

## Horrifying Facts!

In September 1808 a short pamphlet was published in south-eastern Pennsylvania titled *Erschreckende Thatsachen*. A copy of this German language pamphlet is in the library collection of LancasterHistory.org, and for cataloging purposes we needed an English translation to determine the subject of the pamphlet. We contacted Cecile Zorach, Emeritus Professor of German at Franklin and Marshall College, for assistance. She was immediately able to read the old German script and shortly produced a translation for us—the full title being in English, *Horrifying Facts! Read – Consider – and Weigh Them!*



The pamphlet concerned the 1808 gubernatorial election of Pennsylvania between Democratic-Republican candidate Simon Schneider (Snyder) (1759-1819) and Federalist James Ross (1762-1847). The writers of the pamphlet were alerting the public to what they believed were threats to their freedoms if Snyder was elected:

*Free Voters of Pennsylvania! Read the following pages, and consider what to do before it is too late. The time is extremely important: be alert, otherwise your freedom will disappear for ever, and all the famous rights and privileges will be sacrificed on the alter of anarchy.*

The pamphlet includes testimonials from area persons who were worried that Snyder would call a convention to change the constitution to take away the rights of poor men to vote and to establish a military tribunal about the rights of conscience.

Interestingly, Simon Snyder did win the November 8, 1808 election by a 61% margin; however, he barely lost the vote in Adams, Lancaster and Chester counties among others.

 **LancasterHistory.org**

Lancaster County's Historical Society & President James Buchanan's Wheatland

### Our Mission

LancasterHistory.org exists to engage and educate the public about the people, places, and events that shaped Lancaster County within the broader context of the history of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the United States of America. As custodians of a complex past, we collect, preserve, exhibit, and make accessible materials chronicling Lancaster County's heritage as we seek to engage audiences in multi-layered stories of that past.

Horrifying

Facts!

Read – Consider – and weigh them!

Translation from the German of

Erschreckende Thatsachen

By

Cecile Zorach

2014

Copyright LancasterHistory.org



Free Voters of Pennsylvania!

Read the following pages, and consider what to do before it is too late.

The time is extremely important; be alert, otherwise your freedom will disappear forever, and all your famous rights and privileges will be sacrificed on the alter of anarchy.

The Jacobins are willing, in the event that the election of Simon Schneider is successful –

To call a convention and amend the Constitution;

To establish a military tribunal about the rights of conscience; and

To rob each poor man of the right to vote.

Be valiant! Save yourselves and your children from the terrible influences of tyrants.

The election next October will decide your fate: -- Vote then against Simon Schneider, and deserve to enjoy the blessings of free men.

September 14, 1808.

Residents of Pennsylvania!

Read the following:

Berks County, ff.

On May 6<sup>th</sup>, 1808, there appeared before me, the undersigned, one of the Justices of the Peace in and for said county, Friedrich Bechtel in person, who, having been sworn according to the law, testifies and affirms— that Simon Schneider, current speaker of the house of Representatives of the Republic of Pennsylvania, some time ago, in the presence of this testifier and a number of others, declared and spoke  
“that the common people have no right to vote and that a Change should be made.”

The testifier says, that the above words were spoken in the house of Peter Ganter in Lancaster, and he says nothing further.

Friedrich Bechtel.

Sworn and signed before me, in the city of Reading, May 6, 1808.

Friedrich Heller

The previous sworn testimony has already been made public in some of the German newspapers in Reading and Lancaster; and one hopes that every editor, both of an English and a German newspaper throughout the whole state, for the benefit of “the common man” (as the mighty Mr. Schneider likes to call him), will therefore accept a further announcement.

One cannot do otherwise than presume that with the expression “common man” (riffraff) Mr. Schneider understands

the poorer social class, for the whole populace are fellow-citizens to one another. We know no difference among them, neither with regard to their civil nor their religious rights – the Constitution does not make the slightest; it guarantees all citizens, rich or poor, the same rights – the rich landowner, as well as the lowest day laborer. It may be that Mr. Schneider, as a member of the Assembly and as Speaker of a branch of that body, and since he moreover has been proposed for the office of Governor by enemies of the Constitution, considers himself to be an un-common man, and that he can look down with contempt upon those whom he calls the common people. He considers without doubt that in the Constitution “a change should be made;” because (among other causes that make him and his colleagues eager for a change) ”the common people have a right to vote.” – we, however, are of the decided opinion that every citizen – rich or poor – who has a clear interest in the well-being of the state has a right to vote; and indeed should have it just as he currently possesses it; and this is one of several reasons why we are agitating steadfastly against a change of the Constitution; we do not wish (as Mr. Schneider, who would so much like to become Governor) to see the common people robbed of such a great and important right – the right to vote.

It is proper for the public to know who the person is who most solemnly took an oath on the truth of the declaration of Simon Schneider “that the common people have no right to vote and that a change should properly be made.” They are accordingly informed that if poverty or even middle class circumstances make a “common man,” Friedrich Bechtel does not belong to the class “of the common people” that Mr. Schneider claims to disdain and whom he would rob of the right to vote; -- although even if he were a poor man and possessed integrity, his testimony would equally deserve credence – all the more so when given under oath. But Mr. Bechtel is one of the most respected and prosperous landowners in Berks County. His property is a very large estate and he has, as we hear,

three mills operating – Few, if any, men in that county have such a large property. The character of Mr. Bechtel is irreproachable—his uprightness and credibility are well established—and no one who knows him will doubt his word, much less yet his oath. He is a thoughtful, serious, good man; and as we have heard (although we are not fully certain of it) he belongs to the religious society of Menonists.

For the truth of this character represented by Friedrich Bechtel we call on every honorable man who is familiar with him in his own county and in other places.

Thus the fact that Simon Schneider makes use of such shameful, aristocratic expressions as mentioned by Mr. Bechtel, is established through such testimony which could be destroyed by the miserable prevarications and the simplistic nit-picking of B. Grimler or of some other of Simon's supporters. It is truly laughable to make the attempt to prove that a certain man is said to have not uttered certain words that another swears to have heard him mention – because it happens that a third person or even a thousand others, whether they were present at the time or not, would like to have declared that they hadn't heard anything – absurdly vulgar! But it looks as though LB Grimler is making an effort to prove that Simon Schneider and his supporters did not support the Militia Bill that his friend Leib brought as a proposition during the last session, in order to tax the conscience of Menonists, Quakers, etc, although the journals that he himself printed (taken in connection with the printed bill, which he must have seen) show exactly the contrary!

A true test is an intractable matter – and even this can be said with evident certainty, they provide damning evidence of character; the one can no more be destroyed by a secret understanding than the allegation of others can be transferred to its opposite by a denial made face-to-face.

