TO THE PUBLIC.

The undersigned, a Committee appointed to proceed to Huntingdon with Messrs. Hughes and Ingram, a committee appointed on behalf of the friends of David R. Porter, to investigate the charges made against him by Mr. Bannan, through the columns of the Miners' Journal, respectfully submit the following brief statement of facts to the public, as their report of what occurred in the discharge of the duties assigned to them by their fellow-citizens.

Your Committee arrived at Huntingdon late on Sunday evening, and early on Monday morning called on Messrs. Hughes & Ingram for the purpose of proceeding with the investigations; these gentlemen told us they would not be ready before ten o'clock; we then requested them to hand us a list of the charges they required us to prove; they replied that they would not do so until they were ready to begin the investigation. We would here remark that we suggested to them on the way to Huntingdon the propriety of their submitting to us the charges they expected or requested us to prove, which they refused to do until we arrived at Huntingdon.

Between 10 and 11 o'clock, we proceeded to the Prothonotary's office with them, and they then handed us a note as follows:

Huntingdon, Sept. 24, 1838.

Messrs. Bannan and Russel:

In the "Miners' Journal" of the 29th of August last, we find the following allegation:

In the suit of David R. Porter, vs. Robert Campbell, the plaintiff dare not stand a trial, got up for political effect: a letter is conveniently mislaid; "not ready" is the plea.

The undersigned consider the above as the *gravamen*, of all the charges alleged against Gen. Porter's character, the suit having been instituted against one in whose possession were all the documentary evidences to support the allegations, and as of primary importance we urgently solicit your proofs in support of the above quoted charge.

Respectfully &c.

JOHN S. INGRAM,
F. W. HUGHES.

To this your committee replied, that Mr. Campbell was ready for trial at the August court. The suit was put off at the instance of David R. Porter alleging the letter could not be found, and we offered to question Mr. Campbell as to the facts, which was objected to by Messrs. Hughes and Ingram, but they were willing to examine J. G. Miles Esq. the attorney of Mr. Campbell, but objected to the examination being made in the Prothonotary's office, and proposed adjourning to a Tavern. Mr. Miles remarked that he did not wish to be running over town, he had been sent for to the office, and did not even wish to be examined, and objected to going to a Tavern. Mr. Reed the Register and Recorder then very kindly offered us the use of his office, which we accepted, and to which we went—and where Mr. Miles stated as follows:—I was the counsel of Mr. Campbell in that Indictment, Commonwealth vs. Robert Campbell. The prosecution was founded upon a letter which was alleged Mr. Campbell had written to Mr. Middleswarth of Union County.—Mr. Campbell under my instructions was sent to Beaver the week previous to the trial to procure documents necessary to his defence,—he obtained sundry documents from the records which are here—the court came on—no indictment was sent up to the grand jury—either Tuesday or Wednesday morning of the court Mr. Potter as the counsel of Mr. Porter moved for a continuance of the case, and asked that Mr. Campbell should be bound over to appear at the next sessions, and produced Ner Middleswarth as a witness, who on his examination stated that he had been called on by Mr. Anderson for the original letter. I took no notes of what Mr. Middleswarth said, I speak from recollection. Young Mr. Anderson served a subpoena *Duces Tecum* on Middleswarth *the week before the Court*, to produce the letter—he informed Mr. Anderson he had not possession of the letter then—that he had delivered it to some person in New Berlin; that there were several persons present, and he could not recollect into whose possession he had delivered it; that after Mr. Anderson was with him, he had recollected he had delivered it to Robert P. McClay, and that he afterwards wrote to Robert P. McClay, stating that he was subpoenaed to produce it; he produced a letter from R. P. McClay, stating that the letter had passed out of his hands, and he could not recollect to whom he had given it, nor did he know where it was; on laying that ground, they moved that Mr. Campbell should be bound over to next sessions. On the part of Mr. Campbell I objected to his being bound over, stating that due diligence had not been used by Mr. Porter to obtain the letter, and that Mr. Campbell had put himself to considerable inconvenience to prepare himself, and was prepared for trial. Mr. Campbell had several witnesses subpoenaed, amongst others John Stonebraker, on those grounds the trial was put off by Judge Burnside. Mr. Miles admits no bill could be framed without the letter or a copy of it.

