

The barefaced misrepresentations in an extract of a letter, written by one of Mr. Gregg's sons-in-law, or nephews, from Bellefonte, and published in the Harrisburg Chronicle, merit silent contempt rather than serious reply.

1st. To give publicity to a letter written by Mr. Monroe, during the war, to the President of the Centre Bank, relative to assisting Mr. Higgins with Centre money.

2nd. To let his friends know that the federal meeting held during the Court, in Bellefonte, was large and respectable, and that the democratic delegation was neither—and

3d.—The best of all—That Gregg will have a better vote in Centre and Clearfield, than Gen. Hiester had in 1820.

1st.—As to the exchange of money by the Centre Bank, with the Government, we would just state, on good authority, that this was an act of the Directors of the Bank, exclusively, with which Mr. Gregg had little or no concern.

The facts are simply these: The government had issued Treasury Bills, redeemable one, two and three years after date, without interest, in gold or silver.

To reduce them to cash, the holder must, consequently, allow a discount, the same as on the bond of an individual payable at a distant day. The Centre Bank notes were at that period at par, and so careful were the Directors of the interest of the Bank, that not until JAMES MONROE, now President of the United States, bound himself personally for the redemption of those bills, did they agree to make the exchange.

Having this security, the Directors of the Bank (patriotic men!) agreed to exchange Centre money, for gold and silver! On the day specified in the Treasury Bills, the government redeemed them in gold and silver—But before that period, the Centre Notes had depreciated 15 per cent—Therefore the Bank made a good speculation, and the directors acted wisely in making the exchange.—There were 21 directors, and it is true Mr. Gregg was one of them; but it is as true, that it required a majority of them to negotiate the exchange.

Therefore Mr. Gregg does not deserve the credit of the transaction at all—if even in favor of it, of which we have no evidence, he had but a voice among 21—and furthermore, as President of the Bank, he had not even a voice in the deliberations of the Directors, except to give the casting vote, in cases where the vote stood equal.

2nd.—This worthy letter writer, says, that the federal meeting consisted of 250!!! Oh most extravagant falsehood. It is possible 50 were present, and our informant thinks there were scarcely that, not taking into view the number of democrats present, attending out of curiosity. Mr. Gregg's sons-in-law, and others, were riding the county for weeks previous, and no poor fellows were ever so badly rewarded for their trouble.—The result of their labour was a meeting of about 50, about one fourth of whom were officeholders, one fourth expectants of office, and one half reprobates. The principal motion-makers were officeholders, and "the dear friends, foreign relations, and all,"

did nothing more than second motions, which they did with such little judgment, that when the question was put by the chairman, they would sometimes exclaim, "I second that motion!"

The democratic delegation was the largest and most respectable ever held in the county; and when it adjourned to the court house, to announce its proceedings to the people, there was an immense concourse assembled, exclusively democrats, who received them with the most lively satisfaction. We did hear that one of two federal understrappers were sent to "spy out farlies," but they went hence "with a flea in their ear."—Such was the effect of this unanimity in our party, that the federalists are all in the dumps. If they were individually under sentence of death, they could not have the dew of melancholy more visible on their labour-worn countenances.

3d. Mr. Gregg is to have a "better vote" in these counties than Hiester had in 1820. We deny this, and as the election is close at hand, it will soon be determined which of us are correct.

The democrats will take notice that Mr. Shulze's name must be voted— J. ANDREW SHULZE.

CLEAR THE ROAD FOR CLEARFIELD! DEMOCRATIC MEETING.

A number of the Genuine Democratic Republicans of Pike township in Clearfield county, friendly to the election of Mr. Shulze, convened at the house of James Blair, on the 13th of September 1823.

DANIEL BARRET was called to the chair, and JOSIAH EVANS appointed Secretary. On motion, James Blair, Ephraim Andrews, Greenwood McCracken, Thomas Hall & Joseph Evans were appointed a committee to draft resolutions expressive of the reasons of the meeting in supporting Mr Shulze and opposing Mr Gregg.

The following were reported and adopted:

1st. That this meeting have the fullest confidence in the patriotism, and the moral and political integrity of John Andrew Shulze, and will use every honorable exertion to promote his election.

