STAR & REPUBLICAN BANNER.
GETTYSBURGH, PENN.
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1838.

Another Loco Foco Humbug EXPLODED!

THE STATE DEBT.

Certificate from the Secretary of the Commonwealth and Auditor General.

WE, the Secretary of the Commonwealth and the Auditor General, both of whom are, with the State Treasurer, Commissioners of the Internal Improvement Fund of Pennsylvania, do hereby certify that the whole Permanent State Debt, on which the State paid interest, and which she was liable to pay, was, on the 4th day of December 1835, $24,330,003 32, and that it is now (18th August, 1838) $24,230,003 32.

THOS. H. BURROWES,
Sec'ry of the Comm'th.
NATH. P. HOBART,
Auditor General.

Harrisburg, August 18, 1838.

Thomas M. Owens.

☞This gentlemen's *mere certificate* of what he DARE NOT SWEAR to, says the Pennsylvania Intelligencer, is relied upon by the friends of Porter, to overwhelm the overpowering evidence of the two Stonebrakers, and the records of Beaver, Butler, Huntingdon, and Northumberland counties! To show the character of Mr. Porter's certifier, it is only necessary to say that he was once CONVICTED OF PASSING COUNTERFEIT MONEY!—We can prove this in a court of justice.

☞LOOK HERE!

☞ Read the Butler County Record Evidence on our first page, and then turn to the following:

Another Startling Disclosure

More of Porter's Concealed Property.

From the Miltonian.

In a previous paper we have the evidence under oath, of the Stonebraker's—two as respectable men as reside in Huntingdon county, members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in which the fraud of David R. Porter is completely shown. It is there proven that when he took the Holy Book in his hand, and swore that he had surrendered over all his property for the benefit of his creditors, that this oath, was FALSELY TAKEN. That at the same time, he had CONCEALED, in the hands of John Stonebraker, the elder, Bonds and other property to the amount of several THOUSAND DOLLARS. A receipt for a portion of this money, in the hand writing of David R. Porter, dated July 5th, 1825—after he had taken the insolvent oath, is produced by Mr. Stonebraker, and is now lodged with the Prothonotary of Huntingdon County, a fac simile of which we present in another part of to-day's paper. We have, also, in our possession a receipt dated July 31, 1835, signed by David R. Porter, for ones hundred and seventy dollars, money received on a judgment in Northumberland County, which had been assigned by Porter to John Stonebraker, a short time before said Porter took the insolvent act. This Judgment was re-assigned to David R. Porter by John Stonebraker on the 4th of June 1837, and George Davis Esq. who begrudges so little in the Porter matter, was a witness to this assignment. Dare he deny it? The receipt is at hand.

It is useless to give a copy of the record in Northumberland—it is too lengthy. We have the whole under the seal of the Court, and it may be examined by calling at the Miltonian Office. Among these records appears the following:

In the Court of Common Pleas, of said County, August Term 1836, No. 121.

J. M'Farland, Atty. for David R. Porter. vs. Henry Eckbert, Henry Eckbert, jun. Abraham Eckbert, Abm. Reifschneider, Stroblecker and Uhlil as to Abraham Reifschneider.	No. 24, August Term, 1835, on trial last, January 6, 1835. Jury called and same day Jury discharged, and by consent judgment for plaintiff, for the sum of four hundred and eighty dollars and thirty-two cents. All direct payments since original judgment to be allowed, by the Court.
Same vs. Same Def't.	No. 3, April term, 1835 fi. fa. Real debt $275.
Same vs. Same Def'ts.	"Levied personal as within." H. S. $1,30.
Same vs. Same Def'ts.	No. 19, August term 1835 Ven Ex. Personal debt $275 Int. from 27th May 1812. Stayed by plaintiff. H. R. $4,12 paid.

Northumberland County, ss.

I, D. Brautigam, Prothonotary of the Court of Common Pleas of said county, do certify, that the foregoing is a true copy of the Docket entries in the said court, and also, a true copy of the assignment of John Stonebraker to David R. Porter, recorded in Docket entry No. 66, April term 1822, as full and entire as the same remains in my office.

In testimony whereof, I have here unto set my hand, and affixed the seal of the Court at Sunbury, the third day of September A. D. 1838.

D. BRAUTIGAM, Pro't'y.

We now come to David R. Porter's own receipt. It is as follows:

J. M'Farland, Atty. for J. Stonebraker, now for David R. Porter. vs. Henry Egbert who survived Daniel Stroblecker & Abm. Reifschneider, with notice to John Hassel, tenant in possession.	In the Common Pleas of Northumberland county. No. 122, Aug. term 1816 and No. 94 of Aug Term 1827, &c. &c.

Received 31st July 1825 one hundred and seventy five dollars of Henry Eckbert, in full payment of the balance due on the Judgment and to hereby release and discharge the said Henry Eckbert and other defendants therefrom, and do further empower said Eckbert's Attorney, or the Prothonotary to enter satisfaction thereof; and I do hereby release and agree to pay and discharge all legal costs that have accrued in the case. And to save the said Henry Eckbert &c. harmless therefrom.