Question by Mr. Ingram—did not Mr. Potter offer to take the printed letter and frame an indictment, and send it to the Grand Jury? Mr. Miles answered *No.*—Mr. Ingram remarked we have or will have an affidavit to prove it.

Question by Mr. Hughes—Was the question propounded to Ner Middleswarth whether the printed letter was a copy of the original? Mr. Miles replied I have no recollection of any thing being said in Court about the printed copy.

The examination closed here, and Messrs. Hughes and Ingram introduced Gen. A. P. Wilson, the relative of David R. Porter, who stated as follows:

I was in Court when the trial of the Commonwealth vs. Robert Campbell came up on Tuesday morning of the August Session I think. Mr. Potter, the counsel for the Commonwealth's prosecutor, stated that there was such a case, Commonwealth vs. Robert Campbell; that upon the part of the Commonwealth a subpoena *Duces Tecum* has been served on Ner Middleswarth of Union County, requiring him to produce a certain letter from the defendant which was the basis of the prosecution, or something to that effect. I *think* he also stated that notice had been served on Mr. Middleswarth to take a copy of the letter—he further said, I think, that Mr. Middleswarth the witness was in town, and had not the letter, or could not produce it. Mr. Potter stated that the letter being the foundation of the prosecution, no indictment could be framed for the Grand Jury without the letter. I think Mr. Middleswarth was then called and sworn: Mr. Middleswarth stated, *I think it was him stated it*, that a subpoena had been served on him to produce a letter from Robert Campbell; *I think* he also stated that a notice had been shown to him for leave to copy the letter—he then stated that he had received such a letter from Robert Campbell, previous to Mr. Anderson's calling on him, but stated that he had not the letter in his possession when Mr. Anderson called on him, and stated that he had told Mr. Anderson that he had parted with the letter and did not know where it was—he stated that at the time he thus informed Mr. Anderson, he was under the impression that he had given the letter to two or three gentlemen together—he then stated he recollected afterwards that he had given it to Robert P. McClay, of New Berlin, and stated that he had written to Robert McClay to return him the letter of Mr. Campbell, and produced what he said was the answer of R. McClay, which, if my recollection is correct, he says, "The letter passed out of my hands last June, and I do not know to whom; I am sorry I cannot give a better account of it." I think the letter also stated that similar charges had also been made in several newspapers. Mr. Middleswarth was then probably asked if he knew where the letter was—he said he did not know where it was; that he had never seen it since he had handed it to Robert P. McClay. He was then asked by some one I think, whether the printed copy of the letter differed materially from the original—don't know whether the question was put by Mr. Potter or by who, (there was a good deal of side bar conversation,) I think it was by Mr. Potter, and he replied that it did differ materially.—John P. Anderson was then called and sworn, he stated that he had served a subpoena Duces Tecum to produce the letter, and notice for leave to take a copy. I may be mistaken in that, but I understood it so; I did not see either subpoena or notice—he stated that Mr. Middleswarth told him he had not the letter, had parted with it and knew not where it was or whose hands it was in; he stated that he requested Mr. Middleswarth to tell him in whose hands it was, that he might subpoena him to attend the Court, but Mr. Middleswarth informed him he did not know where it was. Question by A. Russel: Did the counsel for the prosecution offer to take a printed copy of the letter and frame an indictment, and go on with the trial? Gen. Wilson answered, I cannot say that the Counsel for the prosecution offered to take a printed copy of the letter and frame an indictment and go on with the trial. Here the examination of Gen. Wilson closed, and the Committee adjourned to meet at the same place at 2 o'clock P. M. When we met in the afternoon, Messrs. Hughes and Ingram asked us if we had any more testimony to offer in proof of the charge, we told them we considered what we had offered had fully sustained the charge, to which they objected, and offered us a paper of which the following is a copy, requesting us to sign it as the joint report of the Committee:

Huntington, Sept. 24, 1838

We the undersigned mutually agree that in the case of the commonwealth vs. Robert Campbell, we are satisfied that the letter of the defendant was *conveniently mislaid by the friends* of Campbell, and that on this account the Counsel for Commonwealth could not proceed with the trial, because no indictment could be sent up to the Grand Jury without the letter.

