

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.*)