A Card.

To the Editor of The Press:

SIR: Although I shrink from calling the attention of the public, particularly in these times, to anything so comparatively unimportant as myself, I owe it to those whose good opinion I value, as well as to my own reputation, publicly to deny and refute the charges made against me last December, by the Congressional Investigating Committee. Whilst I believe that an honest effort to do right will eventually counteract the effect of private slander, public charges made by persons in authority demand a public denial. I should have made this defence immediately; but it was judged best to present my testimony to the committee, and trust to their sense of justice to vindicate me. I have since appeared before them. Their second report, with the testimony, has just reached me. It neither reiterates the charges, nor does me the justice, that I shall prove by the testimony, I am entitled to. A public defence is, therefore, a necessity. For the sake of brevity, and because the questions at issue are not involved, I shall not enumerate the obstacles I had to surmount before I could reach the committee, nor relate the very many deep mortifications I have had to endure in silence; nor describe how the charges crippled my efficiency as an officer, creating suspicions and embarrassments in the performance of my duty. All this I must suppress, as well as the continually rising indignation I feel at the exceeding wrong done me by persons who, from their privileges as members of Congress, can defame, villify, and slander with impunity.

The first charge is, that certain blankets bought by me at St. Louis last August were "rotten and condemned." See first report, pages 120 and 121. It is not true, and is not sustained by the testimony published by the committee. The blankets were below army standard. A board of survey was called to examine them, consisting of Capt. Turnley, assistant quartermaster; Capt. Hendershot, 2d Artillery; and Capt. Haines, commissary of subsistence. On the 5th September they reported (see page 686, 1st vol.): "The board examined three different kinds of blankets from the bales presented for their inspection, and found them *all* rotten, and one kind made partially of cotton; and the board is of the opinion that the blankets are all entirely unfit for issue to troops, and should not be received by the United States at the prices indicated by the bills, or, indeed, at any price, as they are considered valueless for service." This report was unanimous. It is in evidence (see page 686, 1st vol.) that the original bills were before the board when this survey was made. They represented over 8,500 blankets; were in 49 bales, and were of nine varieties. To condemn *all* on such an examination certainly showed great haste, at least. The report was grossly unjust. The chairman, Capt. Turnley, soon after became conscious that the examination *was* hasty, and at his request the board was again called together. The second examination was made under the following "order" from the commanding general (see page 785, 1st vol.): That they "proceed to examine critically the interior of each bale of blankets, and report the result." They did so, and Captains Henderson and Haines reported as follows (see page 786, 1st vol.): "The board met and proceeded to examine the blankets as ordered. In the opinion of the board the blankets are all unfit for issue, being all of a quality inferior in strength, warmth, and durability to the blankets usually issued to soldiers." This report, it will be observed, differs entirely from the first. The word "rotten" is not repeated. The recommendation not to take them at any price is omitted, and the reason now given why they should not be issued is that they "are not equal to blankets usually issued to soldiers." This reason is in accordance with the fact. They *were* inferior to blankets "usually issued to soldiers," and *proportionately lower in price, too*. The exigencies of the times rendered this reason inapplicable, for had no blankets been issued but such as were "equal to those usually issued to soldiers"—namely, weighing 10 pounds per pair, and all wool—very many of our soldiers would not have had any last fall and winter, as the fact is notorious that there was not a supply of army standard equal to the demand for Government purposes. This is proved by the appeal to private families made by the Quartermaster General about that time. Had the Congressional Committee seen the first report of the Board of Survey *only*, the reflection upon me for purchasing "rotten and condemned blankets" would have been sustained by the testimony, but as the other reports were before them, the charge amounts to an aspersion of character. As another illustration of their precipitancy, to use the mildest term, see page 121, first volume, where they say "the same Board reassembled, and Captain Hendershot and Capt. Haines reaffirmed their former report." I have quoted these reports word for word, given volume and page where they may be found, and it is plain that these two officers, in place of reaffirming the first report, in fact say exactly the reverse, by omitting, after a second examination, the grounds upon which the obnoxious charge is based. It is surprising how prone a committee is to do collectively what as individuals they would hesitate to do. I know but little of the persons composing this committee; but I cannot believe that either of them would be willing to do in their own personal responsibility, what they have done conjointly. But the affair did not end here. Capt. Turnley, the only quartermaster on the Board of Survey, not satisfied even with the modification of the report made by Captains Hendershot and Haines, made a minority report, which was also before the committee in October, under the same "order," which varies still more from the first. See pages 786 and 787, first volume, in which he recommends the issue of the blankets; says that they were cheap; as good as could be had at the price; that the troops needed them; that they cost from $1 45 down to $1.13, whilst the usual army blankets cost from $3.75 to $4 each. He also recommended that some be issued for *one*, and in some cases *three* for *one*. The army regulations allow of only *one* to a soldier; two of these would cost less than one of army standard. Capt. Turnley's report was confirmed. It is proper to state that neither would be binding, unless confirmed by the general in command.

I think the foregoing testimony proves that the first charge is groundless.

The next charge is of another character. It is to be found on pages 121 to 123, first report, and says "that there has been an extraordinary and even disgraceful fraud practised," and th t I was "a party to it," and that through me "the Government purchased blankets at $3 85 that cost only $1.45, and which a board of survey was made to believe cost only $1.45." There being 8,500 blankets, and a profit, according to the committee, of $2.40 a blanket, the absurdity of the charge is seen in the fact that the profit alone would have exceeded the total amount of the whole bill.

The committee has published two volumes of reports, with testimony—one in December, 1861; the other in July last. In neither is there proof to sustain their charges. Taken together, there is positive and direct evidence to the contrary, and simple to explain the apparent wrong implied in the first. The charges and the inferences are false.

I was called before the committee, and testified on the 22d October last, Captain Turnley on the 23d. Upon his testimony, mainly, the charges were based; mine was entirely ignored. Had I been recalled, the bill I sent to the commi tee, at their request, and the testimony of Captain Turnley, could have been reconciled at once; or had Captain Turnley been asked to produce the original bills, which the committee knew were in existence and which they asked him about, (see page 787, 1st vol.,) *they* would have explained the discrepancy. The testimony is too long to quote entire; I will give the substance of it in the same good faith I had expected of the committee, as well as make such explanations as are necessary to a clear understanding of the matter. The bill handed by me to the committee, in October, is copied on page 788, 1st volume. It calls for nine varieties of blankets, ranging in price from $3 25 to $3 85, and $2 37 to $2.95 per pair. It was copied from the one made out on the form required by the army regulations, which had been condensed from the original bills before the Board of Survey. It was in all respects like those, except the word "pairs." How and why this word was crossed out on the bill from which this was copied will be shown.

The committee showed the bill on page 788 to Capt. Turnley, and asked him if it was the one before the board of survey, and the one upon which he had based his report. He replied in substance, see pages 787, 789, 795, 1st vol.: "The original bills were so much per pair. The blankets we examined cost $1 45 down to $1.18 each. Some may have been as high as $3 20. There were several bills. On the bill in the first line reads, '200 brown-gray blankets at $3.25;' that is per blanket, not per pair. This bill, and the bills before the board of survey, are not the same." Capt. Turnley made a mistake, when he said the cost was from $1.45 to $1 18, as his own certificate will prove. His error confused the committee. But as they had the same right to obtain *all* the papers, that they had to obtain any, and as they knew the original bills were in existence, it was their duty to procure them, before they made up their report, and held up to obloquy an officer of the Government. As soon as I saw the charges I called upon Capt. Turnley and told him of them, and showed him the error he had made, which he promptly acknowledged, remarking that the charge was a gross wrong; and, of course, the committee would repair it, by giving a like publicity to the correction. He found the bil s the committee had asked him about, and at my request signed the following certificate, (see page 1147, 2d vol.,) and as the committee, on page 121, 1st vol, endorse Capt. Turnley as "a faithful, vigilant, and competent public officer," they should accept as conclusive his correction of an error, unintentional on his part:

"ST. LOUIS, Jan. 10, 1862.

