

THE PATRIOT

Not for himself, but for his country.

WEDNESDAY, August 13.

We have omitted many articles prepared for this day's paper, to make room for the Democratic Meetings given below. We recommend to every democrat, an attentive perusal of their proceedings. Both meetings were unusually large.

VOICE OF CENTRE COUNTY. DEMOCRATIC MEETING

At a numerous and respectable meeting of the Democratic Republicans of FERGUSON TOWNSHIP, CENTRE COUNTY, convened at the house of Robert Patton, on the 9th day of August 1823, pursuant to public notice:

JOHN PATTON, Esquire was called to the chair, and THOMAS BLAIR & WILLIAM MURRAY, Esq. were appointed Secretaries.

On motion, William Patton, Esq. William Cooper, Esq. Isaac Hazlett, Henry Hubler, Col. John Haddon, John Bell and Robert Patton were appointed a committee to draft resolutions and an address expressive of the sense of the meeting. After retiring for some time, they reported the following Resolutions and address, which were unanimously adopted:

1st. Resolved, That this meeting cheerfully concur in the nomination of JOHN ANDREW SHULZE, by the DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION, that met at Harrisburg on the 4th of March last; as that convention was composed of delegates from every County in the State, fairly and specially chosen by the PEOPLE.

2nd. Resolved, That we have entire confidence in the talents, integrity, and uniform republican principles of John Andrew Shulze; as we believe him to be a man possessed of a strong mind and unblemished character, that cannot be assailed by his political enemies; and that we will give him our undivided support for the office of Governor of this Commonwealth; conscious that in so doing we will be throwing in our mite to raise the standard of pure republican principles in Pennsylvania.

3d. Resolved, That we cannot support the election of Andrew Gregg, or Governor; because the following acts of his political life demonstrate, clearly, that he is a FEDERALIST:

1st. His vote for Jay's Treaty;

2nd. His opposition to our late worthy Governor SNYDER and his administration;

3d. His acting and voting with the federalists when a member of the Senate of the United States; and recording his vote against the late GLORIOUS WAR with Great Britain;

4th. His acquiescing in the appointment of Federalists in every county in the state, to lucrative offices; and supplanting Democratic Republicans while Secretary of the Commonwealth: We do say that these acts of his shew clearly that he is a FEDERALIST.

4th. Resolved, That we will not support the election of Andrew Gregg; because he aided and assisted in establishing an aristocratical institution called the Centre Bank of Pennsylvania; and previous to its being incorporated or declared lawful, he accepted the office of President hereof; and ever since that Bank went into operation its notes have been at a discount, and thereby fed the speculators at the expense of the farmers and mechanics.

5th. Resolved, That we will not support the election of Andrew Gregg; because he is the Federal Legislative Caucus Candidate, and his nomination confirmed by a sham convention at Lewistown, convened at the instance of the federal members of the legislature in order to gull and deceive the people; and at which not one half the counties in the state were represented.

6th. Resolved, That we view with contempt the measures resorted to, and the means made use of, by some of the friends of Andrew Gregg in this county, to secure his election; and that we will oppose and prostrate such conduct; because we view it as being inimical to our republican form of government; and the peace of society loudly calls for an opposition etc.

8th. Resolved, That we will re-

main united in the support, and extend all lawful protection to our fellow-citizen, the editor of the Bellefonte Patriot, in opposition to threats made by aristocratical combinations and unprincipled despots.

6th. Resolved, That the proceedings of this meeting be signed by the Chairman and Secretaries, and published in the Bellefonte Patriot.

JOHN PATTON, Chairman. THOMAS BLAIR } WM. MURRAY } Secretaries,

ADDRESS. To the Democratic Republicans of Centre County.

A number of your fellow Republicans, of Ferguson township, having assembled together for the purpose of consulting upon measures best calculated to promote the election of JOHN ANDREW SHULZE, the democratic candidate for Governor, through their committee appointed for that purpose, deem it necessary to address you; and in doing so, we shall endeavor to unite brevity with perspicuity.