This your Committee refused to sign, alleging that such was not proven to be the fact, and offered a paper of which the following is a copy, to be signed as the joint report on the first charge:

We the undersigned mutually agree that in the case of the Commonwealth vs. Robert Campbell, the trial was put off at the instance of David R. Porter, the defendant Robert Campbell being ready for trial.

This Messrs. Ingram and Hughes agreed to sign, provided we would also include and sign what they had offered, which we refused to do; after some further debate they agreed to strike out the word "*consequently*" if we would sign it, but we still refused on the ground that we could not come to such a conclusion from the facts.

We then handed them a note (marked B.) of which the following is a copy:

Huntingdon, Sept. 24, 1838.

Messrs. Hughes and Ingram.

Gentlemen—as we cannot agree as to the report on the first charge, we are willing to submit the whole matter to the people of our county, to draw their own conclusions, and are now ready to proceed to investigate the remaining charges.

ANDREW RUSSEL,
BENJAMIN BANNAN.

In answer to which they handed us a note of which the following is a copy:

Huntingdon, Sept. 24, 1838.

Messrs. Bannan and Russel:

In reply to your note marked B. we would merely state that we are now satisfied that you will not acknowledge the refutation of the charges alleged against D. R. Porter in conformity with your challenge, as in the instance of the Commonwealth vs. Robert Campbell you most evidently and beyond all doubt have not established the charges, you refuse to attach your signatures to an acknowledgment of the fact—with this view of the mission upon which we have been sent, we are confident that no mutual report can be agreed upon by the party and we respectfully decline any further joint action in the investigation of the charges.

JOHN S. INGRAM.
F. W. HUGHES.

To which we replied as follows:

Huntingdon Sept. 24, 1838.

Messrs. Hughes and Ingram.

Gentlemen—We have your note in reply to our note marked B. and we are very sorry to find that you refuse any further joint investigation of the charges against D. R. Porter. We came here for the purpose of making a full investigation and if possible to arrive at the truth; we consider that in the case of the Commonwealth vs. Robert Campbell we "most evidently and beyond all doubt" have established, the charge made, as published in the "Miners Journal", but if we cannot agree as to the proper conclusion we ought to come to, we repeat it we will submit the testimony elicited to the people of Schuylkill County and let them judge for themselves, and urge on you our desire to go on and investigate the remaining charges, and if we cannot agree in opinion as to the result, we will also very cheerfully submit the whole matter to the people and let them judge between us.

ANDREW RUSSEL,
BENJAMIN BANNAN.

The above note was handed to Mr. Ingram at their lodgings. After we had returned to ours, and had communicated to our friends the result of our labors, they urged us to send another note to Messrs. Hughes and Ingram, and insist on an opportunity of exhibiting at least a part of the proofs that we had procured for their inspection; in consequence of which we wrote a note of which the following is a copy:

Huntingdon, Sept. 24, 1838.

Messrs. Hughes and Ingram.

Gentleman—since writing our last note to you we have been impressed with the importance of an investigation of the charges made against D. R. Porter; that debts due by Patton and Porter previous to his insolvency will remain unpaid, we therefore request you to meet us at the Prothonotary's office in this place to morrow morning at 9 o'clock, and we will exhibit to you the evidence of debt, in the hand writing of D. R. Porter, and also other documentary evidence while we have no doubt will fully satisfy you of the truth of the above charges. We will also shew you that D. R. Porter previous to his insolvency assigned property to John Stonebraker, and afterwards received a part of the proceeds of said property from him, the original transfer and receipt being in the hand writing of D. R. Porter.

very respectfully
ANDREW RUSSEL,
BENJAMIN BANNAN.

We carried this down to the lodgings of Messrs. Hughes and Ingram, and met them at the door, when they handed us a note in reply to our note No. 2. After reading the note which we considered ungentlemanly and discourteous in terms, we told them that we could take no notice of it; but as we were unwilling to let our private feelings interfere with our public duties, we offered them the note above mentioned, in which we proposed to meet them the next morning at 9 o'clock to go on with the investigation; they however refused to receive it. The following is a copy of their last note:

Huntingdon, Sept. 24, 1838.

Messrs. Russel and Bannan.

