

The State Sentinel will contain a much larger amount of reading matter, on all subjects of general interest, than any other newspaper in Indiana.

THE SEMI-WEEKLY EDITION is published every Wednesday and Saturday, and during the session of the Legislature, three times a week on Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays, at Four Dollars a year, payable always in advance.

THE WEEKLY EDITION is published every Thursday, at Two Dollars a year, always to be paid in advance.

Advertisements will be inserted three times at one dollar a square of 8 lines, and be continued at the rate of 25 cents a square for each additional insertion. Quarterly advertisements, per square, \$5.

Advertisements from abroad must be accompanied by the cash; or no attention will be paid to them. Postage must be paid.

Asst. W. Morris and the Canal Lands. We give room to-day, at the request of Mr. A. W. Morris, his attempted vindication of himself in relation to the act passed at the last session relative to canal lands, which has lately created so much excitement at Peru, and at other points on the Upper Wash.

In the first place it looks to us as rather contradictory on its face. Speaking of the purchased canal lands east of Tippecanoe river, he says they are not "principally held by persons who have not for many years paid any portion of the principal or interest on their lands."

"As for myself, I desire no place—no power. I shall no sooner enter the city of Mexico than I will convoke an assembly duly elected by all the voters in the states, and clothed with unlimited authority for the purpose of remanding the government according to the will of the people."

"All classes of society—the clergy, the military, the magistracy, the learned professions, commerce, industry and agriculture will be represented in this assembly, and from the moment it meets all power will cease to exist, except such as may emanate from it."

"Happy then at having conscientiously discharged my duty, I shall either retire to private life, or I shall ask the privilege of marching to the frontier to encounter the usurpers of our territory and the enemies of independence and prosperity."

Mexico. The following paragraph is extracted from the manifesto of Paredes to the Mexican people. It sounds very patriotic, and there may be some sincerity in it, but we doubt:

"I shall no sooner enter the city of Mexico than I will convoke an assembly duly elected by all the voters in the states, and clothed with unlimited authority for the purpose of remanding the government according to the will of the people."

"All classes of society—the clergy, the military, the magistracy, the learned professions, commerce, industry and agriculture will be represented in this assembly, and from the moment it meets all power will cease to exist, except such as may emanate from it."

"Happy then at having conscientiously discharged my duty, I shall either retire to private life, or I shall ask the privilege of marching to the frontier to encounter the usurpers of our territory and the enemies of independence and prosperity."

Mexican Provisional Constitution.—Gen. Paredes has promulgated a provisional constitution, of which the following is a synopsis:

The 1st Section declares the intention of the army to protect the nation against the administration of Herrera, and pronounces all future acts of that administration null and void.

Section 2d. Dissolves the Congress and all executive authorities.

Section 3d. Repeats Paredes's promise to convoke an Extraordinary Congress, with full powers to settle the affairs of the nation.

Section 4th. Gives "all classes of society" the franchise.

Section 5th. Makes it the first duty of the Congress to organize the executive power of the State, and proclaims this "Sovereign Assembly" the source of all authority.

Section 6th. Permits the local authorities in the Departments the temporary exercise of their functions.

Section 7th. Eliminates Paredes "Chief of his movement" and forms a kind of advisory Committee to act with or for him.

Section 8th. Provides for inviting the Governor of San Luis Potosi to espouse the cause.

Section 9th. Solemnly disclaims all intention to elevate Paredes beyond the point indicated by his manifesto.

Section 10th. Declares that "the army will punish all persons who oppose this plan."

The revolution was almost bloodless, only one regimental officer and one private soldier losing their lives. Paredes is said to have had fewer than 8,000 men under him, and his march was slow enough to enable Herrera to take every defensive precaution.

The principal accusation brought against the Government by Paredes and his band, is that of being willing to form a treaty with the United States for the surrender of Texas. This, it is true, was a mere pretext to catch the populace.

The election for State officers under the new Constitution took place in Louisiana on the 19th inst.

The democrats succeeded in the city of New Orleans, the only district heard from, in giving their candidate for governor a handsome majority. The vote at the close of the poll stood as follows:

Johnson (Democrat) - - - - 3,431 De Buys (Whig) - - - - 3,055 Johnson's majority - - - - 346

The Indiana State Sentinel

INDIANAPOLIS, FEBRUARY 12, 1846. [Volume V Number 34]

Published every Thursday.

Each one of the 150 Senators and Representatives has during the whole session to examine bills, that the Governor is compelled to examine (at least two-thirds of them) in less than one day!

There are bills that the Governor would not like for to be a member that he would yet feel it his duty to sign as Governor. Generally speaking bills pass by small majorities.

Perhaps there is not a member of the Legislature that would vote for more two-thirds of all the bills that are passed. But what would the anti-veto or whig party say of a Governor that would veto one-third of all the bills passed at a session?

Numbers of cunning, plausible, smooth whigs, that used to bawl out so long and loud against Gen. Jackson and John Tyler for vetoing, have been trying to persuade honest farmers attending court this week, that Gov. Whitcomb has done wrong for not vetoing.

What can be thought of such men? Have they any shame left? Greatly to their disappointment, however, as soon as Gov. Whitcomb discovered the fraud that was trying to be practised under the Morris bill, he at once stopped all proceeding under it.

He closed the mouths of the land sharks and protected the rights of the honest settlers. And now won't they blame him for that? They are mightily afraid that he won't do something wrong.