The approaching election for Governor is more than ordinarily interesting. It is a contest in fact between DEMOCRACY & FEDERALISM. We are aware that this is denied by the federalists; but it is absolutely true, that it is a renewal of the old dispute; a contest for supremacy between the two great political parties. By a combination of circumstances, altogether unnecessary to enumerate, being fresh in the recollection of you all, the democratic party, in this state, has been prostrated for three years past. The best evidence of the fact, is, that measures have been pursued by the present administration, at variance with those principles of Republicanism which we, as democrats, profess, and admire. Immense loans have been made, and the state involved in an enormous debt to banks, which the heaviest duties and taxes, and the economy of twenty years will scarcely repay. The money thus obtained, has been expended without the people deriving any substantial benefit or advantage therefrom. In this policy of sinking the state in debt, we all have a great interest. It is the farmers that must pay these taxes. Now to be threatened with a state tax in times of peace, or a state tax at any time, is so inconsistent with the democracy we profess, that it would be trifling with your understandings to attempt further to show, that no member of the democratic party has had part or lot in the administration of our state government, for the last three years.

One of the primary causes of the prostration of our party, and which is here worthy of notice, was the cry of legislative influence. It was so loud and constant, that very many honest and well meaning republicans were induced to think that there was something in it. The federalists aware of the advantages they derived from that mode of electioneering, have revived it again. Let us then consider what foundation they have for the hue and cry they are now making on that subject.

The democratic members of the last legislature, taking into consideration the importance of uniting the party, met and recommended to their democratic brethren throughout the state, to appoint special delegates to meet in Convention at Harrisburg on the 4th of March, to put in nomination a suitable person to be supported by the democratic party for Governor. In pursuance of which recommendation, special delegates were chosen, and did convene for said purpose. Out of 131 delegates that met in Convention, but twenty one were members of the legislature, and they were specially instructed by their constituents, to meet in said Convention. They were regularly delegated, and before they were admitted as members, they produced sufficient vouchers, well authenticated, to satisfy the Convention, that they were empowered by their constituents to act for them. Even those 21 would not have been in the Convention, had it not been owing to the great distance delegates sent expressly would have had to travel, if sent from the counties on the very confines of the state. So well aware were the delegates that every artifice would be resorted to, and every act laid hold of, and tortured to fix the charge of legislative influence on their proceedings, that they rejected the offer made by the Legislature to adjourn, in order that they might meet in the STATE CAPITOL: for several reasons:

1. Because, the Federalists would have said that the members of the legislature, being in the receipt of three dollars a day, by adjourning for that purpose, had defrauded the state. The federal papers would have been

filled with calculations of the cost to the state of the nomination of the democratic candidate; and it would have been made a prominent objection to his election, the charge would have been laid to the democratic party.

2. Because, the delegates were anxious that their deliberations should be separate and apart from any thing having the semblance of legislative interference: and

3. Because the federal party were anxious, that our delegates should thus commit themselves; that they might with some kind of feasibility, make the charge of legislative influence, and interference."

For these reasons the offer of the legislature was rejected, and the Convention met at the Old Court House; and did not in any way interfere with the deliberations of the legislature.

It is here worthy of remark, that not one of the members of the legislature, admitted by a special resolution, to a seat in the Convention, voted for John A. Shulze. They were nearly all from the western and northern extremities of the state, and were instructed by those they represented to vote for George Bryan; and they adhered to their instructions in every ballot. This fact, alone, demonstrates that John Andrew Shulze was not nominated by legislative influence; and that he was not their choice, is true: for it can be placed beyond all controversy, that if the members of the legislature had nominated, Samuel D. Ingham would have been their choice. Upon what basis, then, rests the charge of legislative influence and interference in the nomination of Mr. Shulze? Not on that of truth. No: it is predicated on falsehood; with the intention of deluding, deceiving and exciting the fears of the unthinking, unreflecting and unenquiring citizen. Like every other charge made against the democratic candidate, and his advocates in this County, it is a wicked and wilful perversion of truth.

