

The editors of the Georgia Journal in their paper of the 8th inst. have "Reviewed" "A Brief Review" of Gov. Gilmer's Administration, "by a Troup man," published in that paper of the 25th ult. The editors after alluding to "the controversy between Gov. Gilmer and Mr. Forsyth," the "alleged pledges" said to have been "given" by Mr. Gilmer "to the Clark party," and other grounds of objection made by the "Reviewer" to Mr. Gilmer's administration, all of which in our view are satisfactorily refuted, observe :

We now have the Legislature in session. The attempt of the Reviewer to make the Governor accountable for the delay that occurred after the meeting in the protection of the gold mines is unjust. He laid the subject before the Legislature on the 19th of October. He could not hasten their action on it. If the people were so much excited in relation to it, why was that excitement not also felt by the representatives of the people when they came together? They passed the first act on the subject towards the latter end of November. It was on the 1st December, reported in the Senate, as duly enrolled. It was signed by the Governor on the next day—the 2d Dec. On the 4th of Dec. the Governor informed the Legislature by message, that the law would not answer the purpose intended—(*Journal Senate, page 243.*) It required him to take immediate possession of the mines, and to use a military force to defend, but declared that the penalties for digging gold should not go into operation until the 1st January, 1831!!! What could any man do under such circumstances more than Gov. Gilmer did? Yet under this state of the facts, when it is proved by the Journals, that although the Governor laid the matter before the Legislature on the 19th October—that the first act was only enrolled on the 1st Dec. (*Journal Senate, page 231.*) and signed by the Governor on the 2d—and that the Governor informed the Legislature on the 4th of December, that the law would not answer the purpose—the author of the Review says, that "about one month after its passage, when sufficient time had elapsed for the removal of every gold digger from the country, his Excellency discovered that the law was not to his liking, and accordingly made a communication to the Legislature, requesting the passage of another law on the same subject." Thus the one month turns out to be only two days.

The Legislature did pass another law, but it was not reported as enrolled until the 22d December, (*Journal Senate, page 373.*) It was signed by the Governor on the same day. Still the penalties of the former act were not to take effect until the 1st January. The guard directed to be raised by the act of the 22d Dec. was to be organized, that is, officers were to be appointed, and men enlisted, and other arrangements made. We doubt very much whether any other man in the Executive office could have done all that was necessary on this point earlier, or more promptly and efficiently than it was done by Gov. Gilmer. The appointment of the officers of the Guard was announced in the Journal of the 1st January. Would the Reviewer himself, with all his parade about energy and efficiency, have done the business earlier or better? What though the guard had not reached the gold region before the 1st of February, as the Reviewer incorrectly states? It was only authorized to be raised on the 22d December: and even if it had been at its post on that day, it could not have done any thing, because the penalties for gold digging did not go into effect until the 1st January.

But it is a most palpable error, that the Governor's guard did not reach the gold region until about the 1st of February as asserted by the Reviewer. In the Georgia Journal of the 17th of March, there is published a letter from Col. Sandford, dated "Agency at Scudder's, January 15," in which mention is made that our "citizens have promptly quitted the territory with the expiration of the year." In the Georgia Journal of the 10th February, there was published another letter from Col. Sandford, dated "Agency at Scudder's, January 22," in which it is stated that Col. Nelson "on Monday the 17th, returned to head quarters having successfully accomplished the object of his march." These documents are before the public. What then becomes of the assertion of the Reviewer, that the "Governor's Guard did not reach the gold region until about the 1st of February, and that in the mean time great depredations were committed on the rights of the people." How can he justly charge the Governor because he did not, so soon as the first act was passed, order out a sufficient volunteer or other military force to expel the invaders? If the people of Georgia are several millions poorer than they would have been, it is not the Governor's fault, but the fault of the legislature; because it was the legislature that passed an act that would not answer the purpose, wasting all the time to do it too, from the 19th of October to the 1st of December, and even then putting off the operation of the penalties for gold digging until the 1st of January; and then, again, wasting the time from the 4th of December, until the 22d, in passing another act to remedy the deficiencies of the former one. It is preposterous in the extreme to charge the Governor with the sins of the legislature. Let every department of the Government bear the burden of its own transgressions, and no more.