Gentlemen—your note in answer to your reply to your letter marked B. only more conclusively convinces the undersigned, that it would constitute a proceeding ridiculous and contemptible, should we any longer act with you in the capacity of a mutual committee to investigate the charges in the "Miners Journal," in conformity with the challenge signed B. Bannan. We regret too that this note compels us to reiterate that *Mr. Bannan did assert that the evidence did not sustain the charge in the case of the Commonwealth vs. Robert Campbell*, and however anxious you may *appear* in urging the investigation, we are assured from your course in that case as well as from extraneous circumstances, that you neither will nor dare make an impartial report; your prejudices and interests compelling you to report against D. R. Porter even were every doubt removed as to the falsity of the charges, which have been promulgated through the Whig and Antimasonic Journals through the present Campaign for Governor.

yours respectfully
F. W. HUGHES,
JOHN S. INGRAM.

Thus ended our joint investigation; we on all occasions, both verbally and by letter, urged these gentlemen to investigate the remaining charges, and give us an opportunity of producing the evidence to sustain them; which they refused, not even asking us to prove a single other charge than the one above mentioned, and one that we considered of far less importance than many others of a more serious nature.—We would here remark by way of illustrating the great aversion these gentlemen (particularly one of them) had to examining the documentary evidence in the office at Huntingdon, that when they handed us their reply marked B. Mr. Ingram got up in a great hurry to leave the office.—We requested him to wait until we penned an answer, he said he had some business to attend to, and desired us to send our reply to their lodgings, which we assented to do, and he went out, leaving Mr. Hughes with us. We then remarked to Mr. Hughes that as we were not likely to do any thing more jointly, we desired him to accompany us to the Prothonotary's office, and we would there exhibit to him the records and documents, which we thought would satisfy him of the truth of the charges. Mr. Hughes assented at once, and proceeded to the Prothonotary's office, and had just got down the Docket and commenced the examination, when Mr. Ingram came to the door and called Mr. Hughes out; they walked off together, Mr. Hughes did not return, we remained in the office during the balance of the afternoon, without either of those gentlemen making their appearance: thus ended the seperate investigation. Your committee was in the prothonotary's office next day until 3 o'clock examining and copying documents, during which time neither of those gentlemen visited the office. We returned to the office about 4 P. M. and found Mr. Hughes there; we were informed afterwards by the clerk in the office that he had been there about an hour and a half, asking for the judgment dockets, and copying therefrom during the time, without asking for any other documents.

We further state that Messrs. Hughes and Ingram on no occasion during our mission offered us any testimony of any kind to contradict the many charges against the character of David R. Porter, except what we have heretofore stated, in the case of the Commonwealth vs. Robert Campbell. Your committee were busily employed during the remainder of the two days they were at Huntingdon, in examining and copying documents relative to the case. We examined and have brought with us, certified copies of the following, which we are ready to exhibit to our fellow citizens, viz:—

1st. The proceedings in the court at January term 1819, on the petition of David R. Porter, praying for the benefit of the act, made for the relief of Insolvent debtors.

2nd. The discharge of David R. Porter by the court, February 19, 1819.

3d. Certificate of Robert Campbell of search for his schedule and list of creditors.

4th. Certificate of proceedings in Court of common pleas, in the case of David McMurtrie vs. Edward B. Patton and David R. Porter, lately trading under the firm of Patton & Porter.

5th. Copy of note of Patton and Porter to David McMurtrie for $956,39, in the handwriting of David R. Porter.

6th. Copy of note of Patton and Porter to James Reed in handwriting of David R. Porter—part of this note was paid, and balance assigned by James Reed to David McMurtrie.

7th. Certificate of proceedings in Court of Common Pleas, in case of Henry Crain and Abraham Crain administrators of Evan Crain deceased vs. David R. Porter, surviving partner of Edward B. Patton, trading under the firm of Patton and Porter.

8th. Copy of settlement and due bill in favor of Evan *Crain* for balance $305,15, in hand writing of David R. Porter.

9th. Certificate of proceedings in Court in the case of Samuel Sturgeon, vs. Edward B. Patton and David R. Porter, lately trading under the firm of Patton and Porter.

10th. Copy of proceedings in Court in August 1819 on petition of Samuel Sturgeon for the Benefit of the insolvent laws, schedule of his property, and debts due, with a list of his creditors.