"The two bills herewith attached, are the original bills by which the blankets referred to by the Congressional Investigating Committee were examined by the board of survey. They are for blankets costing from $1.18½ to $1.92½ each. It was my error in saying they cost from $1.18 to $1.45, (by reason of looking at but one. That marked in blue pencil I did not examine at the time.) These bills are the ones asked for by the Congressional Investigating Committee, and were found by me in Capt. Rankin's office, December 27th, 1861.

"P. T. TURNLEY, Ass't Q. M."

The reason Captain Turnley gives for his error, which I have put in parenthesis, is *interlined* in the certificate, having been inserted after I had drawn it. It slightly confuses the meaning, but does not weaken the force of his correction. He shows that the bills before the board of survey call for blankets from $1.18½ to $1.92½ each, which per pair is $2 37 to $3 85. These are the exact figures in the bill handed the committee, in October, by me.

Copies of the two bills attached to the certificate of Captain Turnley are on pages 1148 and 1149, second volume. They are, as he says, the original bills. One calls for blankets from $2 37 to $2 95 per pair, and the other from $3 25 to $3 85 per pair, and together, amount to exactly the same as the bill I handed to the committee in October. See bills on pages 787, first volume, and 1148, 1149, second volume. The only difference being, that whilst the latter calls for 4,272 blankets, the former call for 4,272 *pairs* of blankets. The following certificate, page 1150, second volume, will show that in consequence of Captain Turnley's report, which the committee had before them in October, I received a receipt for only half the quantity of blankets transferred by me to Captain Rankin, then at the head of the clothing department:

"ST. LOUIS, December 27, 1861.

"The blankets transferred to me by you, in September last, were *double* blankets, but in consequence of the order to issue them *two* for *one*, two were only counted as one, and the receipt given to you for only half the number actually received and distributed. W. G. RANKIN,

"Captain 13th Infantry, Act. A. Q. M.

"To Captain E. M. Davis, A. Q. M. of Vols."

These two certificates were presented to the committee in April, three months before the issue of their last report.

Although not necessary to the argument, it is proper to state why and how the word pairs was crossed out, and as it was done by one of my clerks, it is right I should bear the responsibility, although I did not authorize it, or know that it had been done, when I ordered a copy to be made for the committee in October. When, after the board of survey, this clerk called for a receipt for the blankets, he was told that he could have it for only half the quantity delivered, as, in consequence of Captain Turnley's report, the blankets would be issued two for one. He knew that this receipt and the bill must correspond, or a certificate accompany the papers accounting for the deficiency. With these facts before him, he adopted the plan of crossing out the word *pairs* on the bill, which made the first line read, "200 brown-gray blankets, $3 25," and so, through the bill.

I think that no one can fail to see that the testimony proves that all the bills agree in prices and amounts, and that, therefore, there could not be an "extraordinary and most disgraceful fraud;" that the omission of the word "pairs" was an accident that grew out of the report of the chairman of the board of survey, and that, therefore, there was no intentional "misrepresentation;" and that as I have made no money out of the purchase—which I deem it necessary to say in deference to the judgment of others, and for the sake of those who have so faithfully defended me—both charges and inferences are untrue.

Whether these facts do not disclose "an extraordinary and most disgraceful" disregard for reputation, on the part of the committee, I leave for the reader to decide. E. M. DAVIS.

PHILADELPHIA, Aug. 25th, 1862.

The Draft—A Serious Matter.