D. R. PORTER.

One would have *supposed* that Mr. Porter would have stopped here—and when he had received every dollar in the world that poor Eckbert owned, that he would have stayed his hand. He had a levy on all the personal effects which Eckbert was worth in life and the grave—these he was determined should be sold, and when Porter found that the Landlord had laid in a claim for rent, then due and unpaid, he MAGNANIMOUSLY compounded with Henry Eckbert for one hundred and seventy-five dollars, which sum was raised through Eckbert's friends. DOES PORTER STOP HERE? Does he satisfy the debts as he promised? No.—He suffers Eckbert to be sued for the costs—Execution follows, and on the 25th January 1838, Mr. Eckbert produces the Officer's receipt for the costs—these costs Porter must pay some day, if he can be caught by an officer of the Law.

That you, fellow citizens, this judgment was the property of David R. Porter's creditors. It should have passed over to the hands of his Trustees—but like others who disregard the solemn obligation of an oath, he received the money, by assignment to Stonebraker for his own use. After he had swallowed the Insolvent oath, he then gets Stonebraker to re-assign the Judgment back to him. It is sickening to read these black details of the Villainy of a man who has occupied many honorable stations in society.

More Yet!

From the Pittsburg Gazette.

More Evidence—and at our very door!

We have already had evidence from Huntingdon county, from Beaver county, from Butler county, and from Northumberland, of the dishonest Insolvency of David R. Porter, and at the very moment when we supposed that further evidence was not necessary, a witness appears in our own neighborhood and in our own county of Allegheny.

Our readers will recollect that John Stonebreaker, in his deposition, had the following passage:—

"I also received, from D. R. Porter, a note or bond for about six hundred dollars drawn by some person whose name is not distinctly recollected; but I think it was Myers, or Dyers: *he also left in my hands, one other obligation in favor of Patton and Porter, drawn by a Mr. Wakefield, the amount not recollected.*"

The Wakefield here spoken of, is now a respectable citizen of Franklin township in Allegheny county, and we publish to-day the deposition, which confirms very fully, statements previously made as to Porter's dishonesty.

Mr. Wakefield testifies, that at the time when Patton and Porter were about to fail, that he owed them one hundred dollars, and that they owed him about two hundred. He states that when he heard that they were about to fail, he called upon Porter and wished him to make a settlement, and that Porter said he could not settle, because he had given up all his books and papers to *his assignees*, as Wakefield supposed. In this respect he was then mistaken, the papers were merely placed in the hands of Stonebreaker.

This refusal of Porter to "*settle*" with Wakefield, is strong evidence of a dishonest intention. It is an old saying, that "an honest man will settle fair, even if he never pays." If Porter had been honest, he would have transferred Wakefield's note, when he knew there was a large amount due to him.

Mr. Wakefield further states, that soon after the demand of settlement, and refusal by Porter, he (Wakefield,) moved to Indiana county. He fixes no date for his removal, but it was *shortly* after his demand for settlement, and after the failure of Porter and Patton, in the fall of 1818 or winter of 1818-9, probably about the 1st of April, 1819. One year after Porter brought suit against said Wakefield, in the name of Patton and Porter, and recovered the amount of the note without any deduction for what they owed him.

Here then is another evidence of the recovery of money *after* Porter had been discharged by the Insolvent Law.

It is true, it may be alleged for Porter's friends, that the suit against Wakefield was brought by Patton, and that Porter knew nothing about it.

To meet such an argument, we will show *first*, that this note was in the hands of Porter at the time of the failure, and that he placed it in the hands of Stonebrakers, and second, that Stonebraker returned it to him.

Having in this way traced it into the hands of Porter, it will be manifest, that he must have handed it over to Patton, either to recover the amount for the firm, or else as a payment of so much money. In either case it would be a receipt by Porter, of his portion of it.

First then, that Porter had the note in his hands at the time of 1818-9, and placed it in the hands of Stonebraker, we have the following proofs.

Stonebraker, in the extract from his Affidavit, which we have given above, swears to it positively.

Wakefield, in his affidavit, swears that when he wanted a settlement, Porter told him he had given up all his books and papers, *to some person*. Wakefield *supposed* that it was to his assignees, in that he was mistaken, as the assignees never acted.

Thomas M. Owens, too, the willing witness of Porter, after mentioning that Porter had placed in Stonebraker's hands, the title papers for lands in Beaver, adds as follows:

"I believe Mr. Porter also deposited an order or assignment of an execution, in the hands of the Sheriff of Indiana county, for something over $100, *and another small claim on some one else*, which I cannot recollect, telling us at the same time that there was but little hope of getting any thing out of them."

Surely after reading Stonebraker and Wakefield's statements we may conclude that this "other small claim" was Wakefield's note.

