

THE PATRIOT

Not for himself, but for his country."

WEDNESDAY, October 1.

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

Extract of a letter to the Editor dated, Williamsport, Lycoming county, Sept. 22nd 1823.

Sir—
Sometime since you published in the Bellefonte Patriot, that at the election for Governor in 1808, Andrew Gregg voted against Simon Snyder, & that Andrew Gregg's name was returned among a list of voters as No 84 of Potter township, and which remained filed in your Prothonotary's Office.

Mr. Patrick Tierney, who I am told keeps a public house in your town, yesterday, in a public company, at Mr. T. Hall's door, of this place, stated, in allusion to this publication in your paper—"that it was a positive falsehood," & added, "that Mr. Gregg did not vote at that election, but on the contrary, was a member of Congress, and in the city of Washington at the time."

I mention this to you, that you may be acquainted with the means made use of by some of the relations of Mr. Gregg in your place, to aid his election—and also that you may take the necessary steps to authenticate what you have published.

We did state, sometime since, in answer to the Commonwealth, a paper published in Harrisburg, that Mr. Gregg voted in 1808, at the election for Governor, at Potter township—The fact was denied, and it was put upon us to prove it. To do so, we appealed to the list of voters of that year, filed in the Prothonotary's Office, and found Mr. Gregg's name No. 84, which for that time fixed a quietus upon the subject. But it seems Patrick H. Tierney, on his return from an electioneering excursion to the Yankee counties, whom he went to convert, stated in Williamsport, that we had published a positive falsehood; Mr. Gregg was not at home, being in Congress at that time, and could not have voted!! This is an excellent specimen of Pa-TRICK'S information. In Congress at the time!! Ha! ha! ha! he! he! he! Well now we cannot refrain from laughter. At Congress on the 2nd Tuesday of October, when Congress do not meet for nearly two months afterwards!!

But in order to put this matter to rest, we have procured a certified copy of the list of voters, at Potter district, on the 2nd Tuesday of October 1808. It contains 254 names, and from No. 79 to No. 84 we find the following:

To which copy is annexed the following certificate:

Centre County, ss.
The within and foregoing is a true copy of the original list of voters of Potter township, &c. as remaining in the Prothonotary's office in the said county of Centre. IN Testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and the seal of said Office at Bellefonte the 27th day of September 1823.

J. G. LOWREY, Proth. We would now ask the good people of Williamsport to determine whether we have not officially convicted Pa-TRICK H. TIERNEY of publishing a positive falsehood. We only

abroad the fellow might be believed—at home, he is so well known that his assertions are regarded about as much as the chirping of a whip-poor-will.

Not only did Andrew Gregg vote at the election for Governor in 1808, but he voted against Snyder, and further, he electioneered against him, retailing all the federal slang he could collect.

A CAUCUS.

A Caucus, consisting chiefly of Mr. Gregg's relations, was held at Watson's, in Bellefonte, on Friday last. The result we have yet to learn. It was, no doubt, for the purpose of coin-ing some new falsehood to injure the democratic cause. The people must be on the look-out.

We have heard of a Shulze political horse race, in answer to the Gregg one. The candidates are denominated Honest John and Limber Andrew. In passing through Bellefonte, it represents the latter as running foul of Dr. Curtin's Pill Box, which had the effect of shortening his wind.

We have seen a handbill, issued by Charles Miner, declaiming against the Democratic party, as atheists, de-ists, unitarians, &c. We would ask the people of Pennsylvania to decide which of the two parties pay respect to religion. Snyder and Findlay each and every year, proclaimed a day of "Thanksgiving and Prayer;" Hiest-er and Gregg have omitted to do so. This fact speaks volumes: comment is unnecessary.

We present our readers with the following calculation, shewing the probable result of the present contest for Governor. To test its accuracy, we request such of them as are curious, to preserve the paper until after the election. In estimating Mr. Shulze's majorities, we have diminished rather than over-rated them—On the other hand, we have given Mr. Gregg all that his friends can reasonably claim.

	Shulze	Gregg.
Adams		1200
Allegheny	100	
Armstrong	750	
Beaver	150	
Bedford	350	
Berks		500
Bucks		400
Bradford	200	
Butler	300	
Cambria		
Centre & Clearfield	900	
Chester		350
Columbia	650	
Crawford	100	
Cumberland	550	
Perry	450	
Dauphin		200
Delaware		550
Erie		
Fayette	1100	
Franklin	200	
Green	850	
Huntingdon	100	
Indiana & Jefferson	550	
Lancaster		1400
Lebanon	400	
Lehigh	800	
Lycoming, &c.	600	
Lezerne	200	
Mercer	400	
Mifflin	450	
Montgomery	600	
Northampton	1500	
Northumberland	450	
Philadelphia city		1500
do county	500	
Schuylkill		50
Somerset	200	
Susquehanna	250	
Pike	350	
Venango & Warren	250	
Washington	1650	
Wayne	200	
Westmoreland	700	
Tioga	300	
Union	200	
York	800	
Total	18100	6150
Majority for Shulze		11950

For the Patriot.
To JAMES HARRIS, Esq. Deputy Surveyor for Centre County, and member of the Federal Corresponding Committee.

To tell you that you have been an office hunter, is unnecessary, if ever you turned your thoughts inwardly you must know it. I have had some knowledge of you for twenty-five years past, and form my estimate of your

have seen, and know of you. During that space of time, OFFICE has been your principal object; and it seems your thirst for it has been such, that you were content to accept of one of the most contemptible in the county. A pity, indeed! that a man of your soaring ambition, should be confined to so narrow a sphere.

I am not one of those who believe, that there is any thing very wrong in this desire for office. My creed is, that it is perfectly right, so long as a man under its influence pursues a correct and honorable course; but whenever he departs from right, in order to attain his end, then it is both morally and politically an offence, and one of no trifling magnitude. What has been your conduct in this respect? Have you not alternately declared yourself a democrat and federalist, in order to answer your personally interested views? The principles of the two parties are fixed, and as opposite as the antipodes, yet have you not in your lifetime, frequently declared yourself the friend of each? Whilst you were a democrat, have you not been guilty of conduct which you reprobated in the federalists; and whilst you were a federalist, have you not been guilty of conduct which you declared most wicked and a violation of the peoples rights. "Come let us reason a little together."

It seems that you were chairman of a meeting of Mr. Gregg's federal relations, that convened at Watson's on the 4th of July last, to devise measures to promote Gregg's election. You issued an address, in which you declaim most vehemently against legislative interference in the nomination of a candidate for Governor. Your words are—

"The first question for our consideration is the manner of nominating the respective candidates. The first named gentleman (Mr. Shulze) was nominated by a convention convened at the instance of a legislative caucus. Let us enquire whether this is in accordance with our constitution or the spirit of our government.

It is an axiom of Political truth, that sovereignty rests in the people, and that all power not specially delegated remains with them. The power of electing a Chief Magistrate is inherent to the people, and as an attribute of that sovereignty, the selection and nomination of candidates is with them; and any infringement of that power is a direct usurpation of their rights. The Legislature had usurped and exercised this power unquestioned, until its evils and corruption had become glaring and intolerable. In 1817 an inquiry as to this legislative usurpation was excited among the people, which resulted in a universal manifestation of public opinion against it; and it was repudiated as corrupt and unconstitutional."

And again, at a meeting of the federal friends of Gregg held at the Court House, during the week of the August court, you, as one of the committee appointed to draft resolutions, reported the following:

"Resolved, That we view with sentiments of alarm and indignant disapprobation, the attempt of certain members of the Legislature to violate the spirit of the constitution, by usurping the power of nomination to the important office of Governor, which rests alone with the people."

Now this is all perfectly correct, and no democrat can have any objection to it; but you go on to pervert the truth, by saying that J. Andrew Shulze was nominated by a legislative caucus. This you know to be FALSE, and you knew it at the time; and you made this assertion for no other reason than to hide the fact, that Andrew Gregg was nominated in that way. You flattered yourself that by crying legislative influence, you could evade an enquiry as to how your friend Gregg was nominated.

