

(BY REQUEST.)
TO THE ELECTORS OF THE
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,

WITHOUT DISTINCTION OF PARTY.
Fellow Citizens.—A number of the friends of the present Constitution of Pennsylvania, convened in the city of Philadelphia, have appointed us their committee, to call your attention to the amendments proposed by the late convention, and to urge upon you the duty of voting against them at the approaching election.

The meeting by which this trust was committed to us, was a representation of all the varieties of political opinion which are known in the Commonwealth, with no other exception than that it was composed of the friends of the present constitution. It was a meeting, therefore, without distinction of party, as party organization, we are happy to believe, was not contemplated, the subject of the proposed amendments, and it is in this character that we proceed to the performance of our duty.

We address you all, as associated with ourselves in the enjoyment of the rights and privileges which our fathers intended to secure to us by the constitution of 1790; and we do it with no other end or object, present or remote, than to prevail upon you, if possible, to abide by that constitution as it now stands. The time that remains for reflection is short. The day is at hand, when you are to place in the ballot box the most important vote you have ever given; and while we entreat you to ponder this great question for yourselves, and soberly to estimate the extent both of the blessings you now enjoy, and of the perils to which you expose them by a change of the constitution, we offer for your consideration a few of the most prominent reasons which have governed us, and those whom we represent, in our purpose of adhering to the constitution in its present form.

Fellow citizens, it is a solemn thing to change the constitution of government under which we have lived. Circumstances may call for it, but they should make a case of clear necessity or indisputable expediency to remedy an equally clear and indisputable mischief. It is not enough that the proposed change may be technically proper. The interests of little value in government, which comes home to the interests of men by practical application, and if not good in practice, is good for nothing. Neither is it enough that there are some or several evils of administration under the constitution we possess. What people ever were, or ever will be, free from them?—What legislation will ever be perfect? What people will ever be perfect in the administration of the laws and constitution which they have?—It is one thing to change a law of the state, upon the ground of alleged evil, and another to break up the foundations of law and government and to lay them anew. The working of a single law, which is a rule but for a few cases, may be seen near at hand, and be traced with unerring certainty to its effects; and if these are bad, the law may be safely changed and changed again, until it is found to work well. For this purpose are our annual legislatures. But the working of a single principle in a constitution, which is a connected code of principles for the organization and regulation of government, is a very different thing. Its particular effects can rarely be traced with any certainty. What is assumed to be the evil effect of a clause in the judiciary department, may really proceed from a defect in the constitution of the executive; or it may be in neither, but in the constitution of the legislature; or perhaps in none of them, but in the imperfect nature of man himself.—The good or evil of a principle can in general be seen only in the effects of the whole constitution upon the people. If these are good, none of its principles can be pernicious, however they may offend against theories. Let us never confound the evils inseparable from the condition of man, which no constitution can remove, with the evils of a vicious constitution under which a people cannot prosper. The latter alone are worth the risk that attends the breaking up of old foundations. If the former are sufficient to justify a change, there will be no end to changes of our constitution, while man's nature shall continue what it is.

It is now forty-eight years since the present constitution came from the hands of those who formed it. In that period of time the population of Pennsylvania has been increased nearly four-fold, and its wealth in a still greater ratio. The evidences of its prosperity cover the land.—Its schools for general education, its colleges for the higher branches of learning and science, its hospitals for the sick and disabled, its asylums for the destitute orphan, the deaf and dumb, the blind and the lame, and its penitentiaries for the reform of the guilty, are a theme of praise throughout the Union, and with enlightened foreign nations; and in the improvement of every part of the State, the settlement and increasing population of our new counties, the productive agriculture of the older ones, the extent and stability of the mechanic arts, the growth of manufactures, the development of mineral treasures, and the expansion of our internal commerce by means of the magnificent canals and railroads which cover the State, we seem to behold the smiles of Heaven upon a people who have laid the foundations of their government wisely, and who with their efforts to build up their vast superstructure of wealth, have omitted the noble work of crowning the whole with a provision for the moral and intellectual culture of themselves and their posterity.

