

To the Citizens of Pennsylvania.

When Mr. William Findlay, the State Treasurer, was first charged with having made an exchange of \$ 10,000 of public money in Philadelphia paper for depreciated western money, with Mr. Acheson of Washington, it was supposed to have allusion to myself. The committee of correspondence, for the county of Washington, called on me for an explanation. Without hesitation, I gave a statement, which has been published.

Although my partnership with my brother terminated on the first of January, 1815, yet we did not arrange our business so as to make a settlement until the 25th of that month. We had two establishments in Washington county, one in Washington, and the other in West Alexandria, both of which I sold out to my brother. Most of the cash he took with him, had been the property, and in possession of the former firm. It had been counted and the amount ascertained, on the 25th of January, the day we settled. Knowing then the kind of money, that my brother had collected, in order to take with him to the city, I was satisfied that no such exchange as had been stated ever took place. In addition to my own recollections on this subject I can produce testimony, which, I apprehend, will not be questioned, in the hand writing of the deceased. It is a statement of cash, a copy of which is annexed, made out, a few days before his departure for the city, and given to his then partner, James Cummins. Between the date of the memorandum and the time of his departure, it is probable he received other funds; but of this I have no knowledge. Gen. Acheson had also some orders on the treasury besides several sums of money collected on the way from Washington to Harrisburg, which were not included in the statement of cash. Part of the Washington notes I understand, he exchanged for eastern money before he left home, and on the road over the mountains. He passed through Chambersburg, with a view to effect further exchange, whether he succeeded or not I do not know.

I have also been informed by some gentleman in Pittsburgh, that the notes of the Pittsburgh bank were exchanged by him for eastern money. I appeal to all men of business if it is not customary, when going on journeys, to make purchases to make a memorandum of their funds; such a memorandum was made out by the deceased a few days before his departure from home; the hand writing can be proved by an hundred persons in Washington county and by many in Philadelphia if necessary. The fact however is not denied.

He arrived in Philadelphia in February 1815, and left that place in the beginning of April. Three or four weeks after his return home he became sick, and continued so until he died on the 2d of August.

From what I have stated it will appear that whatever exchange may have been made at Harrisburg, there could be nothing improper in the transaction, nor could the commonwealth sustain any loss. It is probable the transaction was a mutual accommodation to both parties. I never received any communication from my brother nor had I ever any conversation with him upon this subject, and knowing the kind of money he had with him I took it for granted there could have been no such exchange at Harrisburg. That no dishonorable or dishonest advantage could have been taken of the state must be evident from the known character of the deceased, as well as that of Mr. Findlay.

During the late war, few men did more than Gen. Acheson. He was ready and active on all occasions, both with his purse, and by his example, to encourage the youth of the country to turn out in support of what he considered a just and necessary war. In drafting and organizing the different detachments of troops ordered out from time to time, in Washington county, it is known to the officers who commanded the troops, that his conduct was zealous and patriotic. At one time I know he made considerable advances for the public service out of his own pocket. When news arrived that the federal city was taken and burned; that the British was in full march for Baltimore or Philadelphia, an excellent volunteer corps was raised in the town of Washington, in the course of a few days, principally by his exertions and in order to expediate their equipment, he gave a considerable sum out of his own private purse—When this corps had arrived at some place in the mountains, their march was countermanded, in consequence of the failure of the attack on Baltimore, and of Philadelphia being considered out of danger.

Any person who will take the trouble to call at the store of Messrs. William

Wilson, & Co. No. 325, Market street, Philadelphia, will find by examining their books for the months of April and May 1815 which will be freely shown, that considerable sums of western money belonging to Acheson and Cummins were disposed of, from time to time, by Mr. Wilson, at from two and an half to three and an half per cent discount. This proves that the rate of discount has been greatly exaggerated.

DAVID ACHESON.

Philadelphia, August 23, 1817.

(COPY)

Cash on hand January 26, 1817.

Philadelphia, Reading and Jersey	
Notes	\$ 3,075
Gold and Silver	400
Chambersburg Notes	2,000
Carlisle and Harrisburg, &c.	1,100
Pittsburg	1,100
Washington	1,250
	\$ 8,825

Among the many efforts which have been made to injure the character of Mr. Findlay the democratic candidate for the office of governor of Pennsylvania, is the charge of corrupt exchange with general Acheson. The Aurora teems with argument to prove that a check was drawn on the bank of Pennsylvania, and charitably concludes, that no check could have been drawn without corruption. Checks have been drawn by every state treasurer since the removal of the government from Philadelphia, on the banks in this city, for deposits of money at par in the treasury. We have waited until we have become possessed of the full charge, and we will now show how a plain, dispassionate man may view the wonderful affair of the 10,000 dollars without converting into funds, citizens who have ever supported characters of the highest honour and honesty.

The first time, we believe, this charge was publicly made in the newspapers, was shortly after Mr. Findlay was nominated, on the 4th of March. It appeared in the *Western Register*, an old-school paper, published at Washington, Pa. on the 13th March last in the following words:

"Not long since, he (Mr. Findlay) accommodated a merchant of the western country with 10,000 dolls. in Philadelphia paper in exchange for western notes, at a time when they were 10 or 15 per cent, below par."