Since this is the case, what convictions must many of those persons hold who heretofore have advocated the elevation of Simon Schneider to Magistrate of the State – what must they now think of this man’s principles? Did the honorable and thoughtful men among them discover aristocratic arrogance, a contempt for the poor classes of society, and an attitude of intolerance, or will they become aware of none of these crimes behind the so distorted mask of uprightness and ostensible humility? Will those of the “common people” (contemptuously labeled with this name) who know how to treasure their rights, will they be willing to tolerate being forced by the tricks of vainglorious and self-interested demagogues to support a man who has publically declared that they should have no right to vote?

It seems clear to us that in the event that Simon Schneider would be vested with the authority that is bound up with the high office of Governor, together with the influence that now accompanies that position, many of those persons who would lend a helping hand to his elevation could soon discover how much they had erred in the man’s character.

Fact

---

The party of Schneider and the enemies of the Constitution have never made the attempt to retract the facts contained in the sworn testimony of Friedrich Bechtel which have recently been made publically known; of course, they have come forward with a mere denial and have unloaded a large heap of despicable ill-treatment against Mr. Ross in this regard; but they have not made bold to condemn a single point of the testimony; and from this sole circumstance this person deserves complete credibility; but we do not wish to stay resting on this single statement and accept it as a test of the true character of Mr. Schneider; we have many other confirmations similar to the testimony of Bechtel – and some of them are “as convincing

verifications as those in the Holy Scriptures.” The first that we wish to bring to light is the sworn statement of Georg Church, who, after taking a legal oath, stated – that he was living in the city of Sunbury, in Northumberland County about twelve or thirteen years ago; that at that time he was very familiar with Simon Schneider, the present candidate for Governor of Pennsylvania, and that he heard said Simon Schneider declare more than two or three times “that in his opinion, the laws of this country were not right; that they should be amended, and that no poor man should have the right to vote in elections.”

Georg Church

Sworn and signed before me, August 12, 1808. William Steele

Thus here Georg Church declares in the most solemn way that he more than once heard Mr. Schneider make use of the same expressions that are contained in the statement of Friedrich Bechtel. Can one now doubt the truth any longer? Can we demand better proofs? Two men in different parts of the state under the sacred influence of an oath, which was taken from them in full form by a Justice of the Peace, both maintain the same thing. Such a certain testimony as this would convict a man of the greatest crime unless very convincing proofs to the contrary could be provided; but in this case Mr. Schneider’s friends have not offered a single basis of proof against the facts presented by Bechtel and Church; they claim that Simon Schneider said nothing of the kind and immediately seek refuge in calumnies and lies against Mr. Ross. But this will not do;

the populace is starting to understand the ploys; it will place more confidence in the oath of two honest men than in the claims that are present in the dastardly columns of the *Commonwealth* (a newspaper published in Pittsburgh). There is no shadow of a cause to doubt the truth of the sworn statements of these men. Simon Schneider made use of these expressions, and they correspond fully with his votes in the Convention whenever a question is raised that pertains to these cases. Therefore in order to substantiate further the testimony of Bechtel and Church, allow me to give an excerpt from the minutes (proceedings) of the first meeting of the Convention, p. 37.

“It was suggested by Mr. Findley, and supported by Mr. Bond, to delay consideration of a previous resolution in order to introduce the following:

‘Resolved that every free man of 21 years, who before the election has lived for \_\_\_\_\_ years in the United States, or \_\_\_\_\_ years in this republic and at least one of these in the county or district where he makes a claim to his vote, and who has owned a freehold-property or another taxable property for a whole year before the election and the sons of freeholders, who are qualified in consideration of age and place of residence, as described earlier, shall have a right to vote for each of the two branches of the legislature.’”

“On the question: does the Convention wish to allow the suspension for the above-mentioned ultimate purpose? The Yeas and Nays were called out by Mr. Findley and were as follows:

Yea

Enoch Edwards  
William Gibbons  
Thomas Ross  
James Boyd  
Robert Whitehill  
James Power  
Christian Lower  
Abraham Lincoln  
Baltzer Gehr

William Todd  
Alexander Addison  
John Hoge  
David Reddick  
John Smilie  
Albert Gallatin  
James M’Lene  
George Matthews  
Lindsey Coats

Thomas Mewhorter  
Joseph Powell  
John Peiper  
Charles Smith  
Simon Schneider  
William Findley

Jonathan Schuhmacher  
John Gloninger  
William Brown  
Andreas Henderson  
Thomas Beale --29

Nay

James Wilson  
Hilary Becker  
George Roberts  
William Lewis  
Thomas M'Kean  
George Gray  
William Robinson, jun.  
Robert Hare  
Samuel Ogden  
Thomas Jenks  
John Barclay  
Abraham Stout  
Thomas Bull  
Robert Coleman  
Sebastian Graff  
John Hubley  
John Breckbill

Henry Miller  
Henry Schlegel  
William Reed  
Benjamin Tyson  
Benjamin Pedan  
Matthew Dill  
Paul Groscup  
Samuel Sitgreaves  
John Arndt  
Peter Rhoads  
James Ross  
Samuel Morris  
Samuel Potts  
Timothy Pickering  
John Gibson  
John Sellers  
Henry H. Graham --34

Twenty-nine members, among whom was Simon Schneider, voted for the introduction of Mr. Findley's resolution; and thirty-four members, among whom was James Ross, voted against it; consequently, it disappeared, and this is the reason why the present article in our Constitution, which refers to elections and suffrage, is so free and republican. Yes, Simon Schneider gave in this way his opinion that everyone eligible to vote should be a freeholder or should own taxable property of a certain size; and not only this, but that he should also own this taxable property a year before the election. This vote of Simon Schneider in the Convention is in complete accordance with the declarations that he made in the presence of Bechtel and Church; he thought at that time that every eligible voter should be a freeholder for a certain period before the election; and he now says that the common people and poor people have no right to vote; his vote



and his claims are the same; we therefore have to believe him: there is no contradiction present; proof upon proof; we must consequently accept it as a fact that Simon Schneider believes, as he voted in the Convention, namely “that the common people and poor people have no right to vote.” Well spoken, Simon! That’s what you call a friend of the people, with proof thereto.

Pittsburg, August 17.

---

Northumberland, August 16

Sworn Statement

Whoever is unwilling to bear arms, shall not vote!!!

Constitutionalists, read the following and behold the prominent characteristics of the Constitution that Mr. Schneider will have made for you.

Members of the societies of Quakers, Menonists, Dunkers, Amish, read the following and behold what esteem toward your religious feelings will be cherished under the government of Mr. Schneider.

Federalists, read the following and curse the disturbers of the peace of your fatherland and the sworn enemies of true republicanism.