If Mr Shulze had been, like Mr Gregg, nominated in fact by a legislative caucus in the first place, and the nomination afterwards ratified by a sham Convention, composed of office holders, hirelings, and dependants, then indeed would there be some reason, and a great foundation to echo and re echo, corruption, corruption!! But on a minute and fair investigation of the proceedings of the Harrisburg Convention, we ask any enquiring, reflecting and candid man to say, that Mr. Shulze was not honestly and fairly nominated? He was; and by men whose democracy never was doubted. Theirs was no collusion between Bryan's friends, Ingham's friends, or Shulze's friends. The advocates of Bryan and Ingham were at utter variance; and it is a notorious fact, that altho' they did unite in the nomination of Mr. Shulze, yet they never would have united in the nomination of their respective favorites. Mr. Ingham was the lowest in votes on every ballot; and his friends held the balance of power. It required a majority of the whole number to make the nomination; and this could not be done unless the names of one of the persons balloted for was withdrawn. Mr. Ingham's friends magnanimously withdrew his name; and on a subsequent ballot Mr. Shulze was nominated: he having 95 votes, and Mr Bryan 36. That there was any preconcert, any out of door arrangements, in the nomination of Mr. Shulze, we have no evidence; and the federalists with all their cunning have failed to shew that there was. In fact there was none. Our trusty delegates, the faithfulness and integrity of whom we have no reason to doubt, were under the conviction that John Andrew Shulze, was the man whose name would harmonize and unite the democratic party in a greater degree than that of any other person, before the convention, and we heartily concur.

But could so full and fair a representation of the people be dissolved without doing any thing? If they had, it would have annihilated the hopes and prospects of the Democratic party at once. The friends of Mr. Bryan considering this, concurred in the nomination of Mr. Shulze; for they had not in view the exaltation of an individual, however worthy, but the welfare and interest of our beloved country, and the ascendancy of democratic principles. If the minority had refused to acquiesce in the decision of the majority; or if the convention had been dissolved without making any nomination, what situation would our party have been in now? We would have had no regularly nominated candidate, and federalism would have continued in power.

But, Fellow-Democrats! The federalists pretend to say that if Mr. Bryan had been nominated, no opposition would have been made to his election. Is this true? It cannot be. It is altogether unhalloved hypocrisy. Now mark how plain a tale will put them down.

Mr. Bryan must have been nomi-

nated by the same convention; the same members; the same person that nominated Mr. Shulze. Why then tell us, that the same objections would not have been made to his nomination, as is to Mr. Shulze's? Is it not absurdly in the extreme for them to make us of such a fallacious argument, in order to deceive. If Mr. Bryan had been nominated by the convention, then assembled, would it have smothered the cry of "legislative influence, legislative interference."? No: it would not. The hypocrisy of these artful men is too glaring not to be easily seen through; and their conduct too inconsistent, to be confided in by honest and reflecting republicans. These very federalists, that now pretend that if Mr. Bryan had been nominated, they would have supported him, had in anticipation of his nomination, charged Mr Bryan with defrauding the state out of TWENTY THOUSAND dollars, in the settlement of Prothonotary's accounts; and deeply implicated him in the charges made against Mr. Findlay. It is known to you all, that Mr. Bryan, as Auditor General, had the settlement of Mr. Findlay's Treasurer's account. James Duncan, the present federal Auditor General, had searched every musty paper in the Auditor's office, and was ready to open the floodgates of detraction and slander on Mr Bryan. We would have witnessed the scenes of 1820 acted over again; and every transaction of Mr. Bryan's official conduct for 12 years, would have been perverted and distorted to answer their ends. With these facts before you, will you, democrats, oppose the election of John Andrew Shulze, the regularly nominated candidate of the party? Will you be wheedled and cajoled out of your votes by the intrigue of federalism and its panders? No; the garb they have assumed, and the cloak they have mantled themselves in are too thin not to be easily penetrated. It is but the covering of gauze.

