, TUESDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1842.

\$2 a Year, in advance.

THE STATE SENTINEL.

Is published every Tuesday—Office on Washington Street,
Southeast of the State House.

The State Sentinel will contain about twice as much reading matter, on all subjects of general interest, as any other paper in the State.

It comes out every day, always in advance, in no time less than more than one month to meet the money received.

Subscribers will receive due notice a few weeks before the expiration of each year or term, and if the payment for a succeeding year or term be not advanced, the paper will be discontinued. This rule will be adhered to in all cases.

One dollar will be charged for six months, and fifty cents for three months for advances.

Five dollars will be received for three years; or, three years will be sent one year for the same.

ADVERTISEMENTS will be inserted three times at one dollar a square, (250 lines) and be continued at the rate of 25 cents a square, or quarterly advertisements inserted at \$3 a square of 250 lines.

Quarterly advertisers will be accommodated on reasonable terms, which should always be made in writing agreed upon.

All advertisements from abroad must be accompanied by the cash, or no attention will be paid to them.

No postage must be paid.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1842.

The Whigs and the Tariff.

In accordance with a plan previously concerted by the Clay caucuses at the City of Washington, the whig members of the General Assembly of this State held sundry meetings last winter, for the purpose of devising ways and means of lambaging and decrying the Hoosiers in relation to a high "Protective Tariff." In order to do this successfully, they determined first and foremost, to turn out the then editor of the whig organ at Indianapolis, who possessed some little honesty and conscientiousness, and to fill his place with an unprincipled henchman whom they knew had not a spark of those impracticable qualities so detrimental to the true spirit of Clay whiggery. The result of the labors of these notables parson than far has proved, that if his patrons were mistaken as to his abilities in all other particulars, they formed a correct estimate of his willingness to become a complete tool in their hands, and of his capacity to fabricate and propagate the most unblushing falsehoods in relation not only to the great subject of foreign which they had then in view, but to all others. It is due to him to say, that if he has failed in the task he was fitted to perform, it is because his falsehoods have not been sufficiently plausible, and not because they have not been *plausibly* enough—"For their name is legion." Many of those falsehoods were exposed and refuted by us, as soon as they were uttered by their author, and in not a solitary instance out of the very many, has he dared to make even an attempt to deprive or overturn any of the arguments or facts which we have adduced against him. He has learned by long experience that it was much easier for him to tell new lies than it would be to defend his old ones; and not only easier and *cheaper*, a consideration not to be overlooked by a small dealer with a small capital, and a large stock in nothing but unbound brass-molded and hardened rascality.

But it is not our present object to speak of the lies of the Clay Hatching particularly; we have higher goals in view. We propose to show by authentic quotations from Whig oracles that there is no unity of sentiment among them upon the subject of the tariff, and consequently that the sole object of their late outcry has been *harming, hounding, hounding,*

hounding, and hardened rascality. Let us begin with the reputed Father of the "American System," Mr. Clay, and see if we can ascertain his real opinions upon the tariff *at present*. Every body knows that before 1832, Mr. Clay was the champion of a High Protective Tariff *per se*, and that he adhered to that principle until those most oppressed manifested an unequivocal determination no longer to submit to its injustice. He at last made a virtue of necessity, and drove his bargain called the "Compromise Act," by which he deserted his old High Tariff friends and hoped to secure to his interests all the moderate men of both sides of the question. Of this famous act, Mr. Wiggs, in a letter to his constituents, recently published, says:

"I am informed and authorized, by one who saw the manuscript draft of the compromise act of 1833 before it was offered, to state, that when Mr. Clay drew the act of 1833 and showed it to his friends in his own hand writing, after the clause which provides that only such duties shall fall as are necessary for an economical administration of the Government, after the 3rd of June, 1842, the following words, or other words' precisely equivalent, were added, to wit: 'And such duties shall be laid without reference to the protection of ANY DOMESTIC ARTICLES WHATSOEVER.'

We have here evidence that Mr. Clay was ready to sacrifice his to his unshaken ambition, not only his old High Tariff Federal friends and supporters, but also the very principle which he had for long time strenuously contended was absolutely indispensable to secure prosperity to the country! He seems to have been quite willing to yield every thing to that "visionary spirit of free trade," of which he speaks in his letter of last November to the Salt boulders of Syracuse, who had just made him a present of twenty-three barrels and one box of domestic salts, in part payment of the obligations they owed him for the high tax on the foreign article.