Fellow citizens, Georg Kremer is the nephew (son of the brother or the sister) of Mr. Schneider – well known with his intentions and the intentions of his party; and one who, in the event that Mr. Schneider should be nominated, will be an active tool of bringing into reality the sentiments that he has expressed – terrible sentiments, which enforce an election at the tip of a bayonet, and in the person of Mr. Schneider, would make perpetual, through military terrors, the executive power of the country!!!

Let me urgently ask my fellow-countrymen to reflect seriously on the sentiments and declared intentions of the Democratic Party, which fortunately each day are being brought more into the light of day.

This is the mature blossoming of the same plan that Mr. Schneider long ago revealed to Mr. Bechtel. Mr. Schneider declared toward Mr. Bechtel, “that no common man should have a vote.” They have brooded about it until they have decided, as Mr. Kremer has declared, “that no person shall have a vote who does not wish to take up weapons.”

My dear fellow-countrymen, reflect on this before it is too late.

Lancaster County, ff.

Before me, the undersigned, one of the Magistrates of the Peace in and for Lancaster County, came Jacob Comfort, of the aforementioned county, an inn-keeper, who says on his solemn assurance taken in accordance with the law, that some time ago (he can no longer remember the precise date) Georg Kremer was in his house in the city of Columbia and that said Kremer entreated him to show as much interest for Simon Schneider as he could and that he would be rewarded for doing so; and he said that, if Simon Schneider would be elected Governor, they would call a convention and amend the constitution (or have a law passed) that those who were unwilling to take up weapons should have no right to vote; and that, if this were to happen, they would never be able to get rid of us, or words to that effect; it has been some time since that conversation took place. The person making this declaration does not wish to say with certainty that these were the same words of which one made use; but in essence they are the same, and he said nothing further.

Jacob Comfort

Affirmed and signed in Columbia,  
July 29<sup>th</sup> 1808

Before me, William P. Beaty

We the undersigned attest that we have been acquainted with Jacob Comfort for many past years.

His character is beyond reproach, his probity and love of truth are subject to no doubt.

Columbia, 29<sup>th</sup> July, 1808.

Samuel Wright

Samuel Miller

James Wright

James Graham

H. M'Corkle

Thomas Boude

Robert Barber

Michael Bachman

John Forry

Emanuel Reigart

Erward Brien

Jacob Strickler

---

#### Militia Bill

In the Lancaster Journal of July 1<sup>st</sup>, 1808, we made known certain observations with respect to the Schneider party, which brought a bill for proposal during the last session of the Assembly to test the conscience of those religious people who diligently hold an objection to bearing arms.

In order to reveal the intentions of the inventors and supporters of this bill, we are making public the second, third, and eighth (later recast as the seventh) sections.

We showed that the “most abjectest provisions” [*the German is ungrammatical and is in quotation marks*] have been deleted; that, however, the section establishing the militia legion, together with some other insignificant alterations were retained; that as a consequence of the original intention of this section a complete act of incorporation for a military force would have been present, which would have remained independent of both the government and of the people—and that even in the way it passed, its provisions were “anti-republican and depraved.”

We gave the affirming and denying votes on the question as they are to be found in the Record. It was passed by the prevailing vote of Simon Schneider.

We reported likewise that the bill in general “was supported most fervently by Leib and other Democrats who pulled the oar”—that it was “a favorite bill of Simon Schneider.”

All this was precisely and completely true, and both Dickson and Grimler knew that it was all the irrevocable truth, although they had the impudence to deny it and possessed the perfidy to take refuge in prevarications in order to be able to support their denial.

They presented one vote in the Records, about which they believed that these would be consistent with their intention of misleading the people; although both were familiar with the particular circumstances under which this vote had been given, thus they find neither the integrity nor the honesty to acknowledge it.

We wish now to present a short narrative of the progress of the bill and then the bill itself, so that the people may be in a position to judge for themselves.

#### House of Representatives

December 5 – Messers Leib, Biddle, Davis, Ogle, Sherman, M’Kinney, M’Comb, Miner and Lacock, were nominated as a committee to write a report about the militia system.

This committee was appointed by Simon Schneider, the speaker; and it is generally known that five of the nine members are avid Democrats, namely Leib, Davis, Ogle, M’Kinney and Lacock (See the Journal, 1<sup>st</sup> volume, pp 39 and 40).

February 22 – Leib as chairman of this committee reported: “An Appendix to the Record for the Regulation of the Militia of the ‘Republic of Pennsylvania’ “. The first of March was set down for the second reading. (See the Journal, 2<sup>nd</sup> volume, Page 151). The bill did not come up again until the 12<sup>th</sup> of March, when the chairman, after it had been taken into consideration in the committee of the whole House, submitted it with various improvements (2<sup>nd</sup> volume, p. 282).

March 14 – the bill was read for the second time, as it had been improved in the committee of the whole: and to the question “Does the House wish to approve the first part of the first section?”

there were 20 yeas and 55 nays. This question referred merely to the days for exercises and recognizes no principle that essentially deviates from the old law. The members voted without any difference of the parties.

Other improvements about the second part of the section were then suggested by various members, but the votes on them are not in the Journal.

And now we come to the real reason for the contentious question.

A suggestion was made by Mr. Miner and Mr. Darlington (both Constitutionlists) to improve the second part of the second section by interpolating, after the word “shall,” these words: “but nothing in this section shall be so construed that the penalty for not participating in exercises shall extend beyond one dollar per day for those who on account of their conscience do not want to bear arms.” – which was not approved (see Journal, 2<sup>nd</sup> volume, pp. 285-6).

We now refer to the reader to the said 2<sup>nd</sup> section, which will follow below. The word shall is in the middle of the 9<sup>th</sup> line.

We ask then each honestly inclined man of whatever party what the intention of the Constitutionlists was when they made that suggestion? Isn't it clear to every man endowed with common sense that the sole intent of the Constitutionlists was to save those people “whom considerations of conscience forbid to bear arms” from the frightful persecution which this bill, which was presented by a majority of Simon Schneider's friends, sought to inflict upon them?

Through the proposed amendment the people who belonged to those religious societies were placed on the same footing on which they had stood previously. For not participating in military exercises their punishment should not amount to more than one dollar.

But this apparently in no way suits the intentions of the Schneider people. They were not willing to be satisfied

unless they could tax the conscience of Quakers, Menonists, Dunkers, Amish and all the others whose conscience forbids the bearing of arms.

For this sole reason the Schneider people opposed the amendment that had been proposed by the Constitutionals. And this is where the friends of the Constitution found that all public opposition to this bill was useless. They knew that the Schneider people at that time had a majority of votes in the House; and they found that the whole Democratic Party would resist any proposed amendment of the bill. They knew that the bill was a favorite of the five military Democrats who had proposed it – and that they, as usual, would be supported by their party; for at that time only Leib (the Chairman who presented the bill) had the skill to lead the whole party in all questions of contention.