Mexico. The following paragraph is extracted from the manifesto of Paredes to the Mexican people. It sounds very patriotic, and there may be some sincerity in it, but we doubt:

"I shall no sooner enter the city of Mexico than I will convoke an assembly duly elected by all the voters in the states, and clothed with unlimited authority for the purpose of remanding the government according to the will of the people."

"All classes of society—the clergy, the military, the magistracy, the learned professions, commerce, industry and agriculture will be represented in this assembly, and from the moment it meets all power will cease to exist, except such as may emanate from it."

"Happy then at having conscientiously discharged my duty, I shall either retire to private life, or I shall ask the privilege of marching to the frontier to encounter the usurpers of our territory and the enemies of independence and prosperity."

Mexican Provisional Constitution.—Gen. Paredes has promulgated a provisional constitution, of which the following is a synopsis:

The 1st Section declares the intention of the army to protect the nation against the administration of Herrera, and pronounces all future acts of that administration null and void.

Section 2d. Dissolves the Congress and all executive authorities.

Section 3d. Repeats Paredes's promise to convoke an Extraordinary Congress, with full powers to settle the affairs of the nation.

Section 4th. Gives "all classes of society" the franchise.

Section 5th. Makes it the first duty of the Congress to organize the executive power of the State, and proclaims this "Sovereign Assembly" the source of all authority.

Section 6th. Permits the local authorities in the Departments the temporary exercise of their functions.

Section 7th. Eliminates Paredes "Chief of his movement" and forms a kind of advisory Committee to act with or for him.

Section 8th. Provides for inviting the Governor of San Luis Potosi to espouse the cause.

Section 9th. Solemnly disclaims all intention to elevate Paredes beyond the point indicated by his manifesto.

Section 10th. Declares that "the army will punish all persons who oppose this plan."

The revolution was almost bloodless, only one regimental officer and one private soldier losing their lives. Paredes is said to have had fewer than 8,000 men under him, and his march was slow enough to enable Herrera to take every defensive precaution.

The principal accusation brought against the Government by Paredes and his band, is that of being willing to form a treaty with the United States for the surrender of Texas. This, it is true, was a mere pretext to catch the populace.

The election for State officers under the new Constitution took place in Louisiana on the 19th inst.

The democrats succeeded in the city of New Orleans, the only district heard from, in giving their candidate for governor a handsome majority. The vote at the close of the poll stood as follows:

Johnson (Democrat) - - - - 3,431 De Buys (Whig) - - - - 3,055 Johnson's majority - - - - 346

The democrats have also succeeded in electing a majority of the members of the legislature.

REMOVALS OF COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.—We learn by the Union that the following amounts have been respectively retained by the several collectors, being their emoluments during the year ending June, 1845.

The collectors of Boston, during four years, retained, \$24,978, the Collectors of New York, \$25,650, the collectors of Philadelphia \$28,573; Collector Williams of Baltimore, for two years, eight months and twenty days, \$11,842; the collector of Savannah, for three years and nine months, \$9,134; the collector of Charleston \$21,918, and the collector of New Orleans \$15,974. Total emoluments thus retained, \$174,712.

For the Indiana State Journal. To the Public.

The publications in the State Sentinel and Indiana Democrat of last week, and the proceedings of a public meeting, purporting to have been held at Peru, published in the Democratic Pharos, of the 29th inst., at Logansport, entertain so much that is untrue in relation to a business transaction in which I was recently engaged that I am impelled, by a sense of duty to myself, to ask the attention of the public to the following facts:

The Revised Statutes of 1843, in relation to the sale of Washah and Erie canal lands, (see page 307) is as follows:

1. Three months' notice of the time of sale shall be given.

2. The time of sale and the manner in which the notice shall be published shall be designated by the Governor.

3. One-fourth of the purchase money, with one year's interest in advance on the residue, shall be paid at the time of the purchase.

4. A like one-fourth of the purchase money, and interest on the residue, shall be paid at the expiration of each year thereafter, until the whole is discharged.

Sec. 216. When the commissioner superintending any sale becomes satisfied that a combination exists among the bidders to keep the price down, he may, at a less price than would otherwise be obtained, he shall bid off such tract on behalf of the State.

Sec. 217. In the next advertisement of lands for sale, he shall note such tracts as are particularly worthy of public attention, and again offer all such for sale as before.

Sec. 218. On a failure to pay either principal or interest when due, a penalty of twenty-five per cent. on the amount of the purchase money, shall be added to the whole sum, with interest thereon, shall be paid within one year thereafter, the contract of sale shall be vacated, and the land become forfeit to the State for the use of the canal.

Sec. 219. All lands remaining unsold at such public sale, and all lands becoming forfeit under the preceding section, shall thereafter remain to be entered by the first applicant at the rate affixed thereto on the terms aforesaid.

The district of country in which the land office, for the sale of lands east of the mouth of the Tippecanoe, is principally held by persons who have not, for many years, paid any portion of the principal or interest on their lands.

Many of those persons, possessed of ample means, and of good reputation, have recently declared that so long as they could hold "white dog," which was bearing six per cent. interest, they would not pay, because they could make more on that species of money by keeping it in their pockets.

The effect of this course on the interests of the State was, that, in consequence of payments not being made, the superintendent of the canal was compelled to issue a warrant of seizure to me, as necessary repairs, which increased expense caused a further depreciation of its value and the State was compelled to pay double price for all such repairs.

The interests of those in the immediate vicinity of the land office being thus against the enforcement of the provisions of the Revised Statutes above quoