THE COMPILER.

S. J. STABLE, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

GETTYSBURG, PA:

MONDAY MORNING, OCT. 3, 1859.

Democratic State Ticket.

For Auditor General,
RICHARDSON L. WRIGHT, of Philadelphia.
For Surveyor General,
JOHN ROWE, of Franklin county.

Democratic County Ticket.

State Senator,
J. W. DOUGLAS, of Franklin county.
Assembly,
FREDERICK DIEHL, of Franklin.
Commissioner,
JAMES H. MARSHALL, of Hamiltonban.
Director of the Poor,
JOSEPH J. KUHN, of Reading.
Auditor,
AMOS LEFEVER, of Union.
County Treasurer,
WAYBRIGHT ZIEGLER, of Gettysburg.
District Attorney,
J. C. NEELY, of Gettysburg.
Surveyor,
JOHN G. BRINKERHOPP, of Straban.

MORE MEETINGS!

Democrats of Adams, Rally in Your Strength!

VICTORY AWAITS US!

MEETINGS of the Democracy, the friends of Correct Principles, and opponents of Proscription and Sectionalism, will be held in various parts of Adams county, as follows:

At McSherrystown, on Monday afternoon, Oct. 3;

At J. E. Smith's, in Mountpleasant township, on Monday evening, Oct. 3;

At Strasbaugh's School-house, in Buchanan Valley, Franklin twp., on Tuesday evening, Oct. 4;

At Gettysburg, on Wednesday evening, Oct. 5;

At Goodyear's, Graffenberg Springs, in Franklin twp., on Thursday evening, Oct. 6;

At Mount Vernon School-house, in Mountpleasant twp., on Thursday evening, Oct. 6;

At Irishtown, in Oxford twp., on Friday evening, Oct. 7;

At Caledonia Springs, on Saturday evening, Oct. 8;

At Round Hill, in Reading twp., on Saturday evening, Oct. 8;

At Hunterstown, on Monday afternoon, Oct. 10, at 2 o'clock precisely;

At Middletown, on Monday evening, Oct. 10;

At Munshower's Tavern, in Franklin twp., on Monday afternoon, Oct. 10, at 3 o'clock precisely;

At Shaner's Tavern, in Franklin twp., on Monday evening, Oct. 10;

☞ Several Speakers may be expected to address each Meeting. COME ONE—COME ALL!

☞ The Democratic Brass Band of Gettysburg will be present and perform at the Meetings, in their magnificent new Chariot.

By order of Committee.

Oct. 3, 1859. H. J. STABLE, Ch'n.

The Importance of One Vote.

The importance of one vote is rarely made more manifest than it was in the recent elections in Kentucky and Tennessee. One Opposition candidate for Congress, in the former State, was elected by three votes, and in another district the vote was a *tie*. In the latter State one Opposition candidate for Congress was elected by *eight* votes, another by *twenty-six*, and another by *fifty*. In all these cases there were doubtless Democrats enough remaining at home to have turned the scale in favor of the Democratic nominees, had they gone to the election and deposited their ballots, as it was their duty to have done. We hope that Democrats will bear these instances in mind, this fall, in this county and State, and not under estimate the importance of *one vote* in determining the result of the election.

The Truth at Last, tho' Long Coming!

A year ago, the *Compiler* asserted, and PROVED from the House Journal, that CHARLES WILL had supported, whilst a member, the $600 compensation, instead of $700. The *Star* and *Sentinel*, week after week, declared the statement false, and piled up columns upon columns of Italics and little and large Capitals to show that our position was all wrong—that we "lied!" "lied!" "lied!"—just as they are doing now in regard to our exposure of Durboraw's votes.

Conscious of being in the right, we stuck to it, and believed that all parties would acknowledge the fact some day. Our expectation is already being realized. At the Opposition meeting at New Oxford on Saturday last, one of the speakers ADMITTED THAT MR. WILL *DID* SUPPORT THE $600 SALARY, against that of $700!

What think you of that, honest readers—especially such of you as were accustomed to read the plenary indignant denials of the *Star* and *Sentinel* a year ago. As it is now in regard to Mr. Will, it may be a twelve-month hence in respect to Mr. Durboraw. *Then* they may acknowledge that the *Compiler* is right now, just as one of their load guns acknowledged on Saterday the truth of our position in 1858! "Can such men be trusted?"

RAIN OR SHINE!

Democrats of Adams, GO TO THE ELECTION! Let nothing keep a single voter back. The Opposition are trying to poll their full vote. Let us meet them in our strength, and VICTORY IS CERTAIN!

SPURIOUS TICKETS!

The *Star* managers, in their last, say:—"Neither of spurious tickets having already been circulated in a number of the districts." They know that each is the fact, for, if our information be correct, they, *the Star managers themselves*, are having SPURIOUS TICKETS circulated. Such a game need not be followed on to secure success for the Democratic ticket.

DEMOCRATS, BE ON YOUR GUARD!