The Constitutionals now had no hope left of rescuing the state from the tyranny of this bill other than to make it as offensive as possible, whereby they hoped to impede it at the final collection of votes; or if the bill passed through both houses, that the Governor would not approve it.

One vote had been taken already in order to reduce the arbitrary fine for not participating in military exercises from ten to five dollars. This had been rejected.

But in the discussion of the matter shortly afterwards some of the Democrats started thinking that they had almost gone too far! Therefore a recommendation came from Mr. Thompson, supported by Mr. Moore, to reconsider the vote; that is, the vote to reduce the fine from 10 to 5 dollars.

But the friends of the Constitution, when they found that they couldn't bring it so far as to reduce to one dollar the fine for not participating in military exercises for those whose conscience forbids the bearing of arms, decided to retain this extremely reprehensible

provision; and all of them, with four exceptions (Messrs. Lohengier, M'Comb, Miner and Porter) voted against the reconsideration.

These 38 Constitutionals (who decisively opposed the shameful provisions of the bill) had tried to reduce the fine to one dollar; since, however, they found that this could not be carried out, they preferred to vote for ten dollars instead of five, although they well knew that if they subsequently were unable in the House to effect such a reduction in the fine as they wished, the bill could be vetoed by the Governor. As a further proof that their intention in doing this aimed at destroying the bill, if they made it as bad as the Schneider people wished to have it (unless they could reduce the fine to one dollar), Mr. Darlington, a clear enemy of the bill, who had supported the suggestion of reducing the fine to one dollar, now voted in favor of ten dollars.

Can anything be more obvious than the intention of the Constitutionals in this matter? Can any reasonable man give it any other interpretation than we have given it?

This last vote will be found in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Volume of the German Record, p. 292. And it is this vote to which the Democratic printers in Lancaster, Grimler and Dickson have directed the people as evidence that Mr. Schneider was against the bill and voted with the Constitutionals. If Grimler and Dickson had not been in Lancaster at the time when the discussion of this matter drew the attention of the people, we could blame their behavior on their ignorance. But they both knew better. They knew the intention of the Constitutionals so well because these were familiar to nearly every member of the House of Representatives and every man of common sense in the gallery.

The Schneider people, fully overwhelmed by the unexpected behavior of the friends of the Constitution began to get restless,

and when the question about the first part of the second section (up to the word “shall”) was to be taken, only 17 of them were found bold enough to support it. Every Constitutionalist and 24 Schneider people voted against it.

On the question “Does the House approve the second part of the said (2<sup>nd</sup>) section?” which extended the fine for not participating in military exercises in certain cases to 50 dollars for each month, 28 Schneider people were found who voted for it. All Constitutionlists, with one exception, voted against it. (See Record, 2<sup>nd</sup> volume, p. 298).

Can any proof be more solid? Can anyone doubt any longer which party it was that wished to tax the conscience of those people whose conscience forbids them to bear arms?

In this way it happened that the serpent was destroyed. In this way it happened that the Constitutionlists impeded the unified birth of the five military Democrats, Leib, Ogel, Davis, M’Kinney and Lacock, who were all followers of Schneider and were nominated by him to introduce the bill.

As this was the fate of this Jacobin principle in its beginning, all the intolerant premises of the bill fell to the floor, except for the one in the 8<sup>th</sup> section (in the Record called the 7<sup>th</sup>) which pertains to the militia-legion in Philadelphia. The yeas and nays will be found in the 2<sup>nd</sup> volume, p. 304.

At the last collection of votes for the passing of the bill, as it was amended and stripped of its dangerous provisions,

---

\* In this vote, Grimler, who printed the English Record, omitted the name of Mr. Wallace; and Benjamin Mayer, who printed the German Record, not only omitted Mr. Wallace but likewise the name of Mr. Schulz. These printers have not told the Publico why!

40 Schneider people and four Constitutionalists were for it; and against it were 38 Federal and Constitutional Republicans (See Record, 2<sup>nd</sup> Volume, p. 326).

We are now making the whole bill publically known as it was brought to press by John Burnside, the printer of the House.

---

No 138

22. February 1808

House of Representatives

Order of the day for Tuesday, March 1

An appendix to the Acts for the regulation of a militia of the state of Pennsylvania

Section 1. Let it be herewith made a law through the Senate and the House of Representatives of Pennsylvania, meeting in the General Assembly, and it is herewith decided through the authority of the same, that the entirety of the militia of this state shall be instructed and exercised through its respective officers in companies, troops, battalions and regiments as follows: In companies on the first and second Mondays in the month of May and on the first and second Mondays in October; and the regiment instructions in each and every brigade shall be on the third Monday in the month of May and on the third Monday in the month of October in such places as the field officers or a majority of these will decide, and shall last from day to day in such order as the Brigade Inspector will establish on each day of the week (Saturday and Sunday excepted) until the entirety of the regiments have been instructed and exercised in the aforementioned way; about this all Brigade Inspectors shall make a public announcement a month in advance: With the proviso that nothing contained herein shall prevent the officers of a regiment or a majority of them from instruction and exercises in battalions instead of in regiments. – And with the further proviso that some of the Brigade Generals in the first division and the field officers belonging to some of the brigades

in the named divisions or a majority of the same, shall be authorized to organize regiment- instead of company instruction; and upon the announcement given by several of the Brigade Generals of the said division to the Brigade Inspector of the appropriate brigade, that such regiment exercises have been organized, it shall be incumbent upon him to make these known in the manner described above in the event of a regiment exercise.

Section 2. And let it be herewith made law through the aforementioned authority that the fine for non-appearance or absence on days of the company, battalion or regiment exercises shall be not less than a dollar and not more than ten dollars for each day, which shall be levied onto each delinquent according to the value of his property by the Court of Appeals and shall be managed by county rations and levies. And in the event of a calling up of the militia or of a part of it to active duty, the fines for neglect of the required service shall be not less than twenty and not more than fifty dollars for each month of service, which shall be levied on each delinquent by the Court of Appeals and managed by county rations and levies.

Section 3. And let it be herewith made law by the aforementioned authority, that it is the duty of the County Commissioners of the respective counties and they will be herewith charged, under a penalty of fifty dollars for each case of neglect or refusal, with making a list of the names of taxable residents and of the amount and value of all taxable property as was attributed to each person through the last county assessment, within the boundary of each regiment or battalion, whichever the case may be; and to deliver a report to the commanding officer of each, respectively, annually on the first of May. And it shall be the duty of the said commanding officers to provide the Court of Appeals of their respective battalions with a list of the names and the amount of the assessment of property of every militiaman and exempted person

who lives within the boundaries of such a battalion; and it shall be the duty of said Court of Appeals to impose the sum of one dollar on each militiaman who was entered as absent on some day of exercises or an exempt person; and shall furthermore impose on each delinquent a sum which is not to amount to more than one cent on the dollar on his entire reported taxable property, as stated above; with the proviso that the entire amount does not exceed ten dollars for each day of non-appearance on any of the days set for exercises of the militia. And if the militia is called up in the service of this state or of the United States, so shall it be the duty of the appropriate Court of Appeals, and it will be herewith entrusted to it, to levy on each delinquent, including those exempt, the sum of twenty dollars for each month of service that he will neglect or refuse to perform; and moreover the additional sum of fifty cents on each hundred dollars of taxable property that has been reported as stated above: and furthermore with the proviso that the entire amount thus levied shall not exceed fifty dollars for every month's service that was thus neglected or refused.

Section 4. And let it be herewith made law by the aforementioned authority, that when the field officers or a majority of them shall consider it necessary, a company of light infantry, grenadiers, riflemen or lancers may be raised for each battalion from four hundred enrolled militia as an addition to those who have been authorized through the Act to which this is an appendix, and these shall be subject to the same regulations and restrictions for which provision has been made in and by the said Act. And after a statement signed by the aforementioned field officer that thirty men are present in full uniform, the Governor will be requested herewith to grant the legally selected and thus introduced officers their commission, both with regards to the companies that have already been brought together and also to those that are composed subsequently.

Section 5. And let it be moreover herewith made law by the aforementioned authority that in the event that some under-officer should appear on parade without uniform six months after he has been commissioned, a fine of one dollar for each incident shall be levied on him; and that if some other officer should appear on parade without uniform, each such officer shall be levied a fine of two dollars for each incident.

Section 6. And let it be herewith made law moreover by the aforementioned authority that the age and property of some enlisted person in order to bear arms shall be determined by the Captain or commanding officer of a company with the right to appeal to the field officer of the regiment; and it shall be the duty of each male white resident between the ages of eighteen and forty-five years to enlist with the Captain or commanding officer of the company in whose district he resides; and each person who refuses or who neglects enlisting as mentioned above shall be considered as one of the exempt.

Section 7. And let it be herewith made law moreover by the aforementioned authority that in the event that any spectator or bystander should mistreat, assault or strike any of those in the parade or handling weapons, the offending person shall be immediately placed under arrest and shall be held after consultation with the Commander of the regiment, the company, or the corps, until sunset of the same day, on which the misdeed was perpetrated.

Section 8. And let it be herewith made law moreover through the aforementioned authority that the troops, cavalry, and the companies of artillery, riflemen, and light infantry, which constitute the militia legion of Philadelphia, shall be authorized to select a Lieutenant Colonel-Commander and such other field officers as the legion or a majority of it deems feasible; in such manner as other officers of the same rank are made to be chosen, who shall receive their appointment from the governor; and the members of the said legion

shall have the power to make secondary laws for their own governing; to determine as many days for military exercises as some board established by them shall agree upon; and to levy and collect fines for non-appearance on days of exercises or for absence from any assembly about which one has agreed through some secondary laws; which fines shall be collected by some person who has been authorized to do so by the commanding officer of any company or troop or by the Commander of the legion by virtue of his warrant issued under hand and seal; and the fines thus collected shall be used for the goal of covering the costs of said legion. And in the event of a calling up for the quota of the militia of this republic or for the volunteers thereof, the aforementioned legion may offer its services to the President of the United States or to the Governor of this Republic; or in the event that no such offering of their services would be made, the time of military service of said legion can be carried out in its capacity as a legion. With the proviso that nothing contained herein shall be construed as exempting any of the aforementioned companies or troops, with the regiments to which they belong respectively, on those days that have been established by law for military exercises for regiments and brigades.

Section 9. And let it be herewith made law by the aforementioned authority moreover that the articles, rules and regulations by which the militia shall be ruled shall extend to the musicians belonging to them.

Section 10. And let it be herewith made law by the aforementioned authority moreover that the troops of the cavalry that have already been constituted or might be constituted in the future shall be added to the respective regiments, not more than two troop corps for each regiment, and that the company-artillery not belonging to the regiment that Lieutenant Colonel Connelly commands shall be added in a similar fashion to the regiments, not more than one

company for each, and the cavalry troops and the abovementioned companies shall be subjected to the same penalties for their absence from regiment-exercises as the members of other militia corps.

Section 11. And let it be herewith made law by the aforementioned authority moreover that whenever the militia is called up for active duty to this state or the United States, it shall and may be legal for the Governor to organize the light infantry, grenadiers, riflemen, and lancers into brigades, regiments or battalions in such a fashion that each regiment shall consist of no fewer than four hundred, each battalion of no fewer than two hundred, and each company of no fewer than fifty men who shall be provided with officers as described below, namely: For each brigade a Brigade-General, who is to be selected by the officers and common men of the brigade, and a Brigade Major, with the rank of a Major, who is to be appointed by the Brigade General; to each regiment a Lieutenant Colonel and Commander; and to each battalion a Major, all of whom shall be selected by the officers and common men of the regiments at the General Assembly place in such a way as other officers of the same rank have been chosen according to the law.

Section 12. And let it be herewith made law by the aforementioned authority moreover that the Governor shall from time to time order the Commander of the artillery regiment of the city and of the county of Philadelphia to deliver such ordnance as he deems necessary for the common good in order to employ such in exercise with field artillery, mortars or other useful undertakings and that the costs for improvement of the arsenal, wagons, equipment and the renting of horses shall be paid by the treasurer of the County of Philadelphia, upon an attestation signed by the Lt Colonel or officer in command of the regiment; these moneys shall be taken from the fines of the enlisted men, and where no fines of enlisted men are present,

so shall they be paid from moneys that derive from the licenses of taverns; and such sums shall be due to the County Treasurer upon presentation of such licenses, in adjustment of its accounts with the official of the Comptroller's Department.

Section 13. And let it be herewith made law by the aforementioned authority moreover that the execution of a previously committed obligation, or the payment of such, shall free some militiamen or enlisted men from having to execute a second such responsibility until each class has performed its required obligation or has completed payment.

Section 14. And let it be herewith made law by the aforementioned authority moreover that the rank of Lieutenant Colonel of regiments and of Captain of Companies shall be determined by lots and their respective rank in brigade and in regiment, except for flank companies, shall be in accordance with the rank so drawn. The command of the first battalion of each regiment shall devolve on the Major who draws the top number, and in the event of a calling up of a militia detachment, the Brigade General of each brigade shall appoint the Majors who have to serve in this manner, so that no second obligation will be placed on any until all others have rendered service.