But how is it that the charge of legislative influence and interference, is to be laid to the democratic party alone? Have the federalists no members of the legislature? Are they so immaculate, that they would refrain from caucusing? Fellow Citizens! We told you before that they did caucus; and they are the very men who do caucus. Have you not seen letters to their supposed friends, published, which substantiates the fact, beyond all controversy, that it was a federal caucus of federal members of the Legislature, at Harrisburg, that in the first instance nominated Andrew Gregg? Look at the proceedings of the Lewistown Federal Convention! On the first ballot Mr. Gregg was nominated! View the proceedings of the two Conventions! and then determine which of the two Conventions has the appearance of preconcert; of out of door arrangement; of legislative influence!! They are perfectly welcome to nominate their own man in their own way, but let them not charge us with being guilty of what they themselves have practised.

The course pursued by Mr. Gregg, for 18 years past, clearly proves him to be a federalist. We, as democrats, were all in favor of the war. The federalists were opposed to it. Andrew Gregg was opposed to it. It was not enough that he voted eleven times in Congress against it, but we find him afterwards corresponding with open and avowed friends of the British government, in Cumberland county, calling themselves "Peace party men," reprobating the policy pursued by Madison and his cabinet, and condemning those firm and steadfast democrats, then in Congress from Pennsylvania, the pride of our state, and friends of the national government, and of the war. Our government was unable to obtain a redress of grievances, and were compelled to resort to arms. Our frontiers were assailed by savages, furnished with arms and ammunition by British agents—Our seamen were impressed—Our Merchant vessels plundered—Our National flag insulted—Our harbors blockaded, and our vessels of war attacked in our waters. Could such a course be endured? But we forbear to comment on this subject—all of you know the facts connected with it.

Again we find him in opposition to the election of Snyder, from first to last, from 1805 until 1817; and then opposed to the election of the democratic candidate. If these acts do not constitute a change of political opinion, we confess we are at a loss to determine what will.

Rotation in office is a fundamental principle of republicanism. It was strongly urged by Mr Gregg against Mr Findlay's election in 1817 in an address to the people: It certainly was an argument that had great weight. What are we now to think of Mr. Gregg's sincerity? He has been 28 years in lucrative offices, and is now aspiring to one still more lucrative; and being in power himself, and those of his friends upon this cutting argument. We hear nothing now, about "ROTATION IN OFFICE" We deem it unnecessary to comment further on this matter. Your own understandings and good judgments, will draw proper conclusions.

Now let us consider the qualifications of Mr Shulze. He was nominated by one hundred and thirty-one democratic delegates. He has been in the settlement of Prothonotary's accounts; and deeply implicated him in the charges made against Mr. Findlay. It is known to you all, that Mr. Bryan, as Auditor General, had the settlement of Mr. Findlay's Treasurer's account. James Duncan, the present federal Auditor General, had searched every musty paper in the Auditor's office, and was ready to open the floodgates of detraction and slander on Mr Bryan. We would have witnessed the scenes of 1820 acted over again; and every transaction of Mr. Bryan's official conduct for 12 years, would have been perverted and distorted to answer their ends. With these facts before you, will you, democrats, oppose the election of John Andrew Shulze, the regularly nominated candidate of the party? Will you be wheedled and cajoled out of your votes by the intrigue of federalism and its panders? No; the garb they have assumed, and the cloak they have mantled themselves in are too thin not to be easily penetrated. It is but the covering of gauze.

But how is it that the charge of legislative influence and interference, is to be laid to the democratic party alone? Have the federalists no members of the legislature? Are they so immaculate, that they would refrain from caucusing? Fellow Citizens! We told you before that they did caucus; and they are the very men who do caucus. Have you not seen letters to their supposed friends, published, which substantiates the fact, beyond all controversy, that it was a federal caucus of federal members of the Legislature, at Harrisburg, that in the first instance nominated Andrew Gregg? Look at the proceedings of the Lewistown Federal Convention! On the first ballot Mr. Gregg was nominated! View the proceedings of the two Conventions! and then determine which of the two Conventions has the appearance of preconcert; of out of door arrangement; of legislative influence!! They are perfectly welcome to nominate their own man in their own way, but let them not charge us with being guilty of what they themselves have practised.