Thus then Wakefield, Stonebraker and Owens, all prove that the note of Wakefield was placed in Stonebraker's hands by Porter. This is our first point, this shows that Porter had the control of the note.

Second, we have to show, that it was returned to Porter by Stonebraker. What evidence is there of this?

Stonebraker swears as follows:

"Not long after Mr. Porter was released, he called on me, and I gave into his hands, *the obligations and debts spoken of*, and he returned the money for, of Mr. Allison, and the bond of three hundred and forty three dollars, which having been left in the hands of Mr. Allison as security, I did not then have."

Porter's own witness, too Thomas M. Owens, in speaking about the assignments to Stonebraker of the last Beaver bond, proved as follows:

"I believe the assignment was about being made on the bond, I observed, that as I was about to leave the neighborhood in the spring, the assignment had better be made to Stonebraker, and that he and Davis being there together, the balance could be by him assigned to Davis; it was accordingly assigned to Stonebraker—after which being done, *the whole of the other securities were returned to me* by Mr. Stonebraker, *were returned* to Mr. Porter."

Here then is another evidence, that all the securities, Wakefield's note among the rest passed into Porter's hands, and certainly he would not transfer it to Patton, as a mere gift. Besides, even if he made a gift of it to Patton, it would be giving away that which belonged to his creditors. But that as it may, Wakefield was compelled to pay the money to Patton as either the partner or assignee of Patton and Porter—and this took place a year *after* the discharge of Porter under the Insolvent Laws.

It is worthy of notice, how fully Wakefield's statement establishes the veracity of Stonebraker and the accuracy of his memory. Stonebraker swears there was a note of Wakefield's, and Wakefield proves it true.

As to Wakefield's claim, we presume that no suit was ever brought under his instructions, and the insolvent condition of Porter and Patton, but the records in Huntingdon will show whether any such suit was ever instituted.

We venture to say that no suit was brought, because, if there had been such a suit, the friends of Stonebraker, at Huntingdon, would have mentioned it as corroborating his Affidavit.

James Wakefield is a brother of the Reverend Samuel Wakefield of the Methodist Church, now living in Westmoreland county, and the author of the "CHRISTIAN HARP."

Mr. Wakefield is well known in Allegheny and some adjoining counties, and his testimony that Stonebraker was an honest man and of good repute among his neighbors, must satisfy many of our fellow citizens, and convince them that David R. Porter is unworthy of a place in the Gubernatorial chair.

Allegheny County, ss.

Before me, a Justice of the Peace in and for said county, personally came Samuel Wakefield, a resident of Franklin township, in said county, who, on his solemn oath, duly administered saith, that about the year 1815, said deponent resided in Huntingdon county, Penna., when Edward B. Patton and David R. Porter purchased two set of works, called Sligo Forges, and commenced business. Said deponent was employed frequently as a Millwright about said Forges of Patton and Porter till the fall of 1818, or winter of 1818-8. About which time it was reported that said firm of Patton and Porter, was about to fail, when said deponent went to David R. Porter and requested to have a settlement of his account with said firm—which account, as kept by said deponent showed work done for said firm to the amount of about three hundred dollars, of which they had made advances to about one hundred dollars or thereabouts—David R. Porter answered that he could not settle with me then, as he had given up all his books and papers, (he did not say, to whom, but I supposed they were given into the hands of his assignees.) That no settlement then took place, nor did the said Patton or Porter then, or at any time since, ever pay said deponent one cent on said account. That said deponent, shortly after the demand of settlement, removed to Indiana county, Pa., and, about two years afterwards, sent back by his brother Robert, said account to an Attorney in Huntingdon county, named——Duncan, (so far as the name is now recollected) with orders that if it could be collected without putting me to cost to do so, and if, not to let it lie; and said deponent has never heard any thing further in regard to said account. Shortly after Patton and Porter came to Sligo Forges, said deponent had purchased, from said partners, a horse—for which they held his note for one hundred dollars. About a year after said deponent removed to Indiana county, Patton, then residing in Armagh, in said county, commenced a suit, in the name of Patton and Porter, against said deponent on said Promissory note, and collected the full amount of said note from said deponent—the greater part of which was paid in lumber by my brother to said Patton. This was the only note of mine ever in the hands of said firm, and must be the same referred to in the affidavit of John Stonebraker. Said deponent never received any assignment of John Stonebraker for about fifteen years, and knew him to be an honest man—a man of good report among his neighbors, and an efficient member and class leader of the Methodist Episcopal church; and said deponent also knew Samuel Sturgeon to be employed as a collier about said work, but has never seen him since leaving that place.

JAMES WAKEFIELD.

Sworn and subscribed this 22d day of September, A. D. 1838, before

JOHN NEELY.

Behold!

To the Editor of the Huntingdon Journal:

MR. BENEDICT:—On looking over the 'Advocate and Sentinel' of the 28th ult. my attention was arrested by the following statement in it: "Now the truth is, Gen. Porter never had any trustees, the gentlemen appointed never gave bond, or took upon themselves the trust; but having full confidence in his integrity, they and his creditors left it with him to make settlement and manage all the business himself."