Section 15. And let it be herewith made law by the aforementioned authority moreover that the Brigade General of each brigade shall appoint the Brigade Quarter-Master, and the Brigade Inspector shall present a report to the Governor about the Brigade Major and the appointed Brigade Quarter-Master, who shall then have their commissions issued for them, and the Governor shall likewise grant commissions to the adjutants of the General-Major, when the latter makes the report about such appointments.

Section 16. And let it be herewith made law by the aforementioned authority moreover that in the event of some regiment whose regiment-treasury is not adequate to cover the necessary costs of such a regiment, the arrears shall be paid from the moneys that arise from

the tavern licenses when the commanding officer of one such regiment presents instructions to that effect to the county treasurer.

Section 17. And let it be herewith made law by the aforementioned authority moreover that when some militia detachment shall be called up to hold itself in readiness for active duty, such a detachment shall be mustered and examined by the respective Brigade Inspectors within the respective regiment district; and one such detachment shall not march to the general assembly point but shall move into the field only when it is really summoned.

Section 18. And let it be herewith made law by the aforementioned authority moreover that the forty-second section of the act to which this is an appendix and every other part of the mentioned act that is amended or replaced by this, are [*sic*] herewith rescinded.

---

For the accuracy of the announcement made today regarding the militia bill, we call upon every member of the House of Representatives, whether he be a Constitutionalist or a Schneider man – friend or foe – and for the satisfaction of those who might wish to take the records in hand, we have attached the volume and the page of same.

It is agreed that Simon Schneider has appointed a committee of nine persons, of whom five – namely Leib, Ogle, Davis, M’Kinney and Lacock, are all Conventionalists and supporters of Simon Schneider. These five military Democrats, that is, namely, General Leib, General Lacock, Colonel Davis, Colonel M’Kinney and Major Ogle, are the true creators of this shameful bill, which we have again made known and reported about.

It is likewise agreed that he gave the deciding vote on the militia-legion section; and that he and his entire following voted for the final passing of the bill.

From the entire contents of the proceedings it is very probable that this bill as it was presented by the friends of Simon Schneider was a favorite proposition of the Democratic Party and of Simon himself – regardless of all the false remonstrances, of the false depictions, and the labored prevarications of its supporters.

Every upright and thinking man will now be convinced that Simon Schneider and his supporters are working to establish in Pennsylvania one of the cruelest and extremely tyrannical military principles that anyone ever attempted to introduce into a free country.

---

#### Democratic militia bill\*

We reported (says the Lancaster Journal) that the bill has been proposed by a committee appointed by Simon Schneider, of which a majority were Democrats. That this majority, consisting of General Leib and General Lacock, and Colonel M'Kinney and Colonel Davis and Major Ogle, were all Conventionalists and have agreed to support Simon Schneider for Governor. We reported that it was supported most warmly by Leib and other leading Democrats and that it was a favorite bill of the Schneider men. That, however, after the bill had made some progress, some of the Democrats took fright, surely believing that they had gone too far and they stopped giving it their approval.

In all this we were completely correct, and we did not go any further, lest the journals be unwilling to legitimize us.

But we could have gone further and said that Simon Schneider voted in the Committee of the whole House for all excessive and repulsive provisions of the bill.

\*The extremely ignoble provision in the bill was to force those persons who conscientiously have objections about bearing arms to be subject to the militia law or to endure heavy penalties and detention—they were clearly cognizant that a large part of our worthy citizens would choose the latter over the former.

The reader will wish to note that the proceedings in the Committee of the whole House were not entered into the Records and consequently we have no legally recorded proof. But the editor of this newspaper saw Simon Schneider vote for these real provisions in the Committee of the whole House. Mr. Carl Schmidt and Mr. Robert Maxwell, the only two members of our county with whom we have had an opportunity to discuss this matter, both said that he voted for the provisions, and we do not doubt that nearly all members of the House will remember this.

Yes, Simon Schneider voted in the Committee of the whole House for this oppressive tax, levied on the conscience of the Quakers, the Menonists, the Dunkers, the Amish and other religious societies who conscientiously harbor an objection to bear arms.

And Alexander Ogle did the same, as likewise all supporters of Schneider, except for two or three. As a consequence of these two or three not voting for the second and third Section, which were both the most intractable, they would have been lost in the Committee of the whole House had it not been for the vote of Mr. Carl Schmidt, who under this circumstance, supported them, under the express intention (as he declared immediately thereafter to a number of his friends), that the bill might be presented to the House with all its imperfections and its true authors and supporters be exposed to their constituents. He voted against these sections when they came before the House.

Yes, Mr. Schmidt was the only Federal or Constitutional Republican who voted for these provisions in the Committee of the whole House. His vote was required to bring them before the House. So that at least 40 of the Schneider people at the time were in favor of these shameful sections.

This was on Saturday; Sunday came in the meantime, before the bill, as it had been presented by the committee of the whole House, could be taken up. – Whether the solemnity of the day had an effect on the feeling of the Jacobins

is uncertain. But it is agreed that many of these same people on the following day showed signs of remorse. They seemed to be alarmed; and since their names were fully noted in the journals, they recoiled at the frightful responsibility.

---

#### Lancaster Borough Meeting

At a well-attended and respected assembly of the friends of the constitution and of James Ross, in the house of Adam Weber on Saturday evening, August 20, 1808, John Huble, Esq. was appointed Chairman and Samuel White was appointed Secretary.

Since the intention of this meeting had been reported by the chairman, it was decided that the present citizens should take steps toward the selection of vigilance committees in the respective areas of the city. – Whereupon the following persons were proposed and appointed:

For the southeast section – Emanuel Reigart, Esq, Jacob Zanck, Anthony Hook, John Pinkerton, Jeremiah Moscher, Conrad Schwarz, jun., Christian Fick, Jacob Heiß, Samuel Kindig

For the northeast section – Archibald M’Lenagen, Georg Hensel, John Leonard, William Ferree, Jacob Duchman, Peter Schindel, William Haverstick, jun., Georg Hambrecht, Jacob Lichtenhäuser, John Hensel.

For the northwest section -- John Burg, sen., Michael Musser, Jacob Frey, Edward Mott, David R. Barton, Henrich Miller, Michael Klein, (Queen Street) Peter Hufnagel, Georg Messerschmidt, John Lind.

For the southwest section – Henrich Reigart, Richard Gray, Henrich Witmer, Georg Schlauch, Jonas Metzger, Friedrich Reinert, Daniel Witmer, Michael Barnitz, William Cooper, John Dehuff.

As certain newspapers, opposed to the election of James Ross, have repeatedly accused him, among other things,

of having voted for and supported the Law of Foreigners, for the Law of Sedition, for the Naturalization Law and for the levying of direct taxes; and as it has come to light from the Record of the US Senate that James Ross was absent from the seat of government at the passing of all these laws, because of illness in his family, therefore

Resolved, that Wilhelm Kirkpatrick, Adam Reigart the Younger, and James Hopkins, will comprise a Committee to go to Messrs. Dickson and Grimler and request that they make public a retraction of the above listed false notices and might insert in their respective newspapers this article from the *Lancaster Journal* of the 16<sup>th</sup> titled "From the Pittsburg Newspaper."