If we look only to so much of this mass of good as consists of private property, we may see it all around us, and about us every where; but we are universally partakers of it, and with as much equality, as has ever been known in so populous a community. In general it belongs to every man in proportion to his industry, ability and frugality. No man who possesses a share of it can be deprived of it against his will by any other man, nor is he liable to a claim for any part of it by the public, except in common with others for the expenses of the government which protects him. No man who desires to make his share larger, needs

any thing to this end, but the continued application of his own exertions. He who has the most of it, requires no privilege above his fellow-citizens, except that of doing more good, and he who has the least, does not need a plentiful, dissolute, or improvident, has the daily bread of himself and his family in return for his reasonable daily labor.

We appeal to you, fellow citizens, whether this view of the present condition of our Commonwealth is not substantially correct; and if it be, what can be the defects of a constitution which can be the defects of such a people and such an empire? How could such results have come about, if that constitution had failed to secure the great cardinal rights of life, liberty, property, of suffrage, equality under the law, and in making the law? How could they have happened, if the constitution had failed either to establish these rights as principles, or to ordain such a frame of departments, executive, legislative, and judicial, as was best calculated to give them effect? How can there be any material defect in a constitution, the very laws under which, defective as in some instances they may be, and the very judiciary under which, liable as judiciaries ever will be to occasional appointments which disappoint the people, nevertheless have not for an instant retarded the extraordinary growth of this people, nor diffused an apprehension that the very least of these rights is in any danger? How can a change of that constitution be now required, when this state of things was notorious, and it is equally so, that in the main your laws have been wisely made, soundly interpreted, and faithfully executed, in conformity with the principles of the constitution?

Permit us then to ask you one and all, as brethren of one family, as joint inheritors from our fathers, of the charter under which we have thus prospered and may still prosper, will you consent to alter this constitution? Will you consent to alter it upon the theory, not that what is clearly bad in the constitution may possibly be made good, but that what is clearly good, because it has been tried for half a century with the whole constitution, and has worked well, may possibly be made better?—Would any sober-minded man pull down a part or parts of the foundation of his own house upon such a theory? Will the sober, reflecting and practical people of Pennsylvania pull down a part or parts of the foundation of all the houses in the State, upon such a theory? We sincerely hope they will not. The present case is not one of clear necessity or indisputable expediency. It is not a case of existing evil, clearly traced to the constitution, and to whose removal it, which it is proposed to alter, for there is no evil proceeding from any branch of our government, but the causal and inevitable evils of administration, which do not oppose the strength of a packthread to the current of wealth, security and happiness, on which we are carried along.

Suffer us, however, fellow citizens, to call your attention to a brief consideration of the proposed amendments. Though the subject is a copious one, and the time will not permit us to make our consideration of it other than very brief, a very few remarks may nevertheless serve as useful suggestions to excite your own reflections.

The amendments in question admit of division into several classes. The first, in the order in which we shall notice them, regards the right of suffrage, which it is proposed to alter in two particulars, one of them in relation to the color of the elector, who must be a white freeman, and the other in reference to the term of residence and assessment before the exercise of the right, which it is proposed to shorten. As to the first, however our fellow citizens may have been divided upon the point, the proposed amendment has lost its effect by the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court of the State. That court has decided, and it is now the law of the land, having been adjudicated by the court of last resort, that under the constitution as it now stands, a negro or mulatto cannot possess the right of an elector. It is understood moreover to have been the settled law since 1795, when the same law was adjudicated by the High Court of Errors and Appeals, then the court of last resort in the State, composed of President Chew, the Judges of the Supreme Court, and the presidents of all the Courts of Common Pleas. The proposed amendment, therefore, will not alter the constitution, and consequently is of no use. In the other particular, if evils of any moment have occurred from the constitution as it is, or if any considerable portion of our citizens have testified an interest in reducing the two years residence to one, and the six months assessment to ten days, the fact is unknown to us. It concerns none who are now entitled to vote upon the amendment; and if the value of the elective franchise is as great as we all agree that it is, there seems to be the less reason for conferring it upon others on their showing less evidence of attachment to the Commonwealth and to the right, that we have shown ourselves.