11th. Copy of Bond James Kiddo and Alexander Russel to David R. Porter for $343, dated December 7th 1818, with assignment on back of it in the handwriting of David R. Porter to John Stonebraker, dated January 9th, 1819, and assigned by John Stonebraker to George Davis, May 1, 1823.

12th. A Copy of the Receipt of David R. Porter for part of this bond, viz: $125 from George Davis, which receipt was found amongst the papers of George Davis. We exhibited the original Receipt to David R. Porter's attorney, who admitted it was his (Porter's) handwriting.

13th. Extract from deed from David R. Porter to George B. Porter dated December 11th, 1818, for 500 acres of Land in Beaver county, for the consideration of $3000, subject to the payment of a mortgage for $2000 to the Huntingdon Bank—recorded same day in Beaver county.

In December 1819 the Bank put the mortgage in suit, and in March 1821 Mr. Orbison purchased the property for the Bank for the sum of $2250, amount of mortgage and interest. In 1831, D. R. Porter redeemed this land from the Huntingdon Bank for $2500, debt, interest and costs, and on the 19th day of September 1832, David R. Porter, not George B. Porter, makes a deed to John R. Shannon for this tract of Land, for which David R. Porter, not George B. Porter, received the the sum of $3100. Query, what did David R. Porter do with the $3000 he acknowledged to have received from George B. Porter December 11, 1818, for this land a short time before he took the benefit of the act for the relief of insolvent debtors?

14th. Copy of transcript of Docket of Samuel Ryle, Esq. in the case of Michael Wallace, vs. Patton & Porter, Sept. 9, 1817; judgment $96 25.

15th. Transcript from docket of David Snare, Esq. to revive judgment in the above case, Aug. 25, 1838. William Orbison, Esq. appears for plaintiff, and Geo. Taylor, Esq. for defendant, by agreement of parties case continued till Sept. 8, 1838, at 11 o'clock. Sept. 8, Wm. Orbison, jr. Esq. appears for plaintiff, defendant makes default—judgment favor of plaintiff for $200 85.

16th. Copy of complaint before Esq. Vantries against Thomas M. Owens, for passing counterfeit money, on oath of Patrick McVay. Recognizance of T. M. Owens, who is bound in $1000, and David Tinney in $500, for his appearance at court to answer the charge. When the Court came on Patrick McVay was missing and his recognizance forfeited, and it is positively asserted Thomas M. Owens gave McVay a suit of clothes to leave the County, and not come forward to prosecute. Your Committee saw the counterfeit money in the Prothonotary's office.

17th. List of Judgments, &c. as they appear in the docket in the Prothonotary's office.

18th. Certificate of John Reed, Esq. Recorder of Huntingdon County, of the amount of real estate appearing on record in Huntingdon county in the name of D. R. Porter, from which it appears taking the consideration money of each property, that it only amounts to the sum of $2425, although his friends alledge he is worth $40,000; and the first deed in his name from the time of his insolvency is recorded February 26, 1834.

19th. Certificate of John Reed, Esq. Register and Clerk of Orphans' Court, relative to exorbitant fees charged by D. R. Porter.

20th. Certified extract from testimony of William Patton, showing that David R. Porter did not pay one cent of the purchase money of Sligo Forge.

When your Committee arrived at Huntingdon, they were informed by their friends, that John Williamson, Esq. whom it is known to you all, the Porter papers pronounced to be a gentleman of high standing in Huntingdon County; a member of the Methodist Episcopal church, one on whose statements the most implicit reliance could be placed; and against whose testimony the slanders of Porter's opponents fall harmless to the ground, had abandoned the support of D. R. Porter, and being anxious to know what Mr. Williamson's reasons were for so doing, knowing that from his character and standing in society, great weight would be attached to his opinions, we addressed a letter to him as follows:

Huntingdon, Sept. 24, 1838.

To John Williamson, Esq.

Much importance and credit has been attached to your statements, and your position in the present contest. The undersigned, knowing you from the opinions expressed by the friends of David R. Porter, as a man of honor, and knowing too that you have heretofore been an opponent of the present and late administration of the National Government, have been induced to propound to you the following queries, and ask of you a candid and definite answer to each.

1st. Was you at one time an advocate of the election of David R. Porter to the Gubernatorial chair? If aye, why?

2nd. Are you now an advocate of his election? It is said by some you are not—if so, what has changed your views?