2nd. That this meeting confide in Mr. Shulze as a man who will be the Governor of the people, and not of a fragment of a discontented faction; and unfriendly to a PUBLIC DEBT, STATE TAXES in time of peace; PRIVATE PECULATION of the PUBLIC MONEY; and all the most notorious acts for which the present administration, with Mr Gregg at its head, has been celebrated.

3d. That this meeting consider his nomination as fair and honorable, and the result of free deliberation, untrammelled and uncontrolled by legislative dictation, as is falsely pretended by the federalists.

And Resolved—

1st. That we will not support Andrew Gregg inasmuch as he is the Federal Candidate, and has, in his public life, been guilty of acts which shew his unfitness for the office, and total want of Patriotism, viz:

1st. He voted for Jay's Treaty contrary to the known wishes of the American People, and to subvert the views of the BRITISH.

2nd. He voted against the late GLORIOUS WAR.

3d. He corresponded with a Peace Party in order to contribute by his puny and contemptible efforts to render it disastrous.

4th. He became President of an unincorporated institution for the sake of the filthy Salary, altho' it was in open violation of the laws of our land.

5th. He has been always opposed to democratic men and measures, from Simon Snyder down to James Monroe.

6th. He has been guilty of vilifying Jefferson, the author of our declaration of independence.

7th. He refused to fight or take an active part in the Revolutionary War, but was content to remain at home to teach the children of those who were suspected of being enemies to the country, whilst the patriotic young men of those days were all engaged in that glorious struggle.

8th. He voted to deprive POOR MEN of the RIGHT OF VOTING

Resolved, That the federalists in attempting to assume the name of the democratic party, offer a gross insult to our understandings, but we cherish the hope that the skins of the Lamo

will not hide the WOLF."

The following was also read and adopted.

In an address published in the Harrisburg Chronicle, purporting to be issued by a federal meeting in Centre county, it is argued,

That it is no objection to Mr. Gregg that he has received about Forty thousand Dollars of the Public Money for his services already, because Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Madison and Mr. Monroe were elected, altho' they had been in office also. To this we would reply, that there were sound reasons for supporting these gentlemen, that do not exist as to Mr. Gregg. Not to say any thing about the political sin of mentioning the names of these worthies in the same breath with that of Andrew Gregg, they had individually rendered the most important services to their country during the Revolution, and since the revolution, whilst Mr. Gregg has been opposed to the country and its true interest, at the revolution and since it. It was because Jefferson, Madison and Monroe had thus acted, that the principle of rotation in office was dispensed with when they were elected. This was an exception to the general rule; but Mr. Harris, or some other equally willul and equally wise, chose to forget these things.

It is also stated that Mr. Gregg has claims upon the people of these counties, because he was one of the early settlers. This is certainly a new argument in his favor, and will receive a very brief notice. It was not necessary for Mr. Harris to tell the people that Mr. Gregg underwent the toils and dangers of a new settlement; they know as much about it as he does; but the truth is he never suffered much in improving the country. He was generally surrounded with Poor Blacks, slaves too, that he compelled to labour for him, or was quiet receiving eight dollars a day from the Public. This is the way he single stepped "tilld the soil." He has tho' shewn his partiality for early settlers, in his appointment to office in Clearfield county. Altho' some applied who themselves were amongst the first to bear the dangers of a new settlement in a perfect wilderness, yet they were coldly passed by, and those appointed who were little more than qualified by residence. This is Mr. Gregg's friendship for early settlers!! and he certainly has claims upon them!!! What think you, Mr. Harris, Deputy Surveyor for Centre County, &c.?

Resolved, That proceedings of this meeting be published in the Bellefonte Patriot.

DANIEL BARRET, Chairman.

JOSIAH EVANS, Sec'y.

For the Patriot.

Mr. Petrikin,

I have been informed that, recently, a couple of very respectable federalists, of this vicinity have made a list of those who will vote for Gregg; that work about Logan Furnace. My name is included amongst the rest. The greater part of the hands are dissatisfied with it, and I have written you my reasons for supporting Mr. Shulze, which you may publish if you think proper.

MOSES THOMPSON.

A POLITICAL DISCOURSE, TO AWAKEN THOSE THAT SLEEP.

My Friends:—

I have been, as it were, sleeping in the bosom of Centre County, twenty three years, and, altho' I have heard a good deal of the dispute that exists between the federal and democratic party, I was not awakened from my political slumber, until lately. After coming a little to my feelings, I thought it necessary to examine the meaning of the respective words, "Federal & Democrat." I find that a democracy, in relation to government, means a system that admits the power to be in the Legislature, as the Representatives of the people, or in the body of the people themselves. The word federal, in its original meaning, is something that is joined or united to something beside itself; and why it was adopted by the federal party, is, that they wished the union of the several states, without any distinction; but that the sovereignty of each state should be destroyed. This would enable them to arrive at the main object, the establishment of an aristocratical, or monarchical, form of government. Having thus arrived at the meaning of the names of the respective parties, I was astonished at the traps and hooks that have been laid, by those calling themselves federalists, for the people, that they might vote for their candidate. They have frequently told me, that a federal government, would be the best for the common people—that our independence was obtained by federalists and that the articles of our constitution were federal, and that Washington was a federalist, and a good deal of stuff; all which I find to mean more than is apparently intended; altho' some of it may appear to us absolute

nonsense. This is the manner in which they set their traps to catch game to answer their federal ends. Whether Washington was a federalist or not, may be worth knowing; but I am certain he was not, in the sense in which the word ought to be taken. Nor were those who formed our constitution; a majority at least were not; or it would not have been so democratical. Our government would not have been even Representative. The object of the federal party was to vest the power in the hands of the Rich, which could be best done by destroying the sovereignty of the states, and federalizing the government in this way; so that the framers of our State and United States Constitutions could not be all federalists, or our government would not be so democratical. That it is the chief intention of the federal party to deprive the poor of all participation in the government, and vest it all in the Rich, is proved by their conduct in the different Legislatures since. Have they not endeavored to deprive poor men of the right of voting? which is the very foundation of the peoples liberties. This they have attempted frequently, which they would have done, but for the democrats. And it shows conclusively, that even under our government an aristocracy can be established, without changing its apparent form.

We have the words of Washington himself, to prove that he was not a federalist, in this sense of the word. In 1786, he said he "was convinced, with other statesmen, of the necessity of substituting a more vigorous general government, in the place of the impotent articles of confederation;" and in his letter to Mr. Jay, he exclaims: "what an astonishing change a few years are capable of producing! I am told that respectable characters speak of a monarchy without horror;" and he says "from thinking proceeds speaking, and to acting there is but a single step." And who is it I pray that spoke about a monarchy without horror? Why the federalists, who now claim Washington as one of themselves.

In one sense of the word Washington was a federalist and we are all federalists. We wish a union of the states, preserving the sovereignty of each, which is federalism; but this is innocense itself, compared with its true meaning, and the idea the word commonly conveys to our minds.

I cannot understand how a federal government, after the plan wished for by federalists could benefit the common people more than a representative democracy. It may be, as some of them have told me, that common people ought not to meddle with affairs of state; in that case all we would have to do would be to mind our business, and make as much money as we could to keep the rich in lazy indolence. To make up our taxes for this purpose, would be the main object; but I sincerely hope the people will never be so lost to their true interests, as to elect men to office that are in favor of such a government, or ever learned that way.

They may talk of federalism and confederations, as they please, and perplex unassuming citizens with their high words, it is enough for me that I can arrive at their designs, and when ever I can do that, I act accordingly. I have often reflected what all the zeal of the federalists could mean. I wish Bishop; but we do not think it saw what the democrats were at; but I could not precisely find out what the federalists wanted at this time. They tell me that they wish the same kind of government as the democrats; & if they do, why do they disagree at all with the democrats? Why don't they support democrats for office? and why do they adhere so tenaciously to men of their party, or who has apostatized from ours?