Now, Mr. Editor, I do not recollect of any such "*trust*" being conferred on Porter, or any such "*confidence in his integrity*" being reposed in him by his creditors, or any such "*settlement and management of all the business himself*" being made by him, as the above statement would lead the reader to infer. Such a trust, and such a confidence, I do not recollect, ever was conferred or reposed in Porter, by his creditors, or any of them. Such a settlement and management of the business, I do not wish me to have any thing to do in the matter, and that if I would *so* consent and comply he would make me as sick as he could, that he would give me little rest. Such a trust, I think, Thomas M. Owens, as security or bail that I should not lose by being so. This I refused to agree to, and Mr. Porter then walked off and left me. A short time after this, Mr. Porter in conversation induced me to believe that there was no property, or trust funds to be gotten or to look after, at any rate, worth the trouble of attending to it, and in consequence thereof, I never acted in, looked after, or inquired for, any of the business. I have been disappointed in what happened I had that time, that Mr. Porter might pay his debts, as he has since baffled and delayed several of his creditors, whose claims were evidently just. As to my own claim, although I made matter, not the one half of it is yet paid, *though it was the claim on which he got himself put in jail.* During the last August court in Huntingdon, I called on Mr. Porter, personally, and demanded a settlement with him, but he positively refused doing any thing in the matter until after the election, and I will now be compelled to get what is justly due to me from him in the best way I can, which I am now compelled and trying to do by the ordinary process of law.

During the fall of 1801, I became acquainted with John Stonebraker, and lived within a few rods of his house for some length of time. I have since that time lived in his neighborhood, been intimate with him and regularly had dealings with him for the last thirty-six years, and have always considered and found him to be *a man of truth and strict integrity.* I never heard his character for integrity, truth and veracity questioned by any one until he had independence and moral courage enough to publicly declare his knowledge of what he had discovered to be a dishonest transaction on the part of Mr. Porter.

With astonishment I have seen Thomas M. Owens of Birmingham announced in the Porter papers "as an exemplary, pious man, and an elder of the Presbyterian church," and "one whose *declarations* must forever put to flight the *depositions* of the Messrs. Stonebrakers." I have some knowledge of the character of Mr. *Elder* Owens, and would just say, "it is no better than it should be." One thing however is certain, he never was an *Elder* of the Presbyterian church and his character could not have been so *very good but a very few years ago*, when he was where he was first known, ARRESTED ON A CHARGE OF PASSING COUNTERFEIT MONEY at Birmingham in this county, where he had long dwelt and his character was well known. At which time a respectable clergyman who was pretty well acquainted with him, told me he hoped the law might hundred dollars, of which they had made advances to about one hundred dollars or thereabouts—David R. Porter answered that he could not settle with me then, as he had given up all his books and papers, (he did not say, to whom, but I supposed they were given into the hands of his assignees.) That no settlement then took place, nor d the said Patton or Porter then, or at any time since, ever pay said deponent one cent on said account. That said deponent, shortly after the demand of settlement, removed to Indiana county, Pa., and, about two years afterwards, sent back by his brother Robert, said account to an Attorney in Huntingdon county, named——Duncan, (so far as the name is now recollected) with orders that if it could be collected without putting me to cost to do so, and if, not to let it lie; and said deponent has never heard any thing further in regard to said account. Shortly after Patton and Porter came to Sligo Forges, said deponent had purchased, from said partners, a horse—for which they held his note for one hundred dollars. About a year after said deponent removed to Indiana county, Patton, then residing in Armagh, in said county, commenced a suit, in the name of Patton and Porter, against said deponent on said Promissory note, and collected the full amount of said note from said deponent—the greater part of which was paid in lumber by my brother to said Patton. This was the only note of mine ever in the hands of said firm, and must be the same referred to in the affidavit of John Stonebraker. Said deponent never received any assignment of John Stonebraker for about fifteen years, and knew him to be an honest man—a man of good report among his neighbors, and an efficient member and class leader of the Methodist Episcopal church; and said deponent also knew Samuel Sturgeon to be employed as a collier about said work, but has never seen him since leaving that place.

JAMES WAKEFIELD.

Sworn and subscribed this 22d day of September, A. D. 1838, before

JOHN NEELY.

Behold!

To the Editor of the Huntingdon Journal:

MR. BENEDICT:—On looking over the 'Advocate and Sentinel' of the 28th ult. my attention was arrested by the following statement in it: "Now the truth is, Gen. Porter never had any trustees, the gentlemen appointed never gave bond, or took upon themselves the trust; but having full confidence in his integrity, they and his creditors left it with him to make settlement and manage all the business himself."