But I am persuaded you were not in earnest when you declaimed against legislative dictation. You are friendly to it, but you had the wisdom to know that it would not go down with the people to declare your principles openly. My reason for believing these to be your principles, is that on looking over an old file of the Lancaster Journal, I find in one of the 5th March 1805 the following:

"We the subscribers, members of the General Assembly, considering the long tried, firm and meritorious services of Thomas M'Kean, do, upon due deliberation, recommend him to our fellow citizens, to be supported at the next election, for the office of Governor."

Mathias Gress, George Spangler, Christ. Moyer, R. Welles.
Yes Sir, here it stands recorded, that you were a member of the legislative caucus that nominated Thomas M'Kean in 1805, in opposition to Simon Snyder; and now tell me candidly how do you think your profession in 1823 will accord with your practice in 1805? The caucus of which you were a member, was federal exclusively, and you were openly and avowedly a member of the federal party; yet in 1823 you denounce legislative caucussing, and declare that you always were a democrat! Here are truth and consistency with a vengeance!

You were not in earnest when you declaimed against legislative influence, and announced yourself a consistent democrat; you did it merely to deceive the people, and believing that your gross inconsistency could not be exposed. This was your motive; and now let me ask you, in the spirit of friendship, do you believe that there is no immorality in all this? Let me assure you I do not intend to harrow up your feelings, or produce any remorse in your conscience; I will be it from me; but I cannot forbear, at this time, telling you, that unless a man guards well his thirst for office, it will lead him into a labyrinth of inconsistencies, well calculated to injure his moral, religious and political character.

You pretend to a good deal of natural shrewdness, and it does astonish me that you could so far forget yourself. There can be no excuse for you. Your desire for continuance in the petty office you now hold may be great, but it affords you no covering. No office, however important and however great the emolument, ought to induce a man to change his politics twenty times in the course of twenty-five years, and at the same time declare that he was always consistent, and had never changed! No office ought to induce a man to be the member of a federal Legislative Caucus in 1805, and in 1823 act as chairman of a meeting, proclaim himself a democrat, and denounce legislative caucussing. Do not think, for a moment, that I consider it wrong for a man to denounce this species of caucussing; by no means; I am opposed to it, ten times more than ever James Harris was, or is. I could never believe him, when he would say, that he was unfriendly to it. It is the inconsistency of the man who could thus act that I detest, and which every honest man ought to detest likewise.

I ask the attention of the citizens of Centre and Clearfield Counties to these facts. Can it be that they will be imposed upon by such a Proteus as James Harris; who has pestered them with hand bill upon hand bill, against Legislative caucussing, when this same James Harris was the first to be guilty of the abominable conduct he now so much deprecates. He has twice acted as chairman of federal meetings in favor of Gregg, and the whole burden of his song was against legislative influence. He has twice attempted to impose upon the people of Centre County, wilfully and wickedly, by framing and adopting resolutions, that Mr. Shulze's nomination was effected by a legislative caucus. He knew better, but what he will not say and do, may be determined by the exposition I have given of his political conduct. I have weighed him in the balance of truth and consistency and find him greatly wanting. I hope the honest part of the community will attach credit accordingly to the productions of James Harris, the federalist of 1805 and the democrat of 1823; and all in order to be continued in the office of Deputy Surveyor for Centre County!!!
SENEX.

Boggs township, Centre county, September 16, 1823.

MR. EDITOR,
Dr. Linnwood and Mr. Wax nose passed through this township last week, on an electioneering tour. They called at Davy's house, an honest old german, but he was not at home. They left word that if he came home before their return, he should not neglect waiting for them. Davy waited accordingly, expecting something of great importance was about to take place. In the evening they returned:
"Well, Davy, how goes it?"
"Just middling," says Davy.
They then presented a pocket fistol well charged with Brandy.
"Here, Davy, take a shot; it will do you good after a hard day's work."
"Tell us, Davy, who are you going to vote for Governor?"—"Drink Davy, drink."
"Why, says Davy, I allowed to vote for Shulze."
"Come, Davy, drink; you had better vote for your neighbour, Mr. Gregg."
"I used to know Mr. Shulze very well said Davy, and I liked him

about it, but I'll see again the election."

"Give us the bottle, Davy; good evening, Sir;" and away they drove like Jehu of old.

A SHULZEMAN.

From the Pennsylvania Intelligencer. Messrs Mowry & Cameron—My friend, the editor of the Commonwealth, advises me to bet and "lay it on thick" I feel a disposition to bet a few dollars, and therefore take this method of informing any of the betting gentry, that I will bet five dollars on each and every district or county in the state, in the following manner:

I will bet that Andrew Gregg will not receive a majority of votes in those districts or counties which governor Hies or received a majority, at the election of 1820, and that J. Andrew Shulze will receive a larger majority than Wm Findlay, in those districts or counties which gave him a majority in 1820. Call on the printer with your

CASH.

From the Columbian Observer. Every poor man, or rather every man who is not rich is opposed to Andrew Gregg, because he voted to deprive them of the Right of Suffrage, which Gregg maintains the poor should never be permitted to exercise; being of the opinion of the Yankee Royal Family that property and not persons, G. L. D. and not human happiness, should be the measure and object of Representation!! Such is the abominable Aristocracy of Andrew Gregg.

Mr. Shulze is the friend of the poor man, and the champion of his rights, being in principle, feeling, and practice, a Democrat. He is likewise an Economist, for the same reason, that he consults the interest of the industrious and labouring classes, whom he is not willing to tax to pamper pride, or minister to the pomp and magnificence of Aristocracy.—He is an economist from principle, because he knows that the public money is in fact, the money of the People, and is taken from the pockets of the industrious only. Those who vote for Mr. Shulze, only vote to preserve their own property, secure their own rights, and promote their own happiness.

(Translated from the Lebanon Morning Star.)

Hear His Neighbor's; SHULZE AT HOME!!!

Printer Stover—I saw with great surprise, in Hartman's paper, that at a late meeting of Gregg's men, held at Schaeffer's town, my name was placed on the committee of vigilance for Heidelberg township, on their shameful and disgraceful proceedings, which was done without my consent or knowledge. I am a friend of Mr. Shulze, & know that he always was a GOOD, HONEST AND HONORABLE OFFICER of our County; he often gave me good and better advice than an attorney, and I sincerely believe that my friend, Mr. Shulze, is as suitable and deserving for Governor as any other person. I desire you to publish in your paper, that I am the warm friend and advocate of Mr. Shulze, and not for Gregg!!

SAMUEL BEA Z, senior. Heidelberg township, Sept. 8, 1823.

From the same. Mr. Stover—We have seen in the Lebanon Federal paper, that at a late Federal Gregg's meeting, held at Schaeffer's town, our names were placed on the committee of vigilance to promote the election of Gregg; this is to notify you that we shall vote and promote the election of Mr. Shulze.

SAMUEL LEIDIG, PHILIP MOKK, JACOB FRIBERGFR, HENRY DESSINGER, PHILIP BRECHT, JOHN STUMP, JOHN SCHELL.

From the Lancaster Free Press. GREGG'S DEMOCRACY. The Federal papers exultingly quote an essay from the "New York Daily Advertiser," which vouches for the genuine republicanism of Andrew Gregg. The editor states that he has known Mr Gregg for many years, and that he is convinced of his firm and unswerving democratic principles. But, reader, who is this worthy New York Editor? No less a personage than the—SECRETARY OF THE HARTFORD CONVENTION!!! A worthy voucher indeed!!!

The Peace Society of Cumberland, and the Secretary of the Hartford Convention, must be well acquainted with the principles of Andrew Gregg! He advocated them during the war; and, as "one good turn deserves another," they now come forward in