Now I cannot tell why it is that any poor man, or common man, if the phrase is better, can be a federalist. He cannot roar; for I have heard one of that party say that an officer ought not to be a labourer, for they could have no time to study or learn any thing. The fact is, that they have caught them with one of those hooks or traps, that I have alluded to, and have led them to believe that the meaning of the word federalist, is innocent in itself, and that the members of that party have no interest separate from the commonalty, or main body of the people; and in this way make mere tools of them. Some again are not independent, and are compelled to answer the federal ends. Their are others who are federalists, because year, but then you owned a Town Lot and were entitled to vote: new poor man, who actually could assign no other reason! I asked him why he was so ready to deprive himself of the liberty secured to us by the constitution? He replied that "his father had voted with the federalists and he would do so too."

As for the candidates nominated by the democrats and federalists, I know but very little. Mr. Gregg

has lived a great while in Centre county, and I never heard any thing extraordinary of him. He was like other men, that did little ill and little good. I knew him always to be a federalist; but now, I understand, he is willing to bear that reproachful name, a democrat—a name which was given through derision, and has been long so considered by federalists. This I consider a very great objection to him. It would seem he is willing to degrade himself by wearing the name of a democrat, that he may mount into power. If he were governor, having a very extensive patronage, he could provide for his numerous family connections, who would rather live upon the people, than by their own industry. This is real federal doctrine. His family are all arrived at years of maturity, and are wealthy also; but it is natural for men to wish for more than diminish what they have already. Perhaps their understandings and education qualify them, and no doubt they would as soon be supported in this way, as use their own money to support themselves. But I think Mr. Gregg's tour in office ought to be out; for rotation is a reasonable thing, in our government especially, and I expect, at all events, he has enough to keep him the remainder of his days; but perhaps he counts money for honor; and if this is his disposition, I think him unfit for governor. The benefit of the people would not be his object; nor would the poor be provided for at all: the combination would be with the wealthy to increase honor and distinction.

But as for Mr. Shulze, I know nothing more of him to induce me to support him, save that he is a steadfast democrat; a friend to his country, & his fellow citizens; and that his supporters, or himself, have no wish to infringe or alter the Constitution. I believe him, also, to be well qualified. MOSES THOMPSON.

The following comments on Mr. Gregg's vote on the Mississippi question, we extract from the

Democratic Press.

On these facts, as we find them recorded on the Journal of the Senate, we shall offer but few remarks. They speak a language sufficiently intelligible to be understood. In Pennsylvania where no such qualifications as a freehold is required to enable a Freeman to exercise the right of suffrage, such an aristocratic vote as that of Mr. Gregg's will be appreciated as it ought. Mr. Gregg did, what he did, on full and mature consideration. The bill had passed the House of Representatives, with-out this feature of aristocracy and it was ten times under consideration in the Senate, on ten different days. It was after due deliberation he made his vote as we could to keep the rich in this vital stab at the Rights of Man.

The plain meaning of this vote of Mr. Gregg's is, that no man should be permitted to vote unless he is a Freeholder. No Freeman was to vote because he was a Freeman,—he was to vote because he owned a free acre of land, or "a town lot." The Freeman, the poor man, was to pay all taxes and perform all services but he was to exercise no rights! What have the poor to do with this taxes but pay them?—what have the people to do with the laws but obey them? was the sentiment of an English Bishop; but we do not think it becoming in the mouth of an American Legislator, or in that of the Governor of a democratic Commonwealth. This, however, is the old federal doctrine, let us see where it will carry us, and enquire how we should like a provision of the same kind in the constitution of Pennsylvania.

A man who voted last year and had voted for fifty years before, verily the man was a Soldier and had fought for the independence of his country.—This year he advances the pole—the people give way at the sight of the venerable grey headed old Soldier. He has made his way to the window and tendered his vote. It is rejected, it will not be taken; his name has been struck off the list of Freeholders and he can no longer exercise the right of a Freeman. He has lost his freehold and is, in consequence, become a slave.

"Why may I not vote, says the old man, I have voted every year, for the right to vote; the right of self government." "That may all be very true says the Inspector.—We know you voted last year, but then you owned a Town Lot and were entitled to vote: new poor man, who actually could assign no other reason! I asked him why he was so ready to deprive himself of the liberty secured to us by the constitution? He replied that "his father had voted with the federalists and he would do so too."