Now, Mr. Editor, I do not recollect of any such "*trust*" being conferred on Porter, or any such "*confidence in his integrity*" being reposed in him by his creditors, or any such "*settlement and management of all the business himself*" being made by him, as the above statement would lead the reader to infer. Such a trust, and such a confidence, I do not recollect, ever was conferred or reposed in Porter, by his creditors, or any of them. Such a settlement and management of the business, I do not wish me to have any thing to do in the matter, and that if I would *so* consent and comply he would make me as sick as he could, that he would give me little rest. Such a trust, I think, Thomas M. Owens, as security or bail that I should not lose by being so. This I refused to agree to, and Mr. Porter then walked off and left me. A short time after this, Mr. Porter in conversation induced me to believe that there was no property, or trust funds to be gotten or to look after, at any rate, worth the trouble of attending to it, and in consequence thereof, I never acted in, looked after, or inquired for, any of the business. I have been disappointed in what happened I had that time, that Mr. Porter might pay his debts, as he has since baffled and delayed several of his creditors, whose claims were evidently just. As to my own claim, although I made matter, not the one half of it is yet paid, *though it was the claim on which he got himself put in jail.* During the last August court in Huntingdon, I called on Mr. Porter, personally, and demanded a settlement with him, but he positively refused doing any thing in the matter until after the election, and I will now be compelled to get what is justly due to me from him in the best way I can, which I am now compelled and trying to do by the ordinary process of law.

During the fall of 1801, I became acquainted with John Stonebraker, and lived within a few rods of his house for some length of time. I have since that time lived in his neighborhood, been intimate with him and regularly had dealings with him for the last thirty-six years, and have always considered and found him to be *a man of truth and strict integrity.* I never heard his character for integrity, truth and veracity questioned by any one until he had independence and moral courage enough to publicly declare his knowledge of what he had discovered to be a dishonest transaction on the part of Mr. Porter.

With astonishment I have seen Thomas M. Owens of Birmingham announced in the Porter papers "as an exemplary, pious man, and an elder of the Presbyterian church," and "one whose *declarations* must forever put to flight the *depositions* of the Messrs. Stonebrakers." I have some knowledge of the character of Mr. *Elder* Owens, and would just say, "it is no better than it should be." One thing however is certain, he never was an *Elder* of the Presbyterian

GETTYSBURG STAR
GETTYSBURG, PA.
Tuesday, October 2, 1838.

DEMOCRATIC ANTI-MASONIC NOMINATION.

FOR GOVERNOR,
JOSEPH RITNER.

FOR CONGRESS,
JAMES COOPER.

ASSEMBLY,
THADDEUS STEVENS,
CHARLES KETTLEWELL.

COMMISSIONER,
DANIEL DIEHL.

AUDITOR,
JOHN G. MORNINGSTAR.

DIRECTOR OF THE POOR,
PETER TROSTLE.

Examine your Tickets.

LOOK OUT FOR FORGERY!

☞Our friends must not be surprised to see FORGED CERTIFICATES AND AFFIDAVITS circulated before the election! Our adversaries here are the very boys for such things! You will all recollect that it WAS FROM HERE, that the "FORGED LETTER" was issued, which defeated the election of Joseph Ritner in 1832!!!

The AUTHOR of that "forgery" has boasted in his cups that he "WROTE THAT LETTER," but got another to "sign and send it up to the North, where it did old Joe's business for him"!!!

This man is still here—still as regardless of all the principles of honesty and all the promptings of conscience as ever—seeering the latter, continually, by acts kindred to the FORGERY by which he defeated the election of Joseph Ritner!! He is still ready to serve HIS PARTY, though at the expense of every HONEST and MORAL principle!

You may, therefore, look out for FORGERIES and FRAUDS of every this christian community, found voting for *such* a man as David R. Porter! The contest is between *virtue* and *vice*: VIRTUE will triumph *here!*

In Cumberland township, our majority is 21!!! Our farmer friends held their opponents well at bay and nobly conquered after all the efforts made to defeat them!

In Freedom, we have carried our Inspector more than THREE to one! 'Tis the noblest little community in "all creation! But few Loco Focos are to be found within her pure precincts!

In Liberty—old Liberty, the mother of fair Freedom—we carried our Inspector TWO to one, notwithstanding it is the residence of one of the Porter candidates for Assembly, and the opposing candidate one of the worthiest and most popular men of the opposition in that township! It is a noble triumph, worthy of Liberty!

In Franklin—honest old Franklin—we carried our Inspector by more than THREE *to one!* This is a GLORIOUS" achievement, when we consider that *here* was to be one of the "strongholds" of the Anti-Masons! Hardy sons of Franklin have well rebuked the opponents of their old friend and brother, the patriot Farmer Governor! Franklin always does her duty, and does it well and nobly!

Hamiltonban—that hardy and intelligent dwelling place of many of Pennsylvania's noblest sons—acted well her part! A great effort was made to defeat our Inspector; but a few of the friends of the Farmer Governor got together and elected him by 77 of a majority! Much depends on honest old Hamiltonban, and the friends of the property of the County, and best interests of the State, will not be disappointed in her when she comes to cast her vote on the 9th of October.

