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 on the trial of the suit in 1836, by the following witnesses and in the following manner, viz:—

By Wm. Brightman. This witness was the son of the magistrate who tried the case, and at the time of the trial was a lad somewhere about 12 or 14 years old. He heard his father speak of the suit between Garland and myself before and after its termination, and never heard him say any statute was plead. Witness says the statute was not plead, or he would have heard it. This is positive enough for a boy, more interested at his age, doubtless, in marbles than in law suits.

Next, R. B. Garland. This witness thinks if Garland (his brother) had plead the statute, he being there at the time, would have heard it; but does not pretend to know anything about it.

Next, Abraham Jones. Witness lived at Brightman’s house at the time of the trial, paid particular attention, but heard no statute plead; thinks he would have heard it, if it had been plead, says he thinks the cause went off on the proof, and that the Square manifested to him that the cause was tried fairly and not on the statute. This feeble old man only thinks; he knows nothing, carefully as his statement has been drawn up.

Next, Jno. W. Leitch. Witness was the constable who summoned R. B. Garland, and Harvey Griffith, and returned the same summons on the day of trial—never heard the charge of pleading the statute brought against Garland ‘till since he became a candidate—has been a constable for fifteen years and thinks he would have done so if such charge had ever been made. This witness does not say he was at the trial—he was not, just ask him if you doubt! He also

only thinks.

I hereby certify that I was a witness in the case and was present at the trial between Thomas E. Redden and N. R. Garland, before A. Brightman, Esq., in 1836 and that Mr. Garland did plead the statute of Limitation. Given under my hand this 30th day of June, 1848.

THOMPSON N. STRATTON.

S. MURPHY.

Lewis County Set.

The above certificate is a true copy given to Thomas E. Redden, and said T. J. Stratton, this day personally appeared before me, a Justice of the Peace, and made oath that the said certificate was true as stated. Given under my hand this 22d day of July, 1848.

W. S. PARKER.

Is he a credible witness? You all know him,

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, was, at the time, freely and unreservedly talked about. In addition to this, I refer any who can still doubt that the fact was canvassed at the time, to Dr. Nesbit Taylor, Joseph Moore, Isaac Bassett, Charles Wood, Martin Cox, &c.

How then stands the case? Four men and one boy (boy at the date of the suit) prove that they never heard Garland plead the statute—that they think he did not plead it. On the other hand, I have charged that N. R. Garland did plead the act of limitations against me, and I prove it by the following evidence:

1st. The fact that the Magistrate, Brightman, in 1836, one month before the last trial, granted me a new trial, on the ground, asked for by me, that Garland had plead the statute when it would not legally bar me.

2nd. By the oath of Thompson N. Stratton, (referred to by Garlard himself) who swore he did plead it—and by the certificate of Alexander Bruce and James H. Cooper.

3rd. By the testimony of many men who say (and who will say) that at the date of the suit they heard the matter noised about—well recollected by them.

4th. My own solemn affirmation, now made by me, that Garland did so plead the act of Limitation—that I heard him do so, and help me God.

Fellow-citizens of Lewis, can you doubt that the charges I make against Mr. Justice Garland are true? If they are true, can you trust this man, defiled as he is by this baseness, with your honor and your interests, in the legislature of your country? Your votes at the polls next Monday, will show in what esteem you hold truth and honor.

THOMAS E. REDDEN.

Monday, July 31st, 1848.