All this aside however, Mr. Clay avowedly adhered to the principles of the Compromise Act, up to the 1st of March, 1842, on which day, in his character of Dictator, he submitted a series of resolutions to the U. S. Senate, in which he marked out and defined the policy to be pursued by the whig party in the administration of the government. The resolution concerning the tariff was in these words:

"That in the adjustment of the tariff, to raise an amount of twenty-six millions of revenue, the principles of the compromise act, generally, should be adhered to; and that especially a maximum rate of ad valorem duties (30 per cent.) should be established, from which there ought to be as little departure as possible."

He enforced this mandate by a speech in which he concluded as follows in relation to this subject:

"Carry out then the spirit of the compromise act. Do not raise the question of protection, which I had hoped had been put to rest. There is no necessity for protection."

Nothing can be plainer than such a declaration as this certainly. If we can believe Mr. Clay, he has no desire to establish a Protective tariff *per se*. So his friends at the South appear to understand him, as witness the following evidences.

The Augusta Chronicle, a respectable Whig paper, says—

"We do not sustain Mr. Clay on account of his high tariff principles, but we sustain him partly because he agrees with us as to the standard of import duties, viz.: that they should be regulated by the wants of the government, aye! and he specified what those wants should be. If Mr. Clay were for a high tariff we should differ with him in opinion,

and it would be time enough then for us to say whether we would support him or not. Mr. Clay is not only for going as near the compromise standard as possible, but he is the author and founder of that standard now so popular in the South."

The Savannah Republican, a whig paper equally respectable, spurns the idea of "protection" in these strong terms:

"Though it has been asserted, it cannot be proved, that Mr. Clay or his supporters are the friends of a restrictive system for the sake of protection, save only as incidental to revenue."

"We DENY that Mr. Clay or the whigs of Georgia, whose candidate he is, seek for the establishment of a PROTECTIVE TARIFF; but adhere to the principles of the compromise act."

Our readers will also recollect the resolutions of a whig meeting in Putnam County, Georgia, which we published three or four weeks ago, the last of which was as follows:

"Resolved, That as good citizens, we are ever willing to pay any tariff for the purpose of revenue, but NOT A CENT FOR PROTECTION."

Entirely different from these sentiments are the avowals made by Mr. Clay in his letter to the salt boilers of Syracuse, and in his Indianapolis speech. To the Salt boilers he says—

"I had supposed that no man would contravene the power of the duty of Government, in imposing duties for revenue, to make liberal discrimination for the benefit of domestic industry. About the period of 1814, when the power of affording direct protection was first strenuously contested, that of incidental protection was tried and unreservedly conceded. But nothing can conciliate or appease the spirit of visionary free trade. And we now behold the dawn of opposition to all protection, either direct or incidental. The tariff of 1832 was framed under the hope that it would quiet all discontents, and produce general reconciliation. It moderated the pre-existing duties. The tariff of 1842, recently passed, provides a sum of duties generally lower than that of 1832. Yet it is scarcely passed before the war cry of repeal is raised against it."

Mr. Clay here speaks of the new tariff as giving only incidental protection, when it is apparent to every one that it is a tariff for the protection of manufacturing capitalists, and that if it brings a revenue, the revenue is only incidental. He knows well enough that such a principle is odious to the people, and therefore he tries to conceal it under honeyed words. Mr. Clay expresses himself with greater freedom at Indianapolis, having from some cause or other implied the opinion that the Hoosiers were very desirous of having their own foreign markets destroyed, and themselves taxed, in order to secure the interests of the Eastern manufacturing monopolists. In that speech he said:—

"What is the next question of difference between the two parties? The tariff—the protection of our own industry. The whigs favor this policy, and the democrats oppose it. He would not quarrel with any one about forms. That bill would meet his approbation, who afforded great satisfaction to the greatest numbers. He looked to the substance rather than to the form. He should prefer that the principles of the compromise act be adhered to as closely as possible. The house valuation provision should have been insisted upon, though some gentlemen in the South deemed it impracticable. Mr. Clay differed with them on this subject. He knew that the compromise act of 1833 never could have received the sanction of Congress, but for the incorporation of that salutary principle; and if it cannot now be carried out, the compromise should be abandoned. He was for a T-tariff for Revenue to the Government, *protectio* to the manufacturers. The law of the last session is already denounced by the democrats, and its repeal called for through their presses. He did not allude to the great body of the democratic party, but to their leaders—their false and faithless leaders. The honest and upright members of that party, were, he believed, in favor of a sound tariff, and he implied such lack to look, examine, and decide for themselves. Notwithstanding the mis-accuracy of the paper which contained its provisions, notice was given that its repeal was resolved on. For himself, having examined the features of that bill, he declared it a good measure. It is moderate and judicious."