But we must stop rendering to our friends that praise which they nobly won yesterday throughout the County. Suffice it to say, that so far as we have heard, our friends have acted well their parts, and have CARRIED ALL BEFORE THEM! They have given good evidence of the

1500 *majority*

which they intend giving to the present worthy and well-tried Governor on the second Tuesday of October next. MANY CHEERS, THEREFORE, FOR OLD ADAMS! *She will not disappoint her friends in other parts of the State!*

☞The U. S. Gazette says, we are indebted to an estimable correspondent for a complete exposition of the principles of honesty and all the promptings of conscience as ever—seeering the latter, continually, by acts kindred to the FORGERY by which he defeated the election of Joseph Ritner!! He is still ready to serve HIS PARTY, though at the expense of every HONEST and MORAL principle!

You may, therefore, look out for FORGERIES and FRAUDS of every kind; and these, like the "forged letter," will be circulated so near the election that they cannot be contradicted!

We say, beware of statements emanating from Birmingham—THE FRUITFUL ONE, WEEKLY, OF NUMBERLESS FALSE-HOODS!!

RALLY FRIENDS OF RITNER, RALLY!

☞Beware of TREACHERY! Beware of FORGERY and all kinds of FRAUD, that ingenious villains can invent!☜

☞We learn from a source of the most undoubted credit, that a scheme has been set on foot by the Porter-men, which, for *arrhaung* efrrmery and shameless fraud, is unequalled even in the history of the reckless party which conceived it.

It is this: a Porter man is to go to a Ritner man and say to him, 'if you will strike Ritner off your ticket and vote for *Mr. Dieidt*, I will vote for Ritner or *such other*, on *your ticket* as you think proper," or "if you will strike *Cooper* from your ticket for Congress, and vote for *Sheffer*, I will vote for Ritner, Kettlewell, or such other, as you like;" and same Porter man is to go to *twenty* Ritner men, or as many as he believes he can trick in this manner, to do the same, and make the same proposition to them all!!

Our friends will at once see the stupendous fraud which the Porter men are attempting to practice. *Not forty* men will be so stupid as to vote for one of our candidates, procures TWENTY PORTER MEN to vote for the Porter candidates!!!

Yet, Fellow-Citizens! villanous as this scheme is, *it has been practiced in several of the Townships*, AND IS TO BE ATTEMPTED IN ALL! Yes, it is true, that Porter men, who have claimed to be *honest and respectable* citizens, have attempted to deceive their neighbors in this way! One Porter man, whom we could name, *having promised* more than *twenty* of our friends to vote for Ritner if they would vote for *Sheffer* for Congress and *McDiehl* for the Assembly, and *strike Cooper and Stevens!!*

We say to our friends, beware of such TREACHEROUS DECEIVERS! Go to the Polls and vote the WHOLE TICKET

Victory! Victory!!

Inspectors' Election in Adams County.

[From the Star-Extra of Saturday last.]

☞Yesterday was a proud day for the friends of the Farmer Governor! Old Adams was herself in truth! Her hardy sons came up nobly to the support of the Washington and Farmer!

In the Borough, notwithstanding a most desperate effort was made to defeat us, and our opponents were out to a man, we carried our Inspector by 46 of a majority! Many of our friends were absent, and several voted what we term "Judges" tickets through mistake. Yet we have done nobly, and will greatly increase our majority on the 9th of October next. There will on that day be but few of the Anti-Masonic

The Old Constitution.

☞At a meeting of the friends of the Old Constitution of Pennsylvania, convened in the City of Philadelphia, *without distinction of party*, but composed of a representation of the activities of political opinion which are known in this Commonwealth, a Committee was appointed to prepare and publish an address to the people, recalling their attention to the amendments proposed by the late Convention, and to urge upon them the duty of voting against them at the approaching election. That address has been handed to us for insertion in our column, but too late for this week's paper.

It is an able and, in our opinion, unanswerable document in support of our existing Constitution, which we would like to lay before our readers had it been received at an earlier day.

The Committee who have signed the address are one half in favor of the election of David R. Porter, and one half in favor of the re-election of Governor Ritner, and we understand the convention which appointed the committee was similarly constituted. Their names are Horace Binney, Zachariah Poulson, John S. Riddle, Joseph R. Ingersoll, Isaac Pennington, Daniel W. Coxe, Richard Price, Charles Roberts, P. A. Bayhold, Jos. Sexton, Alexander E. Dougherty, Thomas D. Grover, John W. Ashmead, William Stephens, James Dunlap, Joseph Randall, Jacob Price, Hugh Catherwood, Charles Waters, Robert Howell, Ethan Baldwin.

In the language of the address, we say to our readers, "Your liberties, 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 thing 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 confer, and if the proposed changes are solely for yourselves, your families and the State, let us ask the sober, judicious and reflecting men of Pennsylvania, to forget the interest of party, wherefore will you incur the perils of the proposed changes?"