The second class comprehends certain proposed restraints upon the legislative power—in regard to the formation of senatorial districts—the annulling the marriage contract where the courts have a power to decree a divorce—the granting of bank charters without previous public notice of the intention to apply for them, or for a longer term than twenty years, without reserving a right to alter or annul them, if the legislature shall think them injurious to the public—and finally to the incorporation of more than one company in a law. We will not detain you by endeavoring to show, as may easily be done, that some of these amendments will not secure the good, questionable or otherwise, which they mean to attain; but in regard to such of them as are of any interest, we beg you to consider, that they do not involve any fundamental or constitutional principle whatever; that they mean at most to strike at certain errors in legislation imputable to representatives, and not to the constitution, and which from not being comprehended by some principle through which they may be attacked and destroyed at the root, may and

The Carlisle Herald and Expositor.

Upon this subject of Judicial tenure, sufficient to ask you a single question. "Constituted as man is; will Judges in general be as impartial and upright on the trial of a cause, when the renewal of their office depends upon the favour of one of the parties, as they will be when nothing but misconduct can deprive them of their office, then the whole question is answered; for in multitudes of causes and the most important causes too, the appointing power, or those who create and influence it, will be one of the parties in name, in interest, or in feeling. They will be so in every case of great political excitement. They will be so wherever the constitutionality of a popular law is brought into question. They will be so wherever a humble individual, who has no stay but an impartial Judge, is opposed to a great political leader. They will be so in every case which extensive public opinion has already prejudged. These are the cases in which the interests of the public, require that Judges should be left to the support of an equal mind, and undisturbed nerves, to do their duty without fear or favour and yet these are the cases in which, if the amendments be adopted, the best judges may feel that their station in society, and their love for their country, to persuade them to give judgment that shall be acceptable to the friends who can renew their commission. How many will listen to this appeal, we cannot tell. It is wise to expose any of them to it!—One man in a thousand may come out of such a trial like red-hot gold, and lose his office for conscience sake, but how many of the rest would we have to say and lament, that they have preserved their office, but their fine gold has become dim? We must deal with men as they are; and if the amendments deal with them upon any other theory, they are not fit to become parts of a constitution for a community of men.

It is an abuse of language to say, that an office during good behaviour, is an office for life. An office for fifteen years, or for ten years, may be equally so by lasting as long as life. When good behaviour ceases, the office ceases, if the Legislature will do duty. If they are slow to impeach an unworthy Judge, who holds during good behaviour only, how much slower will they be to impeach a Judge, when a few years more will certainly relieve the people of him. A tenure for years, if the Judge does not behave well, is therefore more likely to continue, than an office which has no limitation of time.

Upon this head then we press upon you the fatal tenacity of the proposed amendments. We object to them one and all as fatal to the law, the justice, the security, the repose of the Commonwealth. We regard the election of Justices of the Peace especially, as sapping the very foundations of Justice. A vast number of the decisions of these Magistrates, are and must remain without appeal, and they concern those who are least able to protect themselves. What is to be the security for impartial judgment in such cases? If bad magistrates have come in under the present system, will they be kept out by popular election? Will a magistrate be any purer, because he has sought and obtained his office through political party? Will he be any wiser from holding his office but for five years?—Will he be more impartial, because he wants the vote of one of the parties? We declare to you, Fellow Citizens, that coupled with the amendments are by the Convention, so that we must take all or reject all, if all of the other amendments proposed, were decidedly beneficial, the amendments proposed to the Judicial department would induce us to reject the whole without hesitation.

We will not detain you by advertising at length to one of the amendments, which appears to offer additional security to property, while in the very same clause it takes it back again. It is that which prohibits the Legislature from investing any one with the right of taking private property for public use, without making compensation, or giving adequate security, therefore, before said property shall be taken. But what shall be deemed to be adequate security, how and by whom it shall be given, and when it shall be payable, the Legislature alone are to say; and they have that power by the Constitution as it stands. Property notwithstanding the amendment, may still be taken without compensation, to be paid for after it is taken.

Neither will we occupy any more of your time, by comments upon that dangerous amendment, which proposes to keep the Constitution perpetually before the Legislature and the people as an instrument requiring amendment. This proposal attributes little more acuteness to the Constitution than to an act of Assembly, and will undoubtedly in the end deprive it of any greater respect. It proclaims to the State that there are defects in it, which it is not now proposed to repair, and it invites theorists and politicians to labour for the discovery of them. It will excite a restless insatiable spirit of change in regard to first principles, which we have thought settled for ever. No one can foretell all the consequences of stimulating such a spirit, but it is not difficult to foresee, that the Constitution will be exposed every five years, to the loss of whatever restraint, security, or principle it may contain, to interfere with the temporary interests of a predominant party. Is it practical wisdom to expose the Constitution to this danger? Is it wisdom of the same kind with that which established it? Will any thing remain sacred in the Constitution, when the tenure by which the people are to hold it is no longer than it is proposed to give to the office of a Justice of the Peace?