REMEMBER

That REUBEN DURBORAW voted for $700 a year in actual field at a time when the prices of things did not much more than one-third of what they are now, thus giving $700 or $800 pay for the session probably!

Durboraw's Pledges!

DURBORAW'S VOTES!

Let the Journal of the House Speak!

$500 OFFERED!!!

"I think the Act of last session increasing their compensation to $700 per annum was unwise, and, if elected, I shall certainly vote for its repeal, and use my influence to have the old compensation of $500 restored."—*Samuel Durboraw's Letter to Jacob Resser, Sept. 8, 1858.*

☞ Such was the pledge made a year ago by SAMUEL DURBORAW, the Know Nothing and Black Republican candidate for re-election to the Legislature. The people have a right to know whether his votes last winter squared with his promises, and we propose to give a full, fair, and connected statement of them, so far as they related to the question of "extra pay." The *Star* and the *Sentinel* may rave and rant as much as they please—they may, in order to break the force of our exposures of Durboraw's delinquencies, denounce and vilify us as far as their high-toned christian morality may permit—they may characterize us as "unscrupulous," "ungentlemanly," and so on, to the end of the chapter of fishwoman slang—we have the consolation of knowing that THE TRUTH is with us—that the regular JOURNAL OF THE HOUSE sustains us in every position we have taken. So confident are we of this, that for the correctness of every vote given in this article, we pledge ONE HUNDRED DOLLARS—the Journal, kept by the sworn officers of the House, and which does not lie, to be appealed to for the proof.

Mr. Durboraw's pledge is given above,—taken from the *Star* of September 17th, 1858. We are particular about this, as it is not unlikely that the *Star* and the *Sentinel will even deny the pledge*, if it should seem to be necessary in order to help Mr. Durboraw out of the difficulty he has gotten into *by breaking it*. They have already denied that the Appropriation Bill *made provision for the payment of the members' salary*, in the face of the notorious fact that if they had not been paid thro' it, they would have returned home *without any pay at all!* So brazen-faced have these papers become in their falsehoods.

Now to Durboraw's votes:

On the 2d of March, the Appropriation Bill was under consideration. The fourth section, as reported by the Committee of Ways and Means, provided for the sum of one hundred and fifty thousand dollars, for the payment of the expenses of the Legislature, including the pay and mileage of the members, clerks and officers, stationery, newspapers, &c. The section contained no change in the amount of salary to members, and, of course, left it at $700, as for the previous session.

Mr. Hottenstine moved to amend by repealing the $700 pay, and making it $500.—Mr. Hamersly moved to amend Hottenstine's amendment, by making the pay a *daily* one—$1.50, with expenses going to and returning from Harrisburg. The yeas and nays were called on Mr. Hamersly's motion, and it carried—49 yeas to 41 nays—*Mr. Durboraw voting among the nays*, or AGAINST the $1,50 per day. The question then came up, "will the House agree to the amendment as amended," and the yeas were 39, the nays 52—Mr. Durboraw still voting with the nays, or against the $1,50 per day. The motion was declared lost. For these two votes we refer to page 454 of the House Journal, March 2d.

Mr. Walborn moved to make the pay one thousand dollars per session. This Mr. McClure proposed to amend by making the pay $5,00 *per day, but fixed no limit as to the number of days the pay might continue.* This was a sharp trick of McClure's to get large pay through protracted sessions—*all the time* at $5 per diem. The yeas and nays were called on this motion of McClure's and resulted, 36 for, to 59 against—*Mr. Durboraw among the yeas.* The amendment was declared lost, when Mr. Walborn withdrew his $1000 motion—and the section was agreed to, *still allowing the* $700, as the winter before, and to the repeal of which Samuel Durboraw was most solemnly pledged. For Durboraw's vote on the McClure amendment see House Journal, page 455,—March 2d.

Thus far in the Journal, Mr. Durboraw has not redeemed his pledges.

March 3d and 4th were mainly taken up with the same bill, and in the evening of the 4th, it came up on final passage, the 4th section remaining unchanged, and of course still continuing the old salary of $700. On this final passage vote the yeas and nays were as follows—see House Journal, page 412:—

Yeas—Messrs. Abbott, Barnsley, Barlow, Boyer, (Clearfield,) Brodhead, Burley, Campbell, Chase, Dismant, Dodds, Eckman, Evans, Fisher, Foster, Galley, Good, Graham, Gratz, Irish, Jackson, Ketchum, Kinney, Lawrence, (Washington,) Mahaffey, M'Candy, Neall, Oaks, Proudfoot, Pughe, Quigley, Rohrer, Shaffer, Sheppard, Styer, Taylor, Thompson, Thorn, Walborn, Walker, Warden, Witman, Wigton, Wilcox, Williams, (Bucks,) and Lawrence, *Speaker*—45.