John Stonebraker—Rev. Mr. Smith's Letter.

☞We take pleasure in laying the subjoined correspondence before our readers. Good men will always, and where least expected, find those who will step up and bear witness to their good name, when assailed by demagogues and their tools. Stonebraker being declared by those who know him to be a man of truth, and he having sworn to what convicted Porter of Perjury, we cannot see how any honest, moral or good man can so far forget his duty to his country, himself and his family as to vote for him.

TO THE REV. MR. SMITH.
GETTYSBURG, Sept. 26, 1838.

DEAR SIR:—The Democrats—we address you upon a subject which, from your peculiar situation as an accredited and respectable Minister of the Gospel amongst us, and, of course, engaged in political strife, must naturally be a delicate one; but the importance of the truth to be elicited must be our excuse.

Charges of a serious character, involving moral turpitude, have been and are made against Mr. Porter, one of the candidates for the office of Governor at the coming election; and the proof of these charges rests, in some degree, upon the character of Mr. STONEBRAKER, sen'r. of Huntingdon.

Mr. Stonebraker has been represented to us as a member of the Methodist Episcopal church, and his reputation as such has been exalted or traduced, as might serve political ends.

Aware that you have resided for two or three years, at different times, as a Minister of the Gospel among the Huntingdon people, and presuming that you are acquainted with the prominent members of the church in that region of country, we take the liberty to address you; and respectfully inquire whether you have any knowledge of the man, or, if you have become acquainted with Mr. Stonebraker, and had an opportunity of forming an opinion in regard to his standing and character in that place, which you are acquainted with those brethren of the church, or any of them, who could testify to the respectable standing of Mr. Stonebraker? If so, we would ask, the favor of you to communicate the same to us, that we may satisfy the minds of the public, may be satisfied as to the confidence which ought to be placed in the statements which he has made.

Very respectfully, your friends and brethren,

HER. AND WORDEN,
EDWIN A. ATTLEE,
WM. W. PAXTON,
Rev. ADAM SMITH, Gettysburg.

MR. SMITH'S REPLY.
GETTYSBURG, Sept. 29, 1838.

DEAR BRETHREN:—I received your letter last evening, by which I learn that a most important strife, I claim the privilege of thinking for my self, and of communicating my views and knowledge of facts to my friends, which I have so respectfully requested to do, it upon a subject that they feel to be so momentous.

Therefore, in complying with your request, I state *that I became personally acquainted with Mr. STONEBRAKER, sen'r. of Huntingdon, a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, and as a friend in 1825; and in 1833 and 1834, his acquaintance was renewed. During the intervening years, *I often called, and sometimes lodged with him.* And, *as a member of the Church*, during my labours on this Circuit, HE STOOD VERY FAIR; NOT *I believe* THE LEAST *reproachful hint was doubted by his neighbors*, OR HIS OATH QUESTIONED BY ANY ONE.

And I this statement is in accordance with the Testimony of the forty-two gentlemen, declaring themselves to be members of the same Church, SIX of them in official standing, *the most of whom I know to be men of probity and unyielding integrity.*

I also have an intimate acquaintance with some, and personal knowledge of others, of the Stonebrakers, and I believe that the Stonebrakers are men of veracity and integrity. They are gentlemen of as fair reputation as any that live in Huntingdon county.

I have no apology to make for having given you the above statement.

Very respectfully, your friend, &c.

AMOS SMITH.

Messrs. *Van Oradel, Alter, & Paxton.*

John Williamson, Esq.

☞This gentleman, who was in favor of Porter at the time of his nomination, has declined so much joy to the loco focos, *is now for Gov. Ritner*, BECAUSE OF PORTER'S DISHONESTY!!

All Hail Conowago!

☞This Forest and Intelligent community deserves great credit for the handsome manner in which it rebuked the Loco Foco Party last. Notwithstanding every exertion was made to defeat the friends of the Farmer Governor, they elected their Inspector by a handsome and quite unexpected majority! The Loco Foco leaders, by their wo-begone countenances, on learning the result, clearly evinced their sad disappointment! They may now well be called "Knights of the Rueful Countenance."

Well done, little Freedom!

Hear the voice of her sons!

☞We take pleasure in laying the subjoined before our readers. It will be borne in mind that Freedom is but a small township, numbering only about 80 voters.

To the Editor of the Gettysburg Star.

We, the undersigned, voters of Freedom Township, (late a part of Liberty,) do certify, that at the election for Governor in 1835, we did vote either for George Wolf or Henry A. Muhlenburg, but are now determined to vote for the present Farmer Governor, JOSEPH RITNER.

ARMOR BIGHAM,
SAMUEL RHODES,
DAVID ROTH,
ABRAHAM RHODES,
JOSEPH KELLEY,
JAMES CUNNINGHAM,
ROBERT LINN,
ANDREW REID,
SAMUEL WHITE,
WILLIAM KERNS,
PHILIP SAURBAUGH,
RUDOLPH SAURBAUGH,
ADAM WAYBRIGHT,
JAMES WHITE, Sen.