The course pursued by Mr. Gregg, for 18 years past, clearly proves him to be a federalist. We, as democrats, were all in favor of the war. The federalists were opposed to it. Andrew Gregg was opposed to it. It was not enough that he voted eleven times in Congress against it, but we find him afterwards corresponding with open and avowed friends of the British government, in Cumberland county, calling themselves "Peace party men," reprobating the policy pursued by Madison and his cabinet, and condemning those firm and steadfast democrats, then in Congress from Pennsylvania, the pride of our state, and friends of the national government, and of the war. Our government was unable to obtain a redress of grievances, and were compelled to resort to arms. Our frontiers were assailed by savages, furnished with arms and ammunition by British agents—Our seamen were impressed—Our Merchant vessels plundered—Our National flag insulted—Our harbors blockaded, and our vessels of war attacked in our waters. Could such a course be endured? But we forbear to comment on this subject—all of you know the facts connected with it.

Again we find him in opposition to the election of Snyder, from first to last, from 1805 until 1817; and then opposed to the election of the democratic candidate. If these acts do not constitute a change of political opinion, we confess we are at a loss to determine what will.

Mr. Gregg is known to us all. He has arrived at that time of life, when the mind becomes weak, and assumes the second child-hood. The infirmities of old age relaxes the energies of the mind, if it does not entirely incapacitate a man for public life. He has been twenty-eight years in public life; and in our opinion, it is full time that he be permitted to retire. Nor do we believe that he would now be a candidate, but for the

bitious views of others. Rotation in office is a fundamental principle of republicanism. It was strongly urged by Mr Gregg against Mr Findlay's election in 1817 in an address to the people: It certainly was an argument that had great weight. What are we now to think of Mr. Gregg's sincerity? He has been 28 years in lucrative offices, and is now aspiring to one still more lucrative; and being in power himself, and those of his friends upon this cutting argument. We hear nothing now, about "ROTATION IN OFFICE" We deem it unnecessary to comment further on this matter. Your own understandings and good judgments, will draw proper conclusions.

Now let us consider the qualifications of Mr Shulze. He was nominated by one hundred and thirty-one democratic delegates. He has been in the settlement of Prothonotary's accounts; and deeply implicated him in the charges made against Mr. Findlay. It is known to you all, that Mr. Bryan, as Auditor General, had the settlement of Mr. Findlay's Treasurer's account. James Duncan, the present federal Auditor General, had searched every musty paper in the Auditor's office, and was ready to open the floodgates of detraction and slander on Mr Bryan. We would have witnessed the scenes of 1820 acted over again; and every transaction of Mr. Bryan's official conduct for 12 years, would have been perverted and distorted to answer their ends. With these facts before you, will you, democrats, oppose the election of John Andrew Shulze, the regularly nominated candidate of the party? Will you be wheedled and cajoled out of your votes by the intrigue of federalism and its panders? No; the garb they have assumed, and the cloak they have mantled themselves in are too thin not to be easily penetrated. It is but the covering of gauze.

But how is it that the charge of legislative influence and interference, is to be laid to the democratic party alone? Have the federalists no members of the legislature? Are they so immaculate, that they would refrain from caucusing? Fellow Citizens! We told you before that they did caucus; and they are the very men who do caucus. Have you not seen letters to their supposed friends, published, which substantiates the fact, beyond all controversy, that it was a federal caucus of federal members of the Legislature, at Harrisburg, that in the first instance nominated Andrew Gregg? Look at the proceedings of the Lewistown Federal Convention! On the first ballot Mr. Gregg was nominated! View the proceedings of the two Conventions! and then determine which of the two Conventions has the appearance of preconcert; of out of door arrangement; of legislative influence!! They are perfectly welcome to nominate their own man in their own way, but let them not charge us with being guilty of what they themselves have practised.

WILLIAM PATTON
WILLIAM COOPER
ISAAC HESLETT
HENRY HUBLER
JOHN HASSON
ROBERT PATTON
JOHN BELL.

DEMOCRATIC MEETING.

A very large meeting of the Democratic citizens of Patton and Spring townships was held, according to previous notice, at the house of Palser Sellers in Spring township, on Saturday the 13th of August.