Nays—Messrs. Acker, Bryson, Church, Custer, Fleming, Glatz, Hamersly, Hill, Hottenstine, Keneagy, Laird, Mann, M'Clure, M'Dowell, Patterson, Pierce, Pinkerton, Ramsdell, Smith, (Berks,) Stoneback, Stuart, Wagoneller, Wiley, Williston, Wilson, Withrow and Wolf—27.

Mr. Durboraw's name is not to be found in this list—simply because he was afraid to "face the music," and DODGED the vote!—The *Star* and the *Sentinel* endeavor to make it appear that he voted—but the Journal says he did not, that Journal which was kept by Mr. Durboraw's own political friends, and who were sworn to keep it faithfully. We do not believe that Mr. Durboraw himself will say he was present and voted at the time.—We will bet a "V" or an "X" that he will not *make an affidavit* that he voted on the final passage of the Appropriation Bill on the 4th of March, 1858.

The Bill, having passed the House, was ordered to be sent to the Senate, for the action of that body. A number of its sections were disagreed to, and a Committee of Conference was appointed from both Houses. On the 11th of April, this Committee made their Report, and by not saying a solitary word in regard to the pay of the members, left that question just where it was when the Appropriation Bill finally passed the House—and just where it stood a year before—at $700! *For this Report*, SAMUEL DURBORAW VOTED!—this Report, which still left undisturbed the $700 pay to members, an amount of compensation which, from his high-sounding pledges a year ago, it was fair to infer he would reduce in every shape, and to the last. But he voted FOR IT—thus putting the emphatic stamp of a course of singular delinquency, on this question—a course which, leads, perhaps, the bad all the blind from excuse to blame the $700 salary continued, that he might set aside a $200 Electioneering Fund, to secure a re-election—and make $700 *more!* For this vote of Durboraw's we refer to pages 1094 and 1095 of the House Journal—March 11th.

Such are the votes of Mr. Durboraw on the "extra pay" question. We appeal to the Journal for their correctness in every particular. They demonstrate that Durboraw did not carry out his pledges—the *righteous indignation*" of the *Star* and *Sentinel* to the contrary notwithstanding.

Two More of Durboraw's Votes.

☞ SAMUEL DURBORAW, in the Legislature, last winter, voted AGAINST the *indefinite postponement* of a Bill to prevent foreign-born citizens from voting during the SIX MONTHS AFTER THEIR NATURALIZATION!! This vote was all the same as if he had voted directly in favor of the Bill, the indefinite postponement being the *test*, and the Bill was killed thereby. Thus Mr. Durboraw exhibited his love for Know Nothingism, whose principles of proscription he *swore* to carry out in the Mountjoy Council of that midnight Order. Mark it—Samuel Durboraw voted to keep naturalized citizens out of their votes for six months after receiving their naturalization papers!

☞ In the same manner did SAMUEL DURBORAW cast his vote AGAINST a Bill *to prevent* the intermarriage of whites and blacks. This, it is supposed, was to satisfy his Amalgamation friends. Mark this, too!

Democrats, Sound the Alarm!

Know Nothing "Sam" again in his Midnight Councils!

Members of the Opposition deny that secret Know Nothing meetings are now held in this county, and spend no little breath in the effort to keep down all suspicion.—It won't do, however. We almost daily receive information, from various districts, of circumstances so convincing, as to no longer leave room for doubt.

Here is one of them, as an instance. We are informed, by a gentleman of high character, that on Thursday evening last, Mr. Samuel Durboraw was at Heidlersburg on an electioneering tour. The town was quite lively with Know Nothings until about half an hour after dark, when they suddenly disappeared, and nothing was to be seen of them until about 10 o'clock, when they re-appeared, as quietly and suddenly as they had left! Now, can it be doubted that a secret Know Nothing meeting was held there or in the immediate neighborhood at that time?

This is but one of numerous similar incidents of recent occurrence that have come to our notice, and we warn the friends of Equal Rights all over the county to be up and doing—to watch the midnight tricksters—expose them—and at the election defeat them, as we have heretofore done. AROUSE! AWAKE!—TO ARMS! TO ARMS!!

Pig or Pup!

We are reliably informed that one of the Know Nothing speakers at Fairfield, the other night, declared his belief that FREDERICK DIEHL last fall VOTED FOR CHARLES WILL, notwithstanding the charge to the contrary, and hoped that for that reason no American or Republican would vote for him! This was putting the *pig* into the basket.—But at Oxford, on Saturday afternoon, the pig was taken out and the *pup* put in. The gentleman who made the Durboraw speech there, *not* the one who made it at Fairfield, took directly the opposite ground, and declared that Frederick Diehl did *not* vote for Mr. Will!

These hungry tricksters, in order to humbug the people, are "all things to all men"—pig here and pup there—anything and everything to suit different localities. What would serve their purpose at Oxford, might be death at Fairfield! And yet they prate of "fairness!"

"Fair and Straight-forward!"