To the Editor of The Press:

SIR: It has been suggested in *The Press*, that a fair conscription for military service ought to except families that have already furnished their quota, or more than their quota, to volunteer companies. In other words, where one or more brothers of a family have enlisted, no call should be made on any other son of the same family, until other families have come in, also, for their fair proportion of like patriotic duty. Such, it is understood, is the equitable rule in France. The equity of the thing is so plain, that it is difficult to see how it should be overlooked in the present arrangements for carrying out the draft. Each township and district is to be credited, by special order, with its own recruits, over against its proportion of the conscription. But what comparison can there be between the claims of a whole township to any such credit, and the claims of a particular family to a credit of the same sort? The exemption of the township may be the accidental result of its having a few patriotic families within its limits, while the body of its population show no patriotism whatever. The exemption of any single household, under the same rule, *must* be the fair result of its own patriotism alone. Suppose a township numbering 150 persons liable to service; and then suppose thirty recruits already furnished by it, out of say twenty-five families—five of them having as many as two sons in the army—what shadow of equity can there be in requiring these representative families, if they have still a second or third son liable to service, to divide the chances of conscription, for the remaining twenty soldiers needed from the township, equally with the other families of the township which have done nothing, and now complacently ask to have the patriotism of these representative households counted to their credit? The case is simply monstrous.

And why should the Government not be able still to rectify the abuse? All that is wanted is simply, that the *principle* already declared in regard to townships, districts, and wards, should be extended, with still wider distribution, to domestic communities, to single households, which have an *a fortiori* title, in every view, to its benefit. Surely, if the Government would give the benefit of such a distribution to townships, there would seem to be no good reason why it might not so widen its order as to make it applicable, also, to patriotic families. Such an order, it may be added, would be a powerful stimulus to free enlistment. Many a family would freely spare one son, if by so doing it could certainly retain another. J. W. N.

LANCASTER Co., Sept 3, 1862.

The Object of the Rebels.

To the Editor of The Press:

SIR: The movement of the rebel army from Richmond was, evidently, an absolute *necessity*. The supplies of subsistence in Virginia were exhausted, and difficult to get from other rebel States; their army had nothing but suffering from want of supplies to expect if they remained there longer. It became necessary, therefore, to seek supplies of food elsewhere, and hence the march into Maryland and Pennsylvania, where there is abundance. Rest assured, Mr. Editor, this is the main object of the rebels, and, whilst getting food for their army, at the same time, doing all the mischief possible to loyal men.

I regard this last raid of their forces into Kentucky and Maryland as the desperate act of men who see in it the only hope for continuing the war. True, they have large forces, because every man and boy, able to bear arms, was compelled to join their army; but let us all only unite, heartily, as one man, and their schemes, and plans, and threats will all soon vanish into thin air. Union and action and stout hearts are only now needed to drive those vaunting rebels back to their hiding places in the South, never again to appear in large numbers in the North, and convinced of their folly and vile designs forever.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

AN OLD SOLDIER.

Where is the Man?

To the Editor of The Press:

SIR: In your article this morning of "the Hour, but not the Man," we all must feel the truth of what you say. But although we have not the man in our city, have we not the man in the State? Have we not a tried, a loyal soldier—a man who has the confidence of the soldiers and the community, in General McCall, of Chester county?

Would it not be wise in the Governor to call this tried veteran from his present retirement, and clothe him with the necessary military power to organize the willing thousands of our good old Commonwealth, and lead them to the defence of their homes? I throw out this suggestion in these trying times, for your and others' consideration.

I am respectfully your obedient servant, H.

Speech of Hon. John D. Stiles.

[Correspondence of The Press.]

QUAKERTOWN, Pa., Sept 8, 1862.

The readers of *The Press* would, probably, like to know something in regard to the state of things in the borders of the "disaffected regions"—the upper end of Bucks, a portion of Montgomery and Lehigh counties. A recent Breckinridge Democratic demonstration at a place called Trumbaucsville, in Bucks county, has afforded *facts* that will doubtless prove of general interest.

Hon. John D. Stiles, member of Congress from the district composed of Bucks and Lehigh, was present, according to previous announcement, and addressed the meeting. There was much curiosity to hear him among the patriotic, from the fact that the ambiguous language of the *posters* led to the impression that he and others would counsel resistance to the laws of Congress, and more especially the one in regard to *drafting*. It was our chief design to report the speech verbatim, but in this were signally foiled, as will be presently shown.

Mr. Stiles, elected as a pro-slavery Democrat, and as a stern opponent of the National Administration, has made himself notorious by voting against the tax and confiscation bills, and every other act of Congress tending to suppress the rebellion. On the present occasion, he made it a matter of much self-congratulation, that he had earnestly opposed the Government, and his audience applauded his sentiments to the echo. The abuse of the Administration was overwhelming; it was characterized as corrupt and partisan to the highest degree; it was urged that the war had been originated by the Republican party, aided by renegade Douglas Democrats, and that it was carried on for no other purpose than the abolition of slavery, and to feed the South with negro "niggers," bringing black and white labor into competition. He advised his hearers to stand by party organization to the last—that it was his first and only duty—and that the American Congress was nothing more than a "nigger loving," Abolition rabble. He hoped that if Lincoln's drafting law "didn't take all his hearers, the "unterrified," to fight for a sectional and bigoted Administration, they would set matters right at the next election. They were told there would be drafting in every county, town, and village in the State.

Everywhere would the minions of Abe Lincoln make an extensive and sweeping conscription. Mr. Stiles clearly looked upon the President's requisitions for 600,000 men as a diabolical scheme to get his supporters—the Breckinridge rebel sympathizers—into the ranks of the army. They very evidently wish to stay at home and control the election, and thus raise a "fire in the rear." Is this the manner in which the adherents of Stephen A. Douglas have acted? Let the battle fields of Bull Run, Manassas, Richmond, Port Royal, and Newbern be the answer.

About the conclusion of Mr. Stiles' speech, one reporting was abruptly stopped by a committee of twenty men or more, who demanded the notes and triumphantly carried them off. They were inspected by hundreds, and finally passed into the speakers' stand, and that was the last seen of them. A large band of rowdies kept up a continual noise to prevent us from hearing anything further. They declared that "what was said at the meeting should not be reported in the papers, nor spread abroad over the country." We asked them if they were ashamed of their speaker, but they seemed to think his views all right

In striking contrast with such conduct is that recently displayed by the citizens of Quakertown, (a bright spot in the midst of surrounding Secession darkness,) where, in the course of a single evening, $270 were subscribed for the sick and wounded of our army. LENO.

PHILADELPHIA BOARD OF TRADE

SAM. W. PENNYPACKER, JAMES O. HAND, J. B. LIPPINCOTT, } COMMITTEE OF THE MONTH.

LETTER BAGS

At the Merchants' Exchange, Philadelphia.

Ship Tonawanda, Julius.....Liverpool, Sept 25
Ship Adelaide Bell, Robertson.....Liverpool, soon
Ship George Green, Leach.....Liverpool, soon
Ship Shatemuc, Oxnard.....Liverpool, soon
Bark Aaron I Harvey, Miller.....Port Spain, soon
Bark John Payson, Terry.....Havana, soon
Brig S G Troop, McClellan.....Queenstown, soon
Brig Shibboleth, Morton.....Rarbadoes, 8 d

MARINE INTELLIGENCE.

FORT OF PHILADELPHIA, Sept. 11, 1862.

SUN RISES.....5 38—SUN SETS.....6 16
HIGH WATER.....4 15

ARRIVED

Schr Emma, Smith, 5 days from Lynn, in ballast to Noble, Caldwell & Co.
Schr Lucy, Spence, 1 day from Brandywine, Del, with mill feed to R M Lea.

CLEARED

Brig Alliance, Hicks, Halifax, E A Sonder & Co.
Schr Emma, Smith, Cohasset, Noble, Caldwell & Co.
Schr Maria Fleming, Shaw, Providence, Tyler, Stone & Co.

(Correspondence of the Press.)

