

"Truth is Omnipotent" and will Prevail. **TO THE PEOPLE OF LEWIS COUNTY.**

FELLOW CITIZENS:

Nathaniel R. Garland brings me once more before you. He has issued his second manifesto to you upon that "*petty*," "*insignificant*" charge, that I and others have brought against him. If it is so small a matter, why should it trouble the *learned* and *upright* justice so much? In the eyes of a man so corrupt as to avail himself of the benefit of the Statute, shuffling off an honest debt, by a dishonorable plea, may seem a *small* matter! But I think the highminded citizens of Lewis county entertain a different opinion upon the subject, at least the interest they take in it seems to say so. Fellow Citizens, I have another charge now, as grave as the former, to bring against 'the poor Commonwealth's officer'—it is, that, after having resorted to the plea of 'Limitation,' to defraud me of a just debt, he has further defiled himself by denying it, both by open and public assertion and by every insidious subterfuge. If it should be, that this man who now aspires to sit among the noble and high-minded of the land, has availed himself of a dishonorable plea, repudiated by all fair and upright men, and enhanced its baseness by falsehood, can he be entitled to the suffrages of his virtuous fellow citizens? He who claims to lead the people, should be pure and uncontaminated!

Let me ask your attention, then, to a few observations offered as a refutation of this last hand bill, and as additional proof of the charges brought by me against Mr. Justice Garland.

First, let me dispose of his five sworn certificates.

He proves that he did not plead the Statute of Limitation as a bar to my claim against him

Next, William P. Savage. Witness in May or June 1848, had a private conversation with Thompson N. Stratton—Stratton never hinted to witness that Garland had ever plead the statute—then Stratton said he never blamed Garland if he had plead limitation on Redden, as he would collect his accounts *two* or *three* times if he could. Witness also states that Redden *tried* to make him pay a debt *once*—witness never heard the charge again. Garland 'till since he became a candidate.

The testimony of this witness is *rich*. Stratton, he says, never *hinted* that Garland plead the Statute, and yet in the next sentence, Stratton told him he never blamed Garland if he did plead the act! What reliance is to be placed on such testimony? The same consistent witness says: I tried to make him pay a debt twice. Yes, I tried (as many others did) to make him pay his debt, *twelve* times, but his property, as many of you know, was covered up by fraudulent contrivances, *and it took me 13 years to make him pay it once!*

Next and last, William Frizle, sr. Witness was at the trial and *thinks* he heard the most of it—*thinks* Garland did not lead it—*thinks* he would have heard him if he had. Witness never heard the charge 'till after Garland became a candidate—and certifies that Thompson N. Stratton was not at the trial, *at any time that he was there!*

This witness is another who *thinks* and *thinks* only; his last statement is remarkable and proves that he really knows nothing about the matter, for he is flatly contradicted by Garland himself and Stratton. I am informed that this witness did not sign this certificate

that is sufficient! Was he at the trial? Listen to N. R. Garland himself:

I certify that on the day N. R. Garland made a speech in Vanceburg he, Garlnd, said if we (the hearers) could believe such men as T. N. Stratton he could prove that he, Garland, did not plead the Statute of Limitation, for he said that said Stratton was a witness in the case and was there. Given under my hand this 22d day of July, 1848.

W. S. PARKER.

This is the man to whom Garland in his blindness appealed in a public speech! Perhaps he thought that the iron shackles of party would cause a fellow Democrat to falsify the truth! He was in error! By the mouth of his own witness is he condemned!

In addition I introduce the following certificate of James H. Cooper, in 1836 a Constable in this county, now living in Missouri, to sustain the oath of Mr. Stratton, and the certificate of Alexander Bruce heretofore published.

I recollect of serving a warrant in favor of Thomas E. Redden against Nathaniel R. Garland, on an account, and said Garland's offset on Thomas E. Redden, and returned the summons and offset to Brightman. I was not at the Law day, nor don't recollect the amount of the account nor the offset, but I think it was between seven and eight dollars. After that I called at Brightman's, and he told me that Garland, had taken the benefit of the act of limitation, and he, Brightman, gave me an Execution against T. E. Redden in favor of Nathaniel R. Garland. Mr. Redden settled the debt and cost, and Garland told me to apply it to some debts I had against him, and I done so.

JAMES H. COOPER.

June 22, 1848

I have already published the certificate of Joseph Knot, and Wm. B. Parker, proving that the conduct of Garland in pleading the statute