"Mr. Durboraw is a fair, straight-forward man."—*Sentinel.*

☞ Was it a very "fair" act in Mr. DURBORAW to take an *oath* to proscribe and set a mark upon citizens of foreign birth and members of a particular church—classes who are as patriotic, and as good citizens and prompt tax-payers as any other in the country—many of them, too, his neighbors. Was that "fair?"—And is it "fair" that he should now ask these very citizens, whom he thus swore to deprive of full political rights, for their votes? In addition, was it "straight-forward" in him to leave his home in the darkness of night, in order to reach a country school-house, there to take the infamous obligation?

Disinterested!

The organs of the Superior Know Nothing Councillors are working themselves into a fever in trying to make the impression that Mr. Durboraw's deposit of $200 was a very disinterested act. If he had no, at the time made his arrangements to be a candidate for re-election to the same office, the transaction might have that appearance; but as he was in the field for re-nomination and re-election, it can be looked upon in no other light than as a BRIBE offered to the voters of the county—a bribe of FOUR CENTS A HEAD!—Mr. Durboraw is known to be just as anxious to make money as the majority of people, and just as good at holding on to it. Would he have given away $200 without expecting *more* in return on the investment? NO, NOT HE!

More and More Desperate!

The tricksters who manage the *Star* and Know Nothing affairs generally, are finding themselves still closer and closer to the wall. The large and enthusiastic Democratic meetings held throughout the county last week, bother them sorely—and hence their studied efforts to make them out as small as possible. But they "won't take!" The people in the localities where both parties have held meetings know better, and can place a proper estimate upon the *Star's* representations, or rather, misrepresentations.

Commas misplaced.

Mac.—Thou canst not say, I did it.
Never shake thy gory locks at me.—
Act 3, Scene 4th of Macbeth, not Duncan.

☞ The Opposition speakers, at Petersburg, on Friday night, pitched, tore and raved in a manner so bombastic and "highfalutin" as to leave many of their hearers in doubt whether the meeting was intended as a bona fide political gathering or a fantastical performance. It is suspected that "several lines" were greatly damaged in the herculean effort to demolish the veracity of the *Compiler*. Persevere, gentlemen. *Cease away*—the file can stand it if *your* grinders can.

☞ Look out for an awful break-down! McClure, with a load already more than he can carry, undertakes to "tote" Durboraw along. It is really *too* kind, even if they were partners in the "five dollars a day and roast beef" business.

☞ Let the people remember, that the Legislature of 1857 was the first to increase the salaries of the members "one hundred dollars," and that the bill making that increase was passed by an Opposition Senate, and was signed by an Opposition Governor!

Five "Dollars a Day and Roast Beef" Again.

Here's one of the *Sentinel's* "white lies." It says:

"The attempt to change it [$700 pay] last session failed—although Mr. Durboraw supported the proposition to reduce it to $500."

Mr. Durboraw did no such thing, as the editor knew when he penned the assertion.—The *Sentinel* would, we infer from the sneaking style of this little "white lie," have its readers believe that Mr. Durboraw supported a proposition to reduce the pay to $500 *per session*, as he promised he would! But that journal can't catch gudgeons as easily as all that comes to. Mr. Durboraw never voted for $500 pay per session, and we defy the *Sentinel*, now and here, to point us to the page of the Journal that proves he did.

He did vote for McClure's proposition for $5,00 A DAY, but that was very far from "restoring the old compensation of $500" *per session!*—because McClure was careful (the tricky advocate of high pay) *not to limit the number of days during which such pay should continue*, so that it might as easily have amounted to $800 as under, and more likely above, as a majority of the members would doubtless have made it convenient to sit out a *long* session whilst that rate of pay continued! Most of them don't make half as much at home.

To show how far the *Sentinel* is stretching the truth in undertaking to say that Mr. Durboraw redeemed his pledges by voting for McClure's $5,00 per day, we give extracts from a few of the speeches made in the House at the time, as follows:

Mr. Hamersly desired to explain his vote. The proposition was calculated to increase the pay of members, and therefore he had voted against it.

Mr. Neall thought that the amendment to the amendment was making the salary approximate nearer to $1000. He had therefore voted for it.

Mr. Stevens said, my reason for voting against this amendment, is because I think it will have a tendency to increase our salaries by protracted sessions, instead of diminishing them. I am in favor of a fixed salary of $500 and mileage.

Mr. Kinney gave the following reasons for his vote on the above question: My reasons for voting against the amendment of the gentleman from Franklin, (Mr. M'Clure,) to fix the pay of members at $5 per day are, that the per diem system is an exploded system in Pennsylvania, and would tend to prolong the sessions; and, on the whole, increase the expenses of the government.

Mr. Fleming gave his reasons for voting "no" on the amendment of the gentleman from Franklin, because he sincerely believed it would result in increasing the compensation of members to more than $500, the sum which he thought sufficient compensation. It being evident that every day over one hundred, would result in some $800 per day expenses, and hold out inducements for prolonged sessions.

Mr. Pinkerton said he was opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Franklin. (Mr. M'Clure.) He believed if the amendment carried, that the expenses of the government would be increased rather than diminished. The expenses each day, apart from the pay of members, are not less than $500 per diem, in this House and Senate; and he felt satisfied if this amendment prevailed, that hereafter, instead of the session lasting, as they should, but about eighty days, they would be prolonged to not less than one hundred and twenty-five days. This, at $5,00 per diem, would amount for pay of members, in House and Senate, to $83,125; to which add forty-five days extra for officers' pay, light, &c., at $500 per day, making in the whole $105,625; whilst the present session at $700 per day for members, will cost but $93,100: saving to the Commonwealth $12,525. For these reasons he should vote against the amendment, and hoped that it would not prevail.

Mr. Boyer, (Schuylkill,) said he voted against the amendment of the gentleman from Franklin, for similar reasons as those given by his colleague, (Mr. Pinkerton,) and believing fully that should the amendment carry, it would greatly increase the expenses of this Commonwealth.

Mr. Bertolet said—I vote against the increase of pay of the members of this House, on the ground that I think five hundred dollars is sufficient for any member, who comes here, for the short time that his services are required. A mechanic or laborer, who labors a whole year, scarcely earns more than one-half what members of the Legislature receive.

Mr. Durboraw did not heed such warnings, notwithstanding his pledges to the people of Adams county. He followed and voted with McClure, the persistent advocate of high pay, who declared, in 1858, that $700 was no more than a member should have—he would vote for it, *and did!*

Our readers will have no difficulty in seeing that in this vote, Mr. Durboraw did *not* support a proposition to reduce the pay to $500 per session—but, on the contrary, one which would inevitably have swelled the annual pay from $600 to $1000!

☞ Mr. Durboraw, in his Resser Letter, declared that

"If a public officer has a *right* to vote himself, or take from the public treasury $200 additional to his legal salary, he has a right to vote for and take $1000 additional."

You were right there, Mr. Durboraw; but how came it that you voted for McClure's proposition for $5,00 PER DAY, *without limiting the number of days, to which such pay should apply?* Had it carried, the Legislature might have been in session the summer through, each member drawing his FIVE DOLLARS A DAY all the while, and thus increasing the expenditures of the State hundreds of thousands of dollars.

☞ The Opposition papers say the *Compiler* "lies" in regard to Mr. Durboraw's votes.—FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS are at their service if they will PROVE from the Journal, that we misrepresent him.

For The Compiler.

MR. STABLE:—I have been reading your paper for a few months, and my attention was particularly arrested by your allusions to the Opposition nominations for Commissioner and Director of the Poor. On looking at the Map of the county, I notice that Freedom and Cumberland are joined, in a kind of wedge, by Hamiltonban. The Directors who will remain in the Board reside in Freedom (Mr. WHITE) and Cumberland (Mr. SPANGLER.)—If Hamiltonban should get the third Director, three *adjoining* townships would have the whole Board. This would not be fair, and, although generally voting with Mr. Musselman's party, I cannot sanction this movement with my vote. The allusion in the *Adams Sentinel*, last Monday, to this point, is not satisfactory, but is a "begging of the question." It does not answer the question of the impropriety of the *location* of the present candidate.

Beside this, I suspect very strongly that this nomination for Director was the result of the manœuvring of a life-long office-holder in regard to the Commissionership—the one depending on the other. I have long was thought that the office-holder alluded to had more than his share of public favors, in preference to other equally deserving men, who were forced to stand back to make room for him, and I have heretofore complained of it. Believing his present plan to be to the same intent, I cannot vote for his candidate for Commissioner.

A TAXPAYER.

For The Compiler.

Rambling Resser.

MR. STABLE:—It has been asserted that the name of Jacob Resser, the Opposition candidate for Commissioner, has not been on the Tax List, nor has he been a resident of the County, until a recent period.

We desire to obtain correct information as to these assertions. If they be facts, he has not the necessary familiarity with the history and finances of the County, and is undeserving of the suffrage of its CITIZENS.

☞ In response to the above inquiry—we have examined the Duplicates in the Commissioners' Office, and find that although Jacob Resser is not a young man, his name cannot be found on the Lists prior to 1857! What think ye, voters of Adams, of his seeking to foist himself, under the direction of his place-loving wire-worker, into official position, destitute of any claim upon the support of the people for such position?

We know James H. Marshall to have been a life-long resident of the county, fully cognizant of its public affairs, as well as a man of intelligence, excellent judgment and the highest probity.

Communicated.

Opposition Meeting in Cashtown.

Dear Compiler:—Last night was our quiet village visited by McClure and company for the purpose of holding what they chose to call a political meeting. And such a meeting!—It was nothing more nor less than a signal failure from beginning to end, and will be a lasting and eternal disgrace both to themselves and their party. True, there were some 80 to 100 persons present, ladies and all, but of this number fully one-third were from Gettysburg; and of the remaining two-thirds there were nearly as many Democrats as Black Republicans, and those the most attentive listeners.