Fellow citizens we commend this whole subject to your solemn consideration. We have endeavored to perform the duty committed to us, and we now leave the matter with you; if life, liberty, property, suffrage, equality under the law and in making the law, are already secure, if you and your

fathers have enjoyed these great blessings for forty-eight years, and have prospered in every way while you have enjoyed them, if no man can point out one serious practical evil which the constitution causes, or one attainable practical good that it does not secure; then in the name of wisdom, of fidelity to yourselves, your families, and the State, let us ask the sober, judicious, and reflecting men of Pennsylvania—without distinction of party, therefore will you incur the perils of the proposed changes.

Horace Binney,
Zachariah Poulson,
John S. Riddle,
Joseph R. Ingersoll,
Levis Passmore,
Daniel W. Coze,
Richard Price,
Charles Roberts,
E. A. Raybold,
John Sexton,
J. E. Dougherty,
Thomas D. Grover,
John W. Ashmead,
W. Stephens,
James Godman,
Joseph Randall,
Jacob Frick,
Higley Cuthbertwood,
Charles H. Bates,
Robert Howell,
Ethan Baldwin.

A Candid Statement.

We invite attention to the following statement of facts respecting D. R. Porter's conduct in reference to certain bonds placed by him in the custody of John Stonebraker on the 9th of January, 1819—some few days previous to Porter's application for the insolvent laws. Nothing is stated below in connection with the matter, that cannot be judicially proven.

Porter sold to Kiddo & Russell a tract of land in Beaver county. Deed dated the 5th of April, 1818.—purchase money \$2,000, to be paid as follows—

1st bond	\$1000	payable 1st April, 1819.
2d bond	333 33	1st April, 1820.
3d bond	333 34	1st April, 1821.

The above bonds were left by Porter with James Allison for collection. See Allison's letter, published in the American Sentinel and other Porter papers. These three bonds were left in the hands of James Allison of Beaver; Porter's counsel, who says:—
"On the 14th day of December, 1818, David R. Porter placed in my hands for collection, three bonds on James Kiddo and Alexander Russell, all dated the 7th day of December, 1818; one of which was conditioned for the payment of three hundred and thirty-three dollars and thirty-three cents, on or before the first day of April, 1820, and one other conditioned for a like sum of three hundred and thirty-three dollars and thirty-three cents, on or before the first of April, 1821; for which three obligations I gave Mr. Porter a receipt, stating the purpose for which they were left with me. On or about the 24th April, 1819, George Davis called on me, at my office, and presented the receipt which I had given Mr. Porter for the bonds, with an assignment by David R. Porter of his interest and claim in the bonds therein mentioned to John Stonebraker and Thomas Owens, bearing date, to the best of my recollection, on or about the ninth day of January, 1818. Mr. Davis also presented to me at the same time, a written order, dated the 13th day of April, 1819, and signed by John Stonebraker, for the amount of the bond which had become due on the first of April. This order I believe to be in the hand writing of David R. Porter and signed by John Stonebraker."

Let it be remembered that Allison's statement is put forth by the friends of Porter as furnishing conclusive evidence of the honesty of Porter's conduct. The assignment of Porter to Stonebraker and Owens is dated January 19, 1818.

On the 14th of January, 1819, five days after Porter assigned the above bonds, Geo. Davis, Esq., the intimate and confidential friend of Porter, took out a bail-piece, from the Docket of Samuel Ryle, Esq., a Justice of the Peace, Tyrone township, Huntingdon county, at the suit of Michael Wallace, then and now a resident of the said county, vs. Patton and Porter, on which said suit, said Davis was special bail for D. R. Porter, and on which bail piece, Porter was put in Jail!! On the 10th of February, 1819, D. R. Porter took the requisite oath and was discharged as an insolvent debtor. Aside from the three Bonds given by Kiddo and Russell to Porter and assigned by Porter to Owens and Stonebraker, Porter held a fourth Bond, given him by Kiddo and Russell, for \$343, payable April 1st, 1823. On the 9th day of January, 1819, five days before he went to Jail and after he had placed Allison's Receipt for the three bonds in the hands of Stonebraker, the fourth bond given by Kiddo and Russell on the back of this Bond, was an assignment by Porter of the said Bond to Stonebraker; he also put into Stonebraker's hand other Bonds, for what purpose the deposition of Stonebraker will show.