3d. Are you acquainted with John Stonebraker, and his son John H. Stonebraker? If aye, what is their character as men of veracity and integrity?

4th. Have their statements in the case of Porter's assignment of certain bonds to the Elder Stonebraker, had any weight in changing your opinions of the integrity of Mr. Porter's conduct?

5th. We have seen your name attached to certain certificates, published to sustain the character of Mr. Porter, as an upright and just man—Did you sign those certificates? If aye—do you still adhere to the opinions therein expressed?

6th. Is the Elder Stonebraker a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church in good standing—was he ever expelled therefrom; and is he generally considered a man of "sound mind and disposing memory?"

7th. Have you ever seen any thing which convinced you that the Generl Government was using its influence to secure the election of David R. Porter? If aye—what is it?

8th. Are you acquainted with the characters of Michael Wallace, M. Kinkead & other signers to certificates of the Stonebrakers? If aye—what is their character and standing in society?

A definite answer is requested to these questions, because we doubt not the candid supporters of D. R. Porter will accord honesty of purpose to you, as they always have on all occasions avowed their belief in your statements.

Very respectfully yours, &c.,
ANDREW RUSSEL.
BENJ. BANNAN.

To which we received the following reply:

Huntingdon, Sept. 24, 1838.

Gentlemen—your note has just been placed in my hands, containing several definite questions, and asking equally difinite answers. I am ready to answer openly my sentiments upon any subject, yet on the present occasion when the enmity of small minds may charge me with being an unsettled and wavering caterer for public favours, you will do me the justice to say, I do so more through a wish of injury inflicted upon the public mind, than through a desire to place myself conspicuously before that public. I shall then answer your enquiries as briefly and definite lyas possible. Conscious of the rectitude of my own course, neither the sneers of the envious, nor the lowring brows of the malignant shall deter me.

To your first enquiry I answer I was a supporter of Mr. Porter, because I had been for years intimately acquainted with him; he was my neighbour, and I *then* believed him honest, upright and conscientious in his dealings, and he professedly was the opponent, or at least not the *friend* of the Sub-Treasury Scheme, a measure which I then and still think fraught with much injury to the people if engrafted upon the institutions of the country.

I answer your next inquiry by saying, I am not now an advocate or supporter of Mr. Porter, because I found the party to which Mr. Porter is attached, distinctly declaring their determination to make his election the test of the people upon the Sub-Treasury. If there had been no other reason I was forced to leave his support then, for I never could give my sanction, and my vote, to paralize every energy, every enterprize of my country, and to establish an official power equalled only to that of the Autocrat of Russia: I shall consequently vote for and support Joseph Ritner, because he is the friend of Pennsylvania and opposed to the above scheme.

To your third I reply, I am and have been long and intimately acquainted with both the Messrs. Stonebrakers; their character for truth and integrity is unimpeached, and I believe unimpeachable; they have been free from even the suspicion of want of honesty or truth; their statements have always been considered as good as their oaths, and there is not a man who regards his own character, would say that their oaths were not entitled to the fullest credit. For years they have lived where they now do, and their characters stand without blemish or reproach.

To your fourth question, I must acknowledge it is difficult to make a definite answer. The great amount of testimony which has been brought to bear, and with convincing weight upon the reflecting part of the community, renders it difficult to say any one part had a particular effect. It is the whole, united and combined, all verging to the same facts which convinces and must convince all candid enquirers, at least of a want of moral rectitude in the course of Mr. Porter. I am free to admit that I believe every word uttered by them the Stonebrakers to be true, and had I doubted them, the documentary evidence produced fully sustains them. Others who have examined as I have with a desire to do justice to Mr. Porter, yet free from prejudice, must be convinced, as I have been, of his defection from the path of virtue.

To the fifth, I say I never signed, neither did I authorise my name to be signed to a certificate signed by 84 citizens of this county, saying all the charges in the celebrated Union county letter were false. I did sign a certificate that Mr. Porter was not a blasphemer; I did not believe he was a blasphemer, for I consider blasphemy the highest grade of impious profanity. I did certify that there were no judgements on the docket against Mr. Porter, because they were more than 20 years standing, and in law were not against him. I did not certify that they had been paid.