The Black Republican leaders must indeed have very queer and very erroneous ideas concerning the people of Franklin township, to suppose that they are so extremely verdant and gullible as to believe such silly stuff as they saw fit to spit out last night. But then, like the pig of which Socrates speaks, they have been in the mud, and hence it is quite natural that they should try to rub some of it on Democrats.

After something like an organization was gone through with, Col. McClure made his appearance, mounted on the old Rosinante which has already carried him through more than one campaign—I mean the "Main Line of Public Works, our National and State debt, the Protective Tariff, and Free Labor." Of course, the canal board was Democratic ever since creation, and the men who composed it rogues and swindlers—the Democratic Presidents and Governors have all been thieves and robbers, or their accomplices—the low tariff is the cause of our national poverty,—in short, it would be easier to mention what he didn't hack at than what he did.—What made this gentleman's tirade particularly disagreeable and unpleasant was his unpardonable egotism, that is, he had the private "I" too much in the public ear.

To have accomplished the half of what he claimed for himself, would have required another Hercules. He essayed to effect with a profusion of miserable wit and banter what his paltry arguments could not accomplish.—When his stock of invective was exhausted, he had wisdom enough to vanish during a most impressive silence. A few strangers next set up a feeble call for "Ed McPherson," who soon after mounted the stump. His subject was "Samuel Durboraw," and his object two-fold. The first was to justify Mr. D. in his course last winter; the other was to procure votes for his re-election this fall, neither of which he did. He tell care, however, not to say anything against the irreproachable character of Capt. Diehl. That gentleman, I am sure, would have been ashamed to deliver such a speech in Gettysburg. The whole of his arguments may be summed up thus: *a miserable failure at facetiousness.* To arrest the attention of the audience, he had resource to his old trick of telling stories, some of which are so stale from frequent use that they are positively a bore. The principal thorn in his flesh seemed to be the *Compiler* and its editor. He wound up with his old story concerning a certain hen of his, or somebody elses, trying to hatch seventy eggs, which was just about as much of a possibility as that his party will be victorious at the coming election. A. J. Cover, Esq., was the last speaker. He gravely told his hearers that the "People's party" was sure to be a successful institution in October. As the people and the "People's party" didn't want to hear anything more, they walked off; and he, acting the part of wisdom, soon gathered up his chattles and followed. They overdid the thing entirely, and so did more harm than good. A SPECTATOR.

Cashtown, Pa., Sept. 29th, 1859.

For The Compiler.

LITTLESTOWN, PA., Sept. 27, 1859.

MR. EDITOR: Dear Sir:—The "Nigger" party had a meeting here last night, and of all the political meetings I have ever attended in my life, it certainly was the poorest. There were about one hundred persons present, all told, and nearly one-half were boys. The meeting was organized by Mr. E. Myers getting up and having the officers voted for, and then naming them afterwards. A friend at my right suggests that he did that last, in the event of his naming them first, some of them would have been too exceptionable even for their own "color." One of your Gettysburg lawyers then introduced the candidate for Senator, his presence exciting no applause whatever; and the quasi-congressman elect thinking it too bad, offered three cheers, which were faintly given by the delegation they brought along from Gettysburg. He then opened by expressing his love (!) for Democrats, which was perfectly understood even by the wayfaring, and went on in a poetical strain about our green fields, and hills, and dales, and told us that our prosperity was the result of our own labor, &c.,—something we also were perfectly aware of. His whole speech was entirely foreign from the points at issue, and was perfect bosh. Apropos, after McClure finished, McPherson introduced him to one of our Democrats in the neighborhood, thinking to make a vote, but our old friend said, "You are not my man, I can't go you." It is needless to say that Mr. McClure looked considerably crest-fallen.

McPherson then took the stand, but no one applauded. His speech was of one hour's length, in vindication of Mr. Durboraw's course in the Assembly, but he rather made matters worse than better. He, like McClure, closed amid perfect silence.

Some of the delegation from Gettysburg then called for their lawyer, who responded in a speech of five or ten minutes. He attempted to assail the Democracy, but his efforts were too poor to justify me in giving even this passing notice. When he closed, no one knew it, for no one was paying attention to him, and this was the end of it. I beg pardon, they did afterwards get up a farce by dressing two men up to represent an elephant. A fit synonyme of the whole proceedings.

The Democracy here have their eyes open, and are determined not to be boaxed again. McClure will be beaten out of his boots, and the whole Democratic ticket will receive the largest vote ever polled in this section.

"The per diem system would have been *nearly* as effective in keeping down the pay as the absolute compensation."—*Sentinel.*

☞ "*Nearly*," says the *Sentinel* here, and yet in other parts of the same issue he tries to show that Mr. Durboraw *quite* came up to his pledges, by voting for McClure's $500 *a day* motion. This is a way of shifting and dodging that very *respectable* journal has, but we ask, "what is to be thought of an editor so brazen-faced as that? Surely, no faith can be placed in any of his statements, after such wholesale and persistent falsification." We use the editor's own refined and gentlemanly language.

SKIES BRIGHT!

"THE COUNTRY RISING!"

The Friends of Equal Rights Waking Up to the Importance of the Contest!

LARGE DEMOCRATIC MEETINGS—GREAT ENTHUSIASM!

AT HEIDLERSBURG.

The first Democratic Meeting of the campaign took place at Heidlersburg on Tuesday evening last. Notwithstanding the threatening state of the weather, the friends of the cause poured in from all sides, until it became the largest gathering of the kind we have yet seen in that place. The following gentlemen were chosen officers:

President, HENRY J. MYERS, Esq.

Vice Presidents, John Delap, Samuel Gilliland, Peter Fidler, Jacob Bream, John Lynch, Frederick Pillard, Michael Bowers, Sr., Daniel S. Diehl, John Fieser, Jacob Bollinger.

Secretaries, Peter Miller, Jr., George Shields, Noah F. Hersh, J. M. Pittenturf, Jeremiah Slaybaugh.

The meeting was addressed by D. W. Rowe, and Thos. Orr, Esquires, of Chambersburg, and W. A. Duncan, and J. C. Neely, Esquires, of Gettysburg, in an eloquent, clear and convincing manner, and their remarks were received with frequent bursts of warm applause. H. J. Stable also addressed the assemblage. It adjourned in fine spirits, with three hearty cheers for the Democratic ticket, proposed by that sterling old Democrat, John Lynch, Esq.

AT LITTLESTOWN.

The meeting at Littlestown, on Wednesday evening, was a great gathering of the Democracy of that region—Germany, Mountjoy, Mountpleasant and Union being all represented. The assemblage, we were informed by unprejudiced persons, was fully twice as large as that at the Opposition meeting held there a few evenings previous, and the warmest enthusiasm prevailed throughout. The meeting was called to order by Jacob Klunk, when the following officers were chosen:

President, WM. DUTTERA.

Vice Presidents, George Gonder, Simon S Bishop, Henry Rahter, Peter Greenholtz, George Hesson, Thomas Bittle, Wm. Rider, Moses Hartman, Joseph Arntz, George Lefever, Levi Golden, Wm. H. Lott, John L. Fisher.

Secretaries, Dr. S. G. Kinser, Paul Kuhns, Dr. A. L. Bishop, Wm. Hofferd.

Thomas Orr, Wm. A. Duncan, J. C. Neely and D. W. Rowe successively addressed the meeting, and their remarks were received with frequent demonstrations of satisfaction by the audience. H. J. Stable concluded the speaking, when the meeting adjourned, amidst thunders of cheers for the whole Democratic ticket. It was remarked on all sides that so large a political gathering had not taken place there for many years, if ever before.

AT EAST BERLIN.

The meeting at East Berlin took place on Thursday afternoon, and notwithstanding the extraordinarily busy season with the farmers, very many of whom were just getting in their seeding, the attendance was good, and all appeared to feel the liveliest interest in the canvass. The officers were:

President, WM. WOLF, Esq.

Vice Presidents, George Baker, Esq., Geo. King, Joseph Woods, H. K. Stoner, Michael Brown, Jeremiah Slaybaugh, Abraham King, Peter Chromister, John Lynch, Frederick Holtz, Michael Dellone, Peter Firestone, Samuel March, Frederick Heidler.

Secretaries, W. S. Hildebrand, C. E. Kuhn, Israel Trostle, John Dellone.

E. B. Buehler, W. A. Duncan, and J. C. Neely, Esquires, of Gettysburg, addressed the meeting in an able manner, explaining a number of the issues between the parties, and afforded high gratification to their hearers.—H. J. Stable closed with allusions to county politics, and the meeting adjourned with the determination to do full duty at the polls.

AT NEW CHESTER.

The meeting at New Chester, on Thursday evening, was a glorious demonstration. The surrounding townships of Tyrone, Reading, Hamilton, Oxford and Mountpleasant, were well represented, whilst old Straban was out in great force—exhibiting how earnest the friends of the GOOD OLD CAUSE are becoming, and how determined to conquer on the second Tuesday of October next. With such a spirit prevailing, the Democracy, the party of Equal Laws and Equal Rights, cannot fail to triumph. The meeting organized as follows:

President, GEORGE EHREHART, Esq.

Vice Presidents, Henry Myers, John Thomas, Thomas N. Dicks, John B. Kuhn, John L. Taughinbaugh, John Eckenrode, Wm. Thomas, of C., Col. J. L. Neely, H. J. Myers, H. A. Picking, Maj. Jacob Sanders, John Lynch, Philip Donohue, Thomas R. Bower.

Secretaries, Philip A. Myers, David Holtz, Thomas Ehrehart, Theodore Taughinbaugh, Daniel Thomas, Daniel Lynch.

E. B. Buehler, Esq., made a short and pertinent speech, and then introduced upon the stand J. W. DOUGLAS, Esq., the Democratic candidate for the State Senate, who was received with many cheers. Mr. Douglas addressed the vast crowd at some length, in a speech of great power, which, whilst it contained no word of disrespect towards his opponent, Mr. McClure, abounded in facts of telling force against him. When he ceased speaking, "three cheers for Douglas!" were given with a will.

J. C. Neely and S. J. Vandersloot followed, with speeches that were well received, and H. J. Stable concluded—when cheers for the whole ticket were proposed and responded to until the welkin rang again and again. Such gatherings cannot but strike terror into the mongrel Know Nothing and Black Republican Opposition.

AT FAIRFIELD.

The meeting at Fairfield on Friday evening was another glorious outpouring of the people—nearly TWICE AS LARGE as that of the Opposition a few evenings previous. The Band and large delegation from this place were met, this side of town, by a procession of 40 or 50 horsemen, forming a handsome escort. During the evening bon-fires blazed brightly at various points in the village, and the liveliest enthusiasm prevailed during the entire proceedings. The large assemblage was called to order by Isaac Hurster, when the following gentlemen were chosen officers:

President, Z. HERBERT, Esq.

Vice Presidents, Robert McLaughlin, John Gelbach, Barnard Bigham, Adam Sanders, Aaron Woodring, George Hull, Michael Hagley, Wm. Culp, Isaac Robinson, Jesse P. Topper, Jacob L. Firor, John Bennett, Peter Stoner, Wm. Winebrenner, Jacob Hoodeshell.

Secretaries, Benj. Reed, John McConnell, George Watson, Frederick Dube, Westly King.

J. C. Neely, J. W. Douglas, Dr. W. C. Stern and H. J. Stable addressed the meeting, discussing the questions now at issue. The utmost attention was paid throughout, and the meeting adjourned with many cheers for the cause and the candidates.

AT ABBOTTSTOWN.

The turn out at this place, on Saturday afternoon, was larger than we expected, and an earnest feeling for the success of the ticket was evinced by all. The meeting organized as follows:

President, FREDERICK WOLF.

Vice Presidents, John Bitzer, Jacob Holtzinger, Samuel Grenoff, A. W. Stern, Daniel Forney, Nicholas Carroll, Benjamin Wright, Henry Mayer, George Baker, of J., Samuel Wolf, H. K. Stoner.

Secretaries, Wm. Bittinger, Joseph Wolf, Henry Huffman, Jacob Crout.

J. W. Douglas, Wm. A. Duncan and J. C. Neeley, Esqs., addressed the people in their usually happy styles, and H. J. Stable concluded, when the meeting adjourned, confidence in success and determination to assist in achieving it inspiring all present.

AT NEW OXFORD.

Truly the meeting at New Oxford was suggestive of the exclamation, "*the work goes bravely on!*" Before candle-light the people came pouring in from all sides, and by the time an organization was announced, the crowd had swelled to extraordinary proportions. The difference between that and the Opposition gathering held in the same place was too great to allow comparison. That in the afternoon was hardly a "one horse" arrangement, whilst ours was a full team!—The following gentlemen were the officers:

President, DANIEL HELTZELL.

Vice Presidents, Charles Will, John Lynch, Patrick Harkins, Elias Slagle, Daniel Gitt, Francis Marshall, John Stock, Jno. L. Noel, Thomas N. Dicks, Philip Donohue, Samuel Alwine.

Secretaries, Jno. F. McSherry, Jno. C. Elms, Jno. S. Gitt, Anthony Martin.

Wm. A. Duncan, J. W. Douglas, J. C. Neeley and Charles Will, Esqs., made speeches, and were applauded at many points. H. J. Stable also occupied the stand, in reply to many of the *specious* falsehoods retailed by the Opposition speakers a few hours before. The meeting adjourned with three echoing cheers, the most lively enthusiasm having prevailed throughout.

☞ The Democratic Brass Band of this place was present at all the meetings, and won golden opinions by their charming music. The Chariot every where elicited the warmest expressions of admiration.

☞ The Opposition managers fairly rave in their desperation. They see "the handwriting on the wall," and their hopes of securing office for their favorites are almost dying within them. In regard to Mr. Durboraw their anxiety must be excrutiating. With all his votes exposed, and too many of them entirely inconsistent with his pledges, nothing is left the managers and their organs, the *Star* and *Sentinel*, but to repeat over and over again that the *Compiler* "lies!" "lies!" "lies!" and that Capt. DIEHL failed to vote for CHAS. WILL. Such is the chief burden of their song. So far as the *Compiler* is concerned, it always speaks for itself, and is never more comfortable in a position taken than when backed up by authority so indisputable as the *Journal of the House of Representatives!* In regard to the charge against Capt. Diehl, we must remind the managers that we have flatly contradicted the base "