☞There are several others who have not had an opportunity of signing.

Porter in his own County!

The First Victory!

As an evidence of Porter's popularity in his own county we give the following. "At the election for borough officers, held last week in the borough of Hollidaysburg, Huntingdon county," says the Register, 'notwithstanding the great exertions made by the Porter men, the Ritner ticket for Burgess and Council was elected by a majority of 23 votes." Let it be remembered that this is in the county where the people "KNOW HIM."

A Skunk!

☞There is a communication in the last "Franklin Telegraph," over the signature of "Simon Pure," written by one Andrew G. Miller or at his dictation. This communication is in relation to our candidate for Congress, James Cooper, Esq. *and does not contain one sentence of truth!*

We do not take up our pen to contradict the writer, but merely to inform the public *who he is!* This Andrew G. Miller is the brother-in-law of Mr. Cooper, but his most inveterate foe—because, in his professional pursuits, the latter, on one of two occasions in duty to his clients, it is said, has been compelled to exhibit the former in a point of view not the most favorable. Miller is the Editor of the "Compiler"! Have we not said enough!

Meeting at Sheely's.

☞There was a meeting of the Porterites at the house of Mr. Sheely, in Germany township, on Saturday last, to hear speeches against the Ritner ticket. Some three or four dozen Porter men had assembled, and the "Town Orators" (!) were present in full force, crammed chock full of abuse of Joseph Ritner, and of everything else, which was to their audience, when lo! Mr. Cooper, our candidate for Congress, and Col. Clarkson, appeared upon the scene! Astonishment and bother by their own boasted Tom Thumbs was the sickening result. They looked more like *convicts*, or men detected in some act of villainy, than honored guests, invited to a public meeting to discuss the affairs of the country!

After long caucussing among the Town Orators and considerable delay, the meeting was at length organized. But fright had done its usual work with the Porter men—their tongues were tied! "A voice stuck in their jaws!" their tongues were stiff and unpliant, and worked pretty much like the "stiffest of the stiff" when they attempt to "talk to pitch!" All that the first speaker could utter was "Bank, Bank, Bank—United States Bank!" The second, a federal Crab-Apple looking chap, cried, "Monopoly, Monopoly—Aristocracy—Abolition—Monopoly, Monopoly!" and the third, an *honest citizen!* talked about "Lawyers, (we suppose he is not one, being only a *petti-fogger!*) Lawyers—Town Orators—Lawyers!" and thundered through with the reading of a letter, *which he said* was written by David Fullerton, abusing the Getysburg Rail Road and denouncing Porter's character, and then—the ball was broke!

Permission was then asked by Mr. Samuel Diehl, of Germany township, for Mr. Cooper to address the meeting, but a most determined howl making the request by Sheriff Taughenbaugh, who moved an adjournment and in such indecent haste that he, that he did not allow the President, Mr. Kitzmiller, time to put the question, but put it himself!! The meeting was adjourned. Miller ran one way, Taughenbaugh another, & McClean quick fled, urging the Porter men to leave and the town to hurry in harnessing their horses! And such was the hurry and confusion of their flight, that some of them actually harnessed Col. Clarkson's horse to his gig in mistake! A glorious day this for Porter!!

Mr. Cooper then rose and fired a few shots after the flying leaders, striking them at every fire, but one, escaped from the field, carrying away their wounded! When Mr. Cooper commenced speaking, he was interrupted by a fellow supposed to have been procured for the purpose by Miller and Taughenbaugh, who sung out, as loud as a Steadman pair of lungs would permit him, "Tar and feathers! Peggy Beatty!" and continued this for several minutes, stopping at intervals and threatening to "lick every Ritner man on the ground!" When this real Van Buren performance had ceased, Mr. Cooper addressed our friends and such of the other party as remained, exposing the silly falsehoods of the Town Fugitives as deserved reply.

In justice to our Country opponents, we must say, that we have been informed that a number of the Porter men from Conowago and Germany township, felt that their party was deeply disgraced by the conduct of the Town Dictators, who pretended in their speeches so much modesty and deference to the country people! More than one exclaimed against the conduct of the Sheriff in taking the duties of the President, Mr. Kitzmiller, out of his hands, and declared that he was particularly after the Master of this officious Interpreter had pretended that it was almost awful even to speak in the country! Yet Taughenbaugh assumed the duties of President and adjourned the meeting without the Chairman's leave! Even your political friends, who thought that both sides should have had a hearing! There were some honorable exceptions to such conduct even from town, & as one we have heard of J. B. Danner, Esq.

A SIGN IN HUNTINGDON COUNTY.—A few days since, at the tavern of Peter Boyle, in Gaysport, it was proposed by the landlord, who is a Porter man, to take the vote on the question for Governor, which resulted, for Ritner 41—for Porter 4.