Mr. Clay distinctly declares here that he is in favor of a protective tariff; though he don't care about forms, so he gets the substance. He is willing to abandon the compromise act, under certain circumstances. He distinctly declares himself in favor of the new tariff, and calls it a good, moderate and judicious measure. How does all this tally with his own, and the avowals of others of his party which we have quoted above? Or how with the following, from his zealous supporter the N. Y. Courier and Enquirer, to wit:

"As the present hastily adopted tariff imposes prohibitory duties on many articles, we shall certainly call upon the next Congress to amend it."

Or how do Mr. Clay's declarations in his Indianapolis speech accord with his course and that of his confidential friends in Congress, in relation to this very measure which now professes to regard us so good, so moderate, so judicious?

Mr. Marshall of Kentucky, who represents Mr. Clay's district in Congress, says in a letter recent-

"Mr. Clay and all his political friends were determined that no tariff bill should pass this year, and they remained in that mind, until it was discovered that there were sufficient whigs, with the entire democratic vote, to pass a bill against the votes of the Clay whigs. In this dilemma they turned about, and a part of them voted for the bill which finally passed; they thinking that it was so objectionable that no democrats would vote for it, and that it would consequently be defeated by them; and if sufficient democrats should vote for it to pass it, the President would veto it."

This is indirectly corroborated by Mr. Webster in his late speech at Faneuil Hall. He said—

"It is not true that the Tariff passed so easily, and they remained in that mind, until it was discovered that there were sufficient whigs, with the entire democratic vote, to pass a bill against the votes of the Clay whigs. In this dilemma they turned about, and a part of them voted for the bill which finally passed; they thinking that it was so objectionable that no democrats would vote for it, and that it would consequently be defeated by them; and if sufficient democrats should vote for it to pass it, the President would veto it."

"That in the adjustment of the tariff, to raise an amount of twenty-six millions of revenue, the principles of the compromise act, generally, should be adhered to; and that especially a maximum rate of ad valorem duties (30 per cent.) should be established, from which there ought to be as little departure as possible."

He enforced this mandate by a speech in which he concluded as follows in relation to this subject:

"Carry out then the spirit of the compromise act. Do not raise the question of protection, which I had hoped had been put to rest. There is no necessity for protection."

Nothing can be plainer than such a declaration as this certainly. If we can believe Mr. Clay, he has no desire to establish a Protective tariff *per se*. So his friends at the South appear to understand him, as witness the following evidences.

The Augusta Chronicle, a respectable Whig paper,

says—

"We do not sustain Mr. Clay on account of his high tariff principles, but we sustain him partly because he agrees with us as to the standard of import duties, viz.: that they should be regulated by the wants of the government, aye! and he specified what those wants should be. If Mr. Clay were for a high tariff we should differ with him in opinion."

Silk.—The bounty paid on silk, from the Treasury of Massachusetts, this year amounts to \$3,351.91. This is about one-third larger than last year.

INDIANA LEGISLATURE...1842-3.

SENATE.

Names. D. W. D. W.

Counties. 1841. 1842.

Allen, 0 0 0 0

Bethelnewton, 0 0 0 0

Brown and H., 0 0 0 0

Cass, 0 0 0 0

Clark, 0 0 0 0

Carroll, 0 0 0 0

Crawford, 0 0 0 0

Daviess, 0 0 0 0

Davis, 0 0 0 0

Deacon, 0 0 0 0

Elkhart, 0 0 0 0

Fayette, 0 0 0 0

Floyd, 0 0 0 0

Franklin, 0 0 0 0

Franklin and D., 0 0 0 0

Gibson, 0 0 0 0

Hancock, 0 0 0 0

Henry, 0 0 0 0

Harrison, 0 0 0 0

Howard, 0 0 0 0

Jackson, 0 0 0 0

Knox, 0 0 0 0

Lafayette, 0 0 0 0

Madison, 0 0 0 0

Morgan, 0 0 0 0

Montgomery, 0 0 0 0

Noble, 0 0 0 0

Parke, 0 0 0 0

Perry, 0 0 0 0

Ripley, 0 0 0 0

Rush, 0 0 0 0

Shelby, 0 0 0 0

Starke, 0 0 0 0

Tippecanoe, 0 0 0 0

Vermillion, 0 0 0 0

Wayne, 0 0 0 0

Washington, 0 0 0 0

House of REPRESENTATIVES.

Names. D. W. D. W.

Counties. 1841. 1842.

Adams and J., 0 0 0 0

Ashland, 0 0 0 0

Benton, W., & C., 0 0 0 0

Blackford, H. & W., 0 0 0 0

Brown, B., & C., 0 0 0 0

Brown, B., & W., 0 0 0 0