David R. Porter also left in my hands one other Bond on Kiddo and Russell, bearing date as the others, for three hundred and forty-three dollars, and assigned by endorsement to David R. Porter to me, the assignment dated the 9th January, 1819. I also received, from David R. Porter a note or bond for about six hundred dollars drawn by some person whose name is not distinctly recollecting; I think it was Myers, or Byers. He also left in my hands, one other obligation in favor of Patton and Porter, drawn by a Mr. Wakefield for the amount not recollecting. He also left in my hands, a Patent, or deed, of a Tract of Land situate in Beaver county, of five hundred acres or thereabouts; the whole of which Bonds or obligations and said deed, were deposited in my hands, somewhere about the first part of January, 1819; and assigned to me, all except the deed, on which I believe there was no assignment. The bond for three hundred and forty-three dollars, and the two subsequently mentioned obligations, and the deed were committed

into my especial charge by Mr. Porter, first showing me that the amount for which I was bail could easily be made out of the bonds assigned to myself and Owens, and then saying "take these;" (meaning the three latter obligations and the deed,) and keep them for me!

The existence of a fourth bond from Kiddo and Russell to Porter, which bond I was bail could easily be made out of the bonds assigned to myself and Owens, and then saying "take these;" (meaning the three latter obligations and the deed,) and keep them for me!

The money for the three bonds deposited by Porter in the hands of James Allison, Esq., of Beaver, was collected by Mr. Allison and paid over by him to Stonebraker and Owens, excepting the last instalment, which Allison paid Porter, and which Owens states Porter paid to him!

The transaction in reference to the three bonds was in all probability honest. Allison, Owens and Stonebraker all concur in their statements respecting the three bonds. But the matter is wholly different in regard to the FOURTH bond, assigned by Porter to Stonebraker alone, Owens having no interest in it!! We shall now show, by testimony wholly irrefutable, that Porter did ultimately receive the amount collected on the fourth bond, and we shall establish this fact by the testimony of Allison and by Porter himself.

Stonebraker swears, that Porter left with him the fourth bond of Kiddo and Russell, for safe keeping, on the same day that he gave Stonebraker and Owens the receipt of Allison for the three bonds, assigned by Porter to Owens and Stonebraker. Is this part of Stonebraker's deposition true? The bond in question, we mean the fourth bond mentioned, as Allison's letter conclusively proves!! What did Stonebraker do with this bond?—He says, by request of Porter he assigned it to George Davis, Esq., the intimate friend of Porter. Is this part of his deposition true? On the back of the bond, we mean the fourth bond given to Porter by Kiddo and Russell, the assignment to Stonebraker is written by Porter and signed with his signature, and there is also underneath the said assignment, an assignment of the same bond, by Stonebraker to George Davis. Stonebraker swears that he never received one cent from Davis in consideration of said assignment!!! Now we have traced the bond in question, from Porter to Stonebraker, and from Stonebraker to George Davis, and it only remains to show, who ultimately received the money for the bond.

READ THIS RECEIPT.
This is an exact copy of a Receipt in the handwriting of D. R. Porter, the Van Buren candidate for Governor of Pennsylvania. The original is in the possession of Robert Campbell, Esq., Prothonotary of Huntingdon county.

I paid to D. R. Porter, on a written order from George Davis, a balance of two

hundred dollars and six cents remaining in my hands, of the money collected on the bond assigned by Porter to Stonebraker and by the latter to Davis, as above stated. The suit brought on this last bond was in the name of George Davis, assignee of John Stonebraker, who was assignee of David R. Porter.

Does not the receipt from Porter and the statement of Allison, fully and conclusively establish the truth of Stonebraker's deposition? Why did he get one farthing of it? It belonged of right to his creditors, and ought to have gone to them. If he has paid one dollar of it over to those who were entitled to it, let the proof be adduced. Five days before he went to Jail he passed away certain property to Stonebraker for safe keeping. Stonebraker passed the same property to a friend of the insolvent, and this friend restores the property to the insolvent.

Stonebraker, Allison & Owens.
The Loco Foco place great stress on the statement of Mr. Owens, and call it "a most triumphant refutation" of the charge of Mr. Stonebraker. To give our readers some idea of the comparative correctness of the statement of those two individuals we cite one instance. Mr. Stonebraker states that on the bond of \$343, which he received from D. R. Porter, and which he afterwards, at Porter's request, signed over to George Davis, Esq., he "never received one cent."

In reference to this matter Owens in his last statement says: "And although old John Stonebraker swears that he never received a cent on this last bond, yet he is not only charged in a statement rendered by Mr. Allison, with the sum of \$162.93 paid to him on that bond—but I have seen Stonebraker's receipt for it."

We have already published a receipt in David R. Porter's own hand writing for \$125 00 of that bond; and what became of the same bond will be learned from the following extracts from the statement of Mr. Allison which we published some time ago:

"On the 28th day of February, 1820, I paid to Samuel Stonebraker, for his father, John Stonebraker, three hundred and fifty dollars, money I had received from Mr. Russell, at which time I think, my receipt to David R. Porter, with his assignment on it, was again produced. On the first day of September following, John Stonebraker called on me for more money, producing my receipt and Mr. Porter's assignment. I at this time objected to give Mr. Stonebraker any more money, having received a letter from T. M. Owens, stating that John Stonebraker was, in the language of the writer, "a broken merchant;" the constable having received all his property, and that Stonebraker had never paid over to him any part of the money which had been previously received. Mr. Stonebraker then proposed to leave with me as security, and for collection; another bond on Messrs Kiddo and Russell for \$343, bearing date at the same time as the others and payable to David R. Porter, on the first of April, 1823, and assigned by him to John Stonebraker, by endorsement, bearing date on the 9th day of January, 1819. To Mr. Stonebraker's proposition I assented, and paid him the money then in my hands.—Some time afterwards, Mr. Owens having received a considerable payment from Messrs. Kiddo and Russell, got the last mentioned bond on the order of Mr. Stonebraker. The same bond was on the 1st of May, 1823, assigned by Mr. Stonebraker to Geo. Davis, Esq., who placed it in my hands for collection."

In another part of his statement Mr. Allison says, that on "the 23d July, 1830, I paid to David R. Porter on a written order from George Davis, a balance of two hundred dollars and six cents, remaining in my hands of the money collected on the bond assigned by Porter to Stonebraker, and by the latter, as above stated."

Now, adding together the \$125 received by Mr. Porter, as mentioned in the receipt, and the \$200 06 paid over to Mr. Allison, we have the sum of \$325 06, leaving a balance on the bond of \$17.94 as the Attorney's fee for collection.

By the above extracts it will be seen that instead of Mr. Allison's and Mr. Owens's statements corroborating one another, they are completely at issue, and that on the contrary; Mr. Allison incidentally sustained the statement of John Stonebraker. Now which is the most worthy of credit, Mr. Mr. Stonebraker, or Mr. Allison, whose statements so perfectly accord, or Mr. Owens, whose statement is in a most important point contradicted by that of Mr. Allison, and whose authority is, at best, to be viewed with suspicion. We leave our readers to judge.—Washington Reporter.

LET NO ONE BE IDLE.
There are upwards of one thousand townships and election districts in Pennsylvania. One vote in each would make more than one thousand votes difference in the result of the Governor's election. A vote in each, changed from Porter to Ritten, would make more than two thousand votes of a difference. This will demonstrate how important it is for every man to be on the alert. We have a foe to contend against as industrious as wicked. Let us while we cannot imitate their unworthiness, at least profit by their example of industry. We hope every friend of correct principles will buy himself so disseminate information among the people.—Pa. Intelligencer.

FOR SALE.
OR TO LEASE FOR A TERM OF YEARS.
The entire Farm on which the subscriber resides, containing 185 acres, of 25 acres of it, with the principal improvements, situate within the limits of the township of JNO. V. E. THORNE.
September 16, 1830.