Resolved, that it be commended to the young men of this borough who are friends of the Constitution and of the election of James Ross, to call a meeting together as soon as feasible in order to form a vigilance committee and to make such other arrangements as may be deemed necessary with respect to the approaching election.

John Hubley, Chairman

Samuel White, Secretary

August 23, 1808

Sir,

We call upon you, as the editor of the "*Lancaster Intelligence Sheet*," by appointment of the association of the friends of the Constitution and the election of Mr. Ross, in this city, to put yourself in the position of fulfilling one of the first duties of a printer; and to take part in one of the most pleasant occupations of a thoughtful temperament; this, to discover and expose untruths and to establish and uphold truth – your newspaper has confidently and without compunction reported that James Ross, as Senator of Pennsylvania, has assiduously supported and most warmly defended in the Senate of the United States and in the room of this venerable body the

passing of certain laws of the United States, commonly called the “Alien Law,” the “Sedition Law,” the “Direct Tax Law” and the “Naturalization Law.” – Mr. Ross, called away from the Senate by a most sad domestic event (illness in his family), was not present as some of these laws took their origins, nor in their progress, nor in their final passing; and consequently, he was able neither to speak in their favor nor vote for them, as you have repeatedly claimed. – The Records of the Senate of the United States, demonstrate these facts on this point clearly.

The friends of the Constitution and of the election of Mr. Ross thus confidently hope that your awareness of the duty as a printer and your feeling as a man will give you the occasion on your own accord to work against the effects that your newspaper might have brought about by this publication, by inserting into your next issue the following notice of irrefutable facts. We are prepared to bear the cost of the insertion and we offer it to you; in the event that the object and the material itself are not deemed by you to be worthy of news and of the attention of your readers without it.

Sir, we are  
Your obedient servants  
Adam Reigart  
James Hopkins  
Wilhelm Kirkpatrick

To Mr. Wilhelm Dickson, Printer

The undersigned submitted to Mr. Dickson on Tuesday, the 23<sup>rd</sup> of this month, the above request with the newspaper containing the refutation of the untruths and informed him at the same time that the Record of the Senate in the Office of the Secretary could be called upon for counsel, or if he would prefer, we would deliver it into his hands in order to establish the thoroughness of the notice. After perusing the request and taking note of the notice, Mr. Dickson observed:

that in contentious election times he did not consider it proper to insert counter-evidence of matters that had appeared in his newspaper, as there were newspapers of the opposing party in town where it could appear. That it was not the custom to do so; and he pointed out that before the last gubernatorial election a piece had been published reporting that Mr. Schneider had sold coarsely ground meal (screenings) to his neighbors as wheat flour, and as the sworn testimony of the miller who retracted this was presented to him for insertion, he refused it. He mentioned likewise that the allegation in respect to the two million dollars that appeared to be unaccounted for had been published in the newspaper of Mr. Hamilton and he would never have inserted what had been replied to this. We asked him whether he had ever been requested to publish something that might have been viewed as a response and had refused it – Mr. Dickson said he didn't know that he had ever done this.

We then pledged that Mr. Hamilton would publish some document of proven reliability (and the object which gave rise to it, if that it were true), which should be submitted to him, in the event that it can be seen clearly from this, this money is still in the treasury and has been counted. Mr. Dickson mentioned he did not know that the accusations were false, since he had published them, and although Mr. Ross had not spoken in favor of these laws, or voted for them, nevertheless the Federal Party had approved them. It was given as an answer to him that the accepted principle was unfair, as it was obvious that Mr. Ross, as a Senator, had most vigorously opposed the accise [*sic*] law when it was passed (and Mr. Dickson said he had always heard that this had been the case), that the difference was so great and significant as that between truth and untruth and that it was the duty of a printer to support the one and to suppress the other. Mr. Dickson mentioned then that his newspaper, with respect to political articles was not subjected to the pleasure of the publisher,

he would have to ask other persons for advice and he could not now publish it, he would however give an answer this week whether he would or would not be willing to publish it. We offered him payment for the insertion, which he likewise declined.

Adam Reigart

James Hopkins

Wilhelm Kirkpatrick

(Mr. Dickson will be pleased to note that with respect to the two million we gave, in the greatest compliance with the law, the report that so much money was subjected to the order of the President. We have often inquired what it had been used for, but we have not received any answer. Mr. Jefferson had an opportunity to notify us in his report last winter whether some, and in the event some of this money had been used, to what purpose it had been used, but he said no word to us about this.

In the event that the administration is determined to keep its mouth closed and if it does not want to let the people know anything about its own affairs – so they must begin to become suspicious.

We have up until now not seen any legal accounting of this two million. When it comes to our attention, we will gladly share it with the public. We do not cherish the wish to deceive them; and we wish without any duplicitous words of any kind and without asking the advice of any person or persons, to retract several errors or several incorrect announcements as soon as we recognize them clearly and distinctly to be of this nature.)

[Editor of the *Lancaster Journal*]

---

[From the Pittsburgh Newspaper]

More Untruths

It seems that the enemies of Mr Ross and the Constitution are not content with mere suggestions that he is supposed to have voted for the uproar-foreigners and the naturalization laws;

they have gone as far as maintaining that he not only voted in their favor, but that he spoke in their favor. Now let us illuminate the facts: If one looks at the Record of the Senate for the Year 1797 and '98, one will find that Mr. Ross on the 26<sup>th</sup> of April 1798, requested permission for absence and was absent up to the end of the session, which lasted until July 16th; (on account of the illness of his dear wife, who now lies buried in Lancaster).

On the same day, Mr. Hillhouse's suggestion regarding foreigners was proposed to a committee that submitted a bill on the 4<sup>th</sup> of May, eight days after Mr. Ross had left the Senate. -- See Record, p. 269.

Mr. Lloyd's bill, pursuant to the uproar, arose in the Senate on June 26<sup>th</sup>, exactly eight weeks after Mr. Ross had left the Senate. -- p. 388.

The bill concerning naturalization had its origin in the House of Representatives and was sent to the Senate for the first time on May 22<sup>nd</sup>, four weeks after Mr. Ross had left the Senate. -- p. 291.

The bill for direct taxes had its origin in the House of Representatives and was brought before the Senate on July 2<sup>nd</sup>, nine weeks after Mr. Ross had left the House. -- p. 413.

This bill passed into law on July 14<sup>th</sup>, nearly three months after Mr. Ross had left the Capitol. -- p. 473.