The charge was promptly denied, as soon as it was read, in the *Harrisburg Republican* of the 25th of the same month; we extract the words of that paper.

"To the people of Pennsylvania, where Mr. Findlay is known, it must be needless for us to mention that we are enabled to state, not only that the charge is utterly false as it is wicked, but that no circumstance of any kind occurred in the slightest degree to give any colour to any suspicion of impropriety relative to the exchange or disposal of money."

On the 29th of April will be found, in the same paper, a plain and simple statement, which was republished in the *Centinel* of the 7th of May last, to which we refer our readers for a satisfactory account of the state of the treasury, and of the practice of drawing checks on the Philadelphia banks, by the state treasurer. It will be recollected, on perusing that paper that general Acheson's name was not mentioned at the time, and it was supposed from the vague expression "not long since," and the high discount "10 or 15 per cent," that the transaction alluded to, must have been within a year. As the writers in the *Aurora* seem to think that the mere fact of an exchange is sufficient to overwhelm the treasurer with infamy, and that no exchange could have been made without corruption, or a violation of the law, because they contend, that a transfer of money from one part of the state to another, is a violation of the constitution, which says, "No money shall be drawn from the treasury," but in consequence of appropriations made by law," we extract one part of the paper, which is particularly applicable to the case under consideration.

"Only one other thing requires explanation. It sometimes has occurred under every state treasurer since the removal of the seat of government from Philadelphia, that checks on city banks have been given to persons on account of deposits made at the treasury by such persons in money at par in Philadelphia. It is evident that by doing so the treasurer cannot be benefited, although the interest of the commonwealth may be promoted. The reason for occasionally giving such checks for such deposits is this:—A considerable part of the state funds are received at Philadelphia principally from auction duties and dividends on bank stock which are credited to the commonwealth in the city banks. The greater part of the payments made by the commonwealth in the year, are made in cash from the treasury at Harrisburg, and not checks

on city banks. It therefore becomes necessary once or twice in every year, and especially during the session of the legislature, to transport some of the state funds in cash, from the city banks to Harrisburg, and this must be either done through a branch bank or individuals, or by a special messenger from the treasury office; which of course is done with some trouble to the treasurer and at the expence of the state.

"Now it must be evident that at a time when the cash funds of the state at the treasury are low, it is a benefit to the state, if a merchant or any other person deposits in the state treasury a sum of money in Philadelphia notes or notes at par in Philadelphia, and receives a check on a city bank in exchange. This has sometimes been done by every state treasurer, because the state is not injured but benefited by saving the expence of a special messenger; and it is a convenience to the person receiving the check, for it is easier and safer to carry a check payable to order, than to carry a quantity of money in specie or notes.

"This, although sometimes, is not often done; for if it were to be common, it would consume the time of the clerks in the treasury department and be more expensive to the state than the sending of a confidential person to the city to bring up money from the banks. It is well known that last winter a sufficient sum to pay the legislature could not be procured either through the bank at Harrisburg or from individuals, and that a special messenger was sent to Philadelphia for the purpose.

"But we again distinctly aver, that in no case was a check ever given by the present state treasurer except for legal demands upon the treasury, or the previous deposit in the treasury of Philadelphia bank notes or notes at par in Philadelphia equal to the amount of the check. It is therefore evident, that no possible advantage could occur to the treasurer, or any injury to the public, by any checks of any kind that have ever been delivered."

In this passage will be seen the true, correct, and plain statement of the case of Acheson's check if any such check were ever given, which is a circumstance that we can neither affirm nor deny, as the books of the bank of Pennsylvania are not open for our inspection. However be this as it may, the existence of such a check is altogether immaterial. It proves nothing. At the commencement of this affair it was stated that checks on Philadelphia were drawn on a deposit of money at par in this city, for the accommodation of the public business, and for the interest of the state. We will therefore suppose that the assertion in the *Aurora* is so far true, that a check of Mr. Findlay, in favor of general Acheson, for \$ 8000, does appear on the books of the bank and of the treasury. Now for the proof of corruption:

The editor of the *Western Register* boasts, that he first promulgated this affair and Thomas Morgan an attorney at Washington county and son-in-law of Mr. Duane in his letter, which is the great foundation of the charge, appears to consider his information to that editor to be the foundation of the publication. Mr. Morgan states that he was attending the legislature as a member in February 1815, when general Acheson arrived at Harrisburg and before his departure, "he mentioned to me, that Mr. Findlay had given him a large sum, \$10,000 I think of Philadelphia paper, in exchange for other notes." I remarked that it was a great accommodation—he said, it was. I asked what was the difference in value—he told me; "I cannot however, undertake to state positively, but my belief is, that he said, it was 6 or 8—or 10 per cent." These are the words of Mr. Morgan. In the first place the *Aurora* now asserts that the amount was only \$ 8000—here is one mistake Mr. M. thinks it was in February 1815—he thinks it was \$ 10,000—he cannot undertake to state positively, but his belief is, that he told him the difference in value was 6 or 8—or 10 per cent. A positive charge is made, that Mr. Findlay did positively exchange with Mr. Acheson \$ 10,000 in Philadelphia paper for paper positively 10 or 15 per cent, below par. Not only has uncertainty been made the foundation of a positive charge by the *Register*, but 8000 dollars has been increased to 10,000 by Mr. Morgan, whose memory proving treacherous in this great feature of the cause cannot be relied on in the others. The zeal of the editor is proved to have made him the account he received from his friend and Mr. Morgan represents him as having magnified the 6 or 8—or 10 per cent. to twice the amount of his highest discount, and in his letter to him he says, when he told him the exchange was from 6 to 10 per cent. "you then observe, that you had been setting in type an account of the exchange, and thinking that western was twenty per cent. below eastern paper, you

had so composed it, but would alter it." Now then how did this editor alter it, when Mr. Morgan told him, it was from 6 to 10 per cent? He publishes the charge and positively asserts it was at "ten to fifteen per cent. below par." Yet these conjectures of Mr. Morgan, and misrepresentations of the editor of the *Register* are to destroy the character of William Findlay, and convict general Acheson of being bribed.

Mr. Morgan states that the knowledge of the exchange was possessed by him in "February 1815," while he was in the legislature. Why did not Morgan institute an inquiry into the conduct of the treasurer, as an honest representative of the people should have done? At the following session, when the annual report of the treasurer was made according to law, as it was on the 12th December, 1815, and the accounts were before the house, why did not Mr. Morgan, then oppose it? Because he knew there was no impropriety in the transaction; or, take the alternative, because he was himself guilty of a breach of his trust, by suffering a man who is now charged with misconduct upon his testimony, of this knowledge, to remain in undisturbed possession of the treasures of his country. But perhaps Mr. Morgan may be said to be an indolent man, and was afraid, or had no energy of character sufficient for such an attempt. This cannot excite him from the dilemma, for tho' he might have declined opposing Mr. Findlay, how can he account for his vote to continue that gentleman in his office nearly one year after he knew of this matter. In the *Journals* of the house of representatives, for the session of 1815-16, page 125, Thomas Morgan is recorded as voting in favor of William Findlay, for the office of state treasurer, on the 9th of January, 1816, nearly a year after he now says, he knew of this affair. Does this not prove, that there was nothing in the matter but an ordinary transfer of money?

If additional evidence be necessary to prove that Mr. Morgan cannot, even at this time, think there is an impropriety in this affair, it will appear from the following extract from his letter: "As to the anonymous insinuation in the *Examiner*, that I am an enemy to Mr. Findlay—and that therefore, general Acheson being his friend, he would not tell me of the exchange if made, it is untrue, that I was then, or that I am now, his enemy it is certain that I am not in favor of his election—but it is well known that my opposition is not because I am unfriendly to him personally but an account of the manner of his nomination," Mr. Morgan therefore opposes Mr. Findlay not on account of an impropriety in his conduct, but because he disapproves of "the mode of his nomination."

The next authority for the charge is an extract from the same *Western Register*, in which it is said, that Mr. Sample the editor of the *Reporter*, (a democratic paper published in Washington) admitted that an exchange was made by Gen. Acheson with the treasury. This we have already taken for granted, on the authority of the *Aurora*. If it ever took place, it would be madness in Mr. Findlay to deny it, because his books which are as open to Dr. Leib, and all the opposition members of the legislature, as to himself will prove the fact; if it be so. Mr. Sample states nothing of 6 or 8—or 10—or 10 or 15—or 20 per cent. discount Mr. Sample makes no charge of corruption in the treasurer. On the contrary Mr. Sample, who knows as much of the matter as Mr. Morgan, and also from Gen. Acheson himself, believes and contends that the affair was perfectly honorable.

We next have Mr. John M. Glinsey's letter. Mr. M. Glinsey states that he went to New York in February, 1815, to purchase dry goods at the public sales, when he became acquainted with Gen. Acheson. On speaking of his loss in exchange of Philadelphia bank notes, he observed, "if my loss is great, what will be your's with your western paper? Oh! said Gen. A. I have no cause to complain; as I come down through Harrisburg, a friend there exchanged for me (to the best of my recollection the sum mentioned was) ten thousand dollars or about 10,000." The writers in the *Aurora* admits this assertion to be incorrect; they say the amount was 8000 instead of \$ 10,000 Mr. M. Glinsey's recollection appears to be very imperfect, and all that can be gathered from him was, that general A. told him, he had exchanged some money, on his way to Philadelphia, but with whom he cannot say, and in the amount he is mistaken, Messrs John Thoburn and John Steel, who were present when the conversation took place, state, that neither the amount, time nor place was mentioned. Mr. M. Glinsey must have confused the conversation of Gen. A. with the accounts he has since heard, and those he has seen in the papers. Surely nothing can be drawn from his statement which can be a feather in the scale against the character of Mr. Findlay.