HAVRE DE GRACE, Sept 9

The steamer Wyoming left here this morning, with the following boats in tow, laden and consigned as follows:

Corsilliton, grain to Thornton & Barnes; Perkins & McCann and Joseph C Black, sell, lumber to New York; Sierra Alta, do to Chester, Pa; H R Fredericks, do to W S Taylor; Roanoke, do to Z Crosley; H E Mills, do to Frankford; R M A, do to John Craig; Mary Elizabeth, do to Wilmington; Monitor No 1 and Fanny Fink, anthracite coal to Chas Evans; Gen Cameron, do to Hammett, Van Duzen & Lochman; Falmouth, bituminous coal to New York; Saratoga, do to New Jersey; Mary Linn, do to Delaware City; Fourth of July, anthracite coal to John Street; W C Brubaker, O J Brubaker, and Amazada, do to Delaware City.

MEMORANDA.

Park A Bradshaw, Fish, for Philadelphia, entered out at London 25th ult.

Bark Emily O Starr, Fairfowl, sailed from Shanghae 28th June for Nagasaki.

Bark Old Hickory, Meade, sailed from Belfast, Ireland, 6th inst, for Philadelphia.

Bark Cariocca, Oliver, from London for Philadelphia, sailed from Gravesend 23d ult.

Bark Florence, Tove, hence, at Queenstown 22d ult sailed for Antwerp.

Bark Niccia, (Ital) Califan, hence for London, at Gravesend 26th ult.

Brig Princeton, Wells, cleared at Boston 9th inst for Philadelphia

Schrs A Tirrel, Higgins, and J R Plater, Gandy, hence, arrived at Boston 9th inst.

Schrs J E Mather, Nickerson, Sarah L Stevens, Studley, and Garland, Norton, cleared at Boston 9th inst. for Philadelphia

Schr Thomas Borden, Wrightington, from Fall River for Philadelphia, at Newport 8th inst.

Schrs J S Welsh, Smith, hence, and Monterey, Craig, from Delaware City, at Providence 8th inst.

Schr Alma Collin, Franks, hence, arrived at Newburyport 8th inst.

Schr Henrietta, Jones, sailed from Newburyport 8th inst. for Philadelphia.

Schr Georgia, Gilchrist, from Providence for Philadelphia, sailed from Newport 7th inst.

Schr J V Willgerodt, Chipman, hence for Boston, returned to Newport 6th inst, and remained at 1½ P M on the 8th.

Schrs Geo E Prescott, Pendleton, from Salem for Philadelphia, and Jas Neilson, Burt, from Taunton for do, at Newport 8th inst.

Schr Vermillion, Avery, hence, arrived at New Haven 8th inst.

Schr E W Benedict, for Philadelphia, cleared at New Haven 8th inst.

Schr Julia E Pratt, Pratt, sailed from Providence 8th inst. for Philadelphia.

Schr Tighlin, Kellar, cleared at St John, NB, 4th inst. for Philadelphia.

LEGAL.

IN THE ORPHANS' COURT FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF PHILADELPHIA. In the matter of the Estate of LYDIA PRIOE, dec'd. The Auditor appointed by the court to audit, settle, and adjust the account of ROBERT S. PASCHALL, Administrator, &c., of LYDIA PRIOE, deceased, and to report distribution of the balance, will meet the parties interested at his Office, S E. corner of EIGHTH and LOCUST Streets, on MONDAY, September 15th, A. D. 1862, at 4 o'clock in the afternoon. se6 stuth5t DANIEL DOUGHERTY, Auditor.

UNITED STATES, EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, *SCT.* THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, TO THE MARSHAL OF THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, GREETING:

WHEREAS, The District Court of the United States in and for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, rightly and duly proceeding on a Libel filed in the name of the United States of America, hath decreed all persons in general who have, or pretend to have, any right, title, or interest in the schooner LOUISA, whereof ——— is master, her tackle, apparel, and furniture, and the goods, wares, and merchandise laden on board thereof, taken and seized at sea, about thirty miles southeast by east from Charleston, South Carolina, by the United States steamer BIENVILLE, under command of Commander Mullaney, and brought into this port, to be monished, cited, and called to judgment, at the time and place underwritten, and to the effect hereafter expressed, (justice so requiring) You are therefore charged, and strictly enjoined and commanded, that you omit not, but that, by publishing these presents in at least two of the daily newspapers printed and published in the city of Philadelphia, and in the *Legal Intelligencer*, you do monish and cite, or cause to be monished and cited, peremptorily, all persons in general who have, or pretend to have, any right, title, or interest in the said schooner LOUISA, her tackle, apparel, and furniture, and the goods, wares, and merchandise laden on board thereof, to appear before the Hon. JOHN CADWALADER, the Judge of the said Court, at the DISTRICT COURT ROOM, in the City of Philadelphia, on the TWENTIETH day after publication of these presents, if it be a court day, or else on the next court day following, between the usual hours of hearing causes, then and there to show, or allege, in due form of law, a reasonable and lawful excuse, if any they have, why the said schooner LOUISA, her tackle, apparel, and furniture, and the goods, wares, and merchandise laden on board thereof, to appear before the Honorable JOHN CADWALADER, the Judge of the said Court, at the DISTRICT COURT ROOM, in the City of Philadelphia, on the TWENTIETH day after publication of these presents, if it be a court day, or else on the next court day following, between the usual hours of hearing causes, then and there to show, or allege, in the form of law, a reasonable and lawful excuse, if any they have, why the said schooner JOSEPHINE, her tackle, apparel, and furniture, and the goods, wares, and merchandise laden on board thereof, should not be pronounced to belong, at the time of the capture of the same, to the enemies of the United States, and as goods of their enemies, or otherwise, liable and subject to confiscation and condemnation, to be adjudged and condemned as good and lawful prizes; and further to do and receive in this behalf as to justice shall appertain. And that you duly intimate, or cause to be intimated, unto all persons aforesaid, generally, (to whom by the tenor of these presents it is also intimated,) that if they shall not appear at the time and place above mentioned, or appear and shall not show a reasonable and lawful cause to the contrary, then said District Court doth intend and will proceed to adjudication on the said capture, and may pronounce that the said schooner JOSEPHINE, her tackle, apparel, and furniture, and the goods, wares, and merchandise laden on board thereof, should not be pronounced to belong, at the time of the capture of the same, to the enemies of the United States, and as goods of their enemies, or otherwise, liable and subject to confiscation and condemnation, to be adjudged and condemned as good and lawful prizes; and further to do and receive in this behalf as to justice shall appertain. And that you duly intimate, or cause to be intimated, unto all persons aforesaid, generally, (to whom by the tenor of these presents it is also intimated,) that if they shall not appear at the time and place above mentioned, or appear and shall not show a reasonable and lawful cause to the contrary, then said District Court doth intend and will proceed to adjudication on the said capture, and may pronounce that the said schooner ELIZA, her tackle, apparel, and furniture, and the goods, wares, and merchandise laden on board thereof, should not be pronounced to belong, at the time of the capture of the same, to the enemies of the United States, and as goods of their enemies, or otherwise, liable and subject to confiscation and condemnation, to be adjudged and condemned as good and lawful prizes; and further to do and receive in this behalf as to justice shall appertain. And that you duly intimate, or cause to be intimated, unto all persons aforesaid, generally, (to whom by the tenor of these presents it is also intimated,) that if they shall not appear at the time and place above mentioned, or appear and shall not show a reasonable and lawful cause to the contrary, then said District Court doth intend and will proceed to adjudication on the said capture, and may pronounce that the said schooner ELIZABETH, her tackle, apparel, and furniture, and the goods, wares, and merchandise laden on board thereof, did belong, at the time of the capture of the same, to the enemies of the United States of America, and as goods of their enemies, or otherwise, liable and subject to confiscation and condemnation, to be adjudged and condemned as good and lawful prizes; and further to do and receive in this behalf as to justice shall appertain. And that you duly intimate, or cause to be intimated, unto all persons aforesaid, generally, (to whom by the tenor of these presents it is also intimated,) that if they shall not appear at the time and place above mentioned, or appear and shall not show a reasonable and lawful cause to the contrary, then said District Court doth intend and will proceed to adjudication on the said capture, and may pronounce that the said schooner JOSEPHINE