To your sixth interrogation, I must say that I regret that the first clause is introduced it is with feelings of mingled sorrow and surprise that I saw the name of any christian sect introduced into any political discussion. The sphere of the professed worshipper, in any form, is around the alter & sanctuary of his God; to him he must render his account for the deeds done in the body, and whether a man is attached to any sect, is a matter of small moment, if he be a sincere and worthy member, he will meet his reward. I cannot violate the precepts of him who says "judge not." I can only say that Mr. Stonebraker has been for many years and is now a member of the church you name, and his continuance there is evidence of his standing, and I never heard of his having been expelled therefrom. In answer to the last clause, I say his mind is sound and as capable of recollecting and relating transactions now as in his more youthful vigor.

To answer your 7th query, I can briefly say that since the Messrs. Stonebrakers have given their testimony to the public, the marshall of the U. S. has served a writ upon Samuel Stonebraker, the Son and Brother of the others, for an alleged defalcation of nine dollars, and that too without previously making any call on him. The execution of which process must add costs to the amount of fifty dollars, on a poor, young, honest, correct man, who was prepared at any time to adjust the claim upon the government giving him the credit, to which he was entitled. I consider this an insult and injury upon the people, when hundreds who owe thousands of dollars roam unmolested, and merely because they belong to the dominant party.

In answer to your last inquiry I say I am acquainted with nearly all of the signers to the certificates for the Stonebrakers, and know them to be men of character and correct habits. Many of them are among the oldest and best citizens of the county. But as you have selected Mr. Wallace and Kinkead, I must add my testimony to their character something more at large. Mr. Wallace served in the Senate of this State and was elected from this district, and he has ever been respected and honored by his neighbors. Mr. Kinkead has been for many years a prominent leader of the old Democratic party, and is still a firm, unyielding supporter of Jeffersonian Democracy, and was appointed Post master at Yellow Springs by President Madison, and has held that appointment ever since, until he was removed by Mr. Kendal.

Thus I have answered as briefly and as candidly as possible your inquiries; you are at liberty to make what use of it you deem prudent.

With expressions of regard,
I am respectfully yours
JOHN WILLIAMSON.

To A. Russel, and B. Bannan, Esqrs.

Your Committee beg leave to say, from the documentary evidence they have examined, and from all the information they could get from the most respectable citizens of Huntingdon County, that the charges published in the Miners' Journal against David R. Porter, are substantially true; and we have no hesitation in saying that no candid and honest man can go to Huntingdon and make the same examination we did, and see and hear the same amount of testimony we did, can come to any other conclusion. It we saw nothing to palliate or contradict the charges; if there could be any thing produced by his friends, the fault was theirs—they did not offer us any thing; we therefore take it for granted they had nothing to offer. In conclusion, we would merely state, that Messrs. Hughes and Ingram did not examine any of the Bonds, the assignments of property, the evidences of debt in Porter's own handwriting, and in fact all the principal evidence on which the charges are based; nor did they express any desire to us to see them after their arrival in Huntingdon.

There are a great many other facts which came to our knowledge after our arrival in Huntingdon, which might be embodied in this report, but its great length, and the confident belief that what has already been stated, is sufficient to convince any candid and honest man, desirous of correct information, of the truth of the charges, we have refrained from increasing the length of this our report.

ANDREW RUSSEL,
BENJAMIN BANNAN.

Pottsville, Sept. 29th, 1838.

Notice

To the Subscribers of the Town Hall of Pottsville.

A SECOND Instalment of Two dollars and fifty cents on each share of stock, is required to be paid to the subscriber, on or before the first Monday in October next.

By order of the Board.
JOHN T. HAZZARD, Treas'r.

Sept. 22. 74 tf

Notice.

NOTICE is hereby given, that the subscribers appointed by the Orphan's Court of Schuylkill county, to settle and apportion the assets in the hands of Geo. Hill, administrator of the estate of John Miller late of West Penn township in Schuylkill county, deceased, to and among such as are entitled thereto, according to law, will meet for that purpose on Monday the 15th day of October next, at one o'clock in the afternoon, at the house of Michael Graeff, Innkeeper in the Borough of Orwigsburg.

CHARLES WITMAN,
JOHN P. HOBART,
JACOB BROOM,
Auditors.

Orwigsburg, Sept. 24, 1838. 76—