Does not the receipt from Porter and the statement of Allison, fully and conclusively establish the truth of Stonebraker's deposition? Why did he get one farthing of it? It belonged of right to his creditors, and ought to have gone to them. If he has paid one dollar of it over to those who were entitled to it, let the proof be adduced. Five days before he went to Jail he passed away certain property to Stonebraker for safe keeping. Stonebraker passed the same property to a friend of the insolvent, and this friend restores the property to the insolvent.

Stonebraker, Allison & Owens.
The Loco Foco place great stress on the statement of Mr. Owens, and call it "a most triumphant refutation" of the charge of Mr. Stonebraker. To give our readers some idea of the comparative correctness of the statement of those two individuals we cite one instance. Mr. Stonebraker states that on the bond of \$343, which he received from D. R. Porter, and which he afterwards, at Porter's request, signed over to George Davis, Esq., he "never received one cent."

In reference to this matter Owens in his last statement says: "And although old John Stonebraker swears that he never received a cent on this last bond, yet he is not only charged in a statement rendered by Mr. Allison, with the sum of \$162.93 paid to him on that bond—but I have seen Stonebraker's receipt for it."

We have already published a receipt in David R. Porter's own hand writing for \$125 00 of that bond; and what became of the same bond will be learned from the following extracts from the statement of Mr. Allison which we published some time ago:

"On the 28th day of February, 1820, I paid to Samuel Stonebraker, for his father, John Stonebraker, three hundred and fifty dollars, money I had received from Mr. Russell, at which time I think, my receipt to David R. Porter, with his assignment on it, was again produced. On the first day of September following, John Stonebraker called on me for more money, producing my receipt and Mr. Porter's assignment. I at this time objected to give Mr. Stonebraker any more money, having received a letter from T. M. Owens, stating that John Stonebraker was, in the language of the writer, "a broken merchant;" the constable having received all his property, and that Stonebraker had never paid over to him any part of the money which had been previously received. Mr. Stonebraker then proposed to leave with me as security, and for collection; another bond on Messrs Kiddo and Russell for \$343, bearing date at the same time as the others and payable to David R. Porter, on the first of April, 1823, and assigned by him to John Stonebraker, by endorsement, bearing date on the 9th day of January, 1819. To Mr. Stonebraker's proposition I assented, and paid him the money then in my hands.—Some time afterwards, Mr. Owens having received a considerable payment from Messrs. Kiddo and Russell, got the last mentioned bond on the order of Mr. Stonebraker. The same bond was on the 1st of May, 1823, assigned by Mr. Stonebraker to Geo. Davis, Esq., who placed it in my hands for collection."

In another part of his statement Mr. Allison says, that on "the 23d July, 1830, I paid to David R. Porter on a written order from George Davis, a balance of two hundred dollars and six cents, remaining in my hands of the money collected on the bond assigned by Porter to Stonebraker, and by the latter, as above stated."

Now, adding together the \$125 received by Mr. Porter, as mentioned in the receipt, and the \$200 06 paid over to Mr. Allison, we have the sum of \$325 06, leaving a balance on the bond of \$17.94 as the Attorney's fee for collection.

By the above extracts it will be seen that instead of Mr. Allison's and Mr. Owens's statements corroborating one another, they are completely at issue, and that on the contrary; Mr. Allison incidentally sustained the statement of John Stonebraker. Now which is the most worthy of credit, Mr. Mr. Stonebraker, or Mr. Allison, whose statements so perfectly accord, or Mr. Owens, whose statement is in a most important point contradicted by that of Mr. Allison, and whose authority is, at best, to be viewed with suspicion. We leave our readers to judge.—Washington Reporter.

LET NO ONE BE IDLE.
There are upwards of one thousand townships and election districts in Pennsylvania. One vote in each would make more than one thousand votes difference in the result of the Governor's election. A vote in each, changed from Porter to Ritten, would make more than two thousand votes of a difference. This will demonstrate how important it is for every man to be on the alert. We have a foe to contend against as industrious as wicked. Let us while we cannot imitate their unworthiness, at least profit by their example of industry. We hope every friend of correct principles will buy himself so disseminate information among the people.—Pa. Intelligencer.

FOR SALE.
OR TO LEASE FOR A TERM OF YEARS.
The entire Farm on which the subscriber resides, containing 185 acres, of 25 acres of it, with the principal improvements, situate within the limits of the township of JNO. V. E. THORNE.
September 16, 1830.