On this point, the case is made out thus strongly in favor of the Governor and against the Reviewer, on documents before the public, and with which the Reviewer ought to have been acquainted. But it is still in favor of the promptitude of the Governor.

The attention of the Legislature was called to the subject on the 19th October, (*See Journal Senate, page 9.*)

The first act became a law only on the 2d December, (*see the act itself. Acts 1830, page 154.*)

The Governor informed the Legislature that it would not answer the purpose, on the 4th December, (*Journal Senate, page 243.*)

The second act became a law only on the 22d Dec. (See acts 1830, page 114.)

On the 24th Dec. Col. Sandford was appointed Commander of the Guard.

On the 29th he left Milledgeville for the Cherokee country.

Col. Nelson left Gainesville, with his company, on the 4th January.

The ammunition wagon, detained by high waters, reached Scudder's on the 10th January.

Col. Sandford writes to the Governor on the 15th January from Scudder's, and his letter was published in the Journal of the 17th March.

Yet the Reviewer asserts that the Governor's Guard did not reach the gold region until about the first of February.

In relation to the reservation of the Gold Mines, which forms one ground of charge against the Governor, he expressed, we have no doubt, his honest convictions of what was right—convictions which are approved we believe by a majority of the quiet reflecting people of the State, whenever they let their reason have the sway. But did he not sacrifice his individual opinions to the will of the people, as expressed through the legislature? The act was passed disposing of the gold mines, and the lands except lots under 100 acres. Did he put his veto on it? No. It stands with his signature to it, thus showing clearly that whatever his individual opinions of policy and expediency may have been, he sacrificed them to his sense of official duty, and sanctioned the act passed by the representatives of the people, disposing of the gold mines by lottery.

We deny positively that there is any intention either on the part of the Governor, or of his friends, to agitate the matter again. They have no design to reserve and lease out the mines if they have the power, as charged by the Reviewer. Every thing that has passed in relation to the subject goes to disprove the charge. Here are the facts. In 1825, an act was passed reserving to the State ores, mines, &c. and this by the Clark party, who were in power in the Legislature of that year. In 1829, that act was repealed; and by whom? Were not Mr. Gilmer's friends in a majority that year? Did Gov. Gilmer put his veto to that act? In 1830, the great lottery bill was passed disposing of the lands, gold mines and all, in the Cherokee country. Although Gov. Gilmer recommended a reservation of them for State purposes, yet the representatives of the people, thinking differently, did he resist the will of the people thus expressed? He sanctioned the bill and the question is now settled. What do these facts prove? They prove as clearly as can be, that Gov. Gilmer and his friends will not reserve and lease out the gold mines, if they have the power. They entertain no such design.

In vindicating the policy of the Governor, in relation to the occupancy of the country and the disposition of the lands, it would be waste of time to add a single word to what was said by a "A Citizen of Hall," in the last Journal. The extreme delicacy of the situation in which the authorities of the State were placed, by the ground our representatives had to take in Congress to secure the passage of the Indian bill, is, in that production, ably and happily delineated. It has been read, we have no doubt by all who honestly wish for information on the subject. If it has not been read, we recommend that it may be read attentively. It places that matter in its true light.

So much of the Review as embraces a criticism on the Governor's message in relation to the reservation of the gold mines, has been already answered in the Journal. Nearly all that the Reviewer has advanced on this topic, is but a repetition of what has been already urged in another quarter and completely refuted.

The attack on the Governor on account of the Penitentiary we have already pronounced to be disingenuous. In the last Journal that matter was set in its proper light before the people. It was shown that it is the Legislature, and the Inspectors, who are responsible to the people for what has been done since the last session towards sustaining the institution. This was proved by reference to the laws passed, first in 1829, and next in 1830. Let any man who is disposed to deal fairly, refer to these acts and come to a different conclusion if he can.