These are facts; and the record of the Senate is the best proof against those unparalleled claims of the Pittsburgh committee. If they arose out of ignorance of the circumstances, then they should step forward as honest men and confess their incorrect representation; if they, on the contrary, have made themselves guilty of a deliberate denial of truth; then they will be silent and will let the address remain a monument of their untruths.

So far was Mr. Ross removed from lending support to these laws; he was not even present when they were discussed,

or when they were passed into law; so far removed from the opportunity to hold speeches, he was 300 miles away from the place. – In order to prove this, the Record of the Senate can be seen in the press of this (Pittsburgh) newspaper.

What they mean by the direct tax I don't know; I suspect they do not know themselves. This tax is for two million dollars; Mr. Jefferson's government administration did not repeal it – it is currently a law. So far removed from repealing it, they passed on March 16<sup>th</sup>, 1802, an act to effect the collection of this tax by force, and the sale of lands of the delinquents. This is a strange way of repealing a law, when one passes a second one to give the effect of the first one more weight. Mr. Ross was at home for almost three months when the law was being made; it was passed ten years ago and has never been repealed. Mr. Jefferson collected the arrears instead of advising repeal. We call upon the committee to step forward and give a cause for their behavior; a single sentence from the speeches of Mr. Ross, which he is said to have held about the foreigner- and naturalization laws; they cannot do this; when they were suggested, Mr. Ross had left the Senate and had returned to Pittsburgh.

#### Simon Schneider and the Embargo

Whoever has read with attention the notice that appeared in the *Lancaster Journal* of the 29<sup>th</sup> of last month, regarding the progress of the militia bill submitted by the five committee men of Schneider during the last session must have viewed with loathing the insolent attempts that the Jacobins were making then to injure the scruples of conscience of those religious societies that hold an objection to bearing arms.—and to oppress with unheard of and cruel militia fines the peaceable and worthy members of that society. We made the entire bill known in order to let our readers see what kind of frightful

principle of tyranny was being deliberately thought up by five of Schneider's chosen friends for the suppression of Quakers, Menonists, etc.: a principle that would still be in force today had it not been defeated by the determined opposition and the good effort of the Federal and Constitutional members of the House. – By their agency that oppressive part of the bill was finally deleted, except for one single part, and this one, as we have proven, was achieved by the prevailing vote of Simon Schneider.

After we established irrefutably through reference to the Record of the last session and to its volume and page the fact that the Schneider party was the author and supporter of this so godless bill (regardless of the twisting and false depictions of the Jacobin printers to the contrary), we now wish to continue to show that the same parties in the same session supported another completely unnecessary, similarly havoc-wreaking measure, under which the residents of the United States in this present moment suffer terribly – one will immediately see that we mean the Embargo. This has likewise been denied; but we will prove our claim through reference to the Record of the House of Representatives just as we have done with reference to the militia bill.

It is illuminating that on the 29<sup>th</sup> of last January on the suggestion of Michael Leib, supported by James Engle, a resolution was brought forward in legislation, namely:

“Resolved through the House of Representatives of the State of Pennsylvania that the Embargo placed by the general government has our hearty and full approval and that we see in it a wise measure that has as its goal to guarantee the peace of our land, the property of our citizens, and to accord us a restitution for injustice done to us.”

This is the resolution through which the Schneider people gave voice to the Embargo.

This is the resolution through which the Schneider people prepared praise for the Embargo. This is the resolution of which they wished it should pass through the House of Representatives. And although they were not strong enough (since three of their members were absent) to achieve it through their own strength, they hoped, though in vain, that some Constitutionals could be won to support it. But they failed completely. Each Federal and Constitutional Republican in the House, and this redounds to their great honor, in order to be relieved of Leib's resolution granting approval, all the while Simon Schneider and his entire supporters voted in its favor [*incomplete sentence*]. The Record of the House notes this incident as follows:

“A suggestion was made by Mr. Sergeant and supported by Mr. Espy, to postpone the aforementioned resolution in general. And

to the question 'Does the House approve the postponement?'

Mr. Lacock and Mr M'Clure requested the Yea and the Nay and these are as follows, namely:

Yea: Messrs. Acker, Appel. Barnet, Beach, Bethel, Biddle, Brobst, Clawges, Cope, Darlington, Eichelberger, Espy, Evans, Gemmill, Gettys, Gisch, Hare, Hulme Ingham, Joder, Kelton, Kepner, Kimmel, Lobinger, Martin, Maxwell, M'Clellan, M'Comb, M'Sherry, Minor, Pennock, Porter, Ramsey, Rinker, Rose, Savits, Sergeant, Schäffer, Scherman, Shewel, C Schmidt, Trimble and Wright – 43.

Nay – Messers Banks, Boileau, Brown, Bucher, Davis, Dysart, Engle, Griffin, Gross, Heyser, Jennings, Kerr, Lacock, Leib, Lowry, Maclay, M'Clure, M'Farland, Mechling, Moore, Murray, Ogle, Orr, Parke, Pepfer, Rankin, Rupert, Shearer, Sheetz, Schultze, R. Schmidt, W. Schmidt, Starne, Starrett, Stevenson, Tarr, Thompson, Wallace, Weber and Schneider (Speaker) – 40.

And so it was decided in the affirmative.

The reader will wish to observe that a general postponement of the question yields a denial. The House cannot take up this question again during the session or act with regard to it.

As Simon Schneider and his supporters found in the House of Representatives a majority that opposed the resolution, they had no other way available to give their “hearty and complete support” to the Embargo than to let their voices in support of it be incorporated in the Journal. There their votes are registered; and they are staring in the face of those who gave them!

And in this manner each friend of the Constitution voted against the proposal to give support to the Embargo: in the meantime Simon Schneider and all friends of a Convention voted for it.

---

Residents of Pennsylvania!

Your fatherland appears to be standing at the precipice of ruin! Is this then the time to entrust the state government to the hands of recognized trustees of a ruinous Embargo! O! Be wise now. Awake from your deathly slumber. Turn away from your party prejudices and look only upon the public best. Do not let yourselves be deceived by party designation. Strive to elect men who possess wisdom. Only such men are in a position to lead us through the dense fog that surrounds us.

Consider that the friends of the Embargo are the enemies of trade. Consider that trade is the loyal handmaid of agriculture; and that agriculture is the foundation of the land. Consider that Simon Schneider is the trustee of the Embargo that has now nearly brought the land to ruin. Do not trust him. Let each good citizen in the state consider the duty that he owes his fatherland in this so terrible

moment of our public affairs. Let him lend his support to a man who possesses wisdom and virtue as governor of Pennsylvania. Let him vote for James Ross and encourage all his neighbors who love peace and happiness to do the same. This is the best hope that we have of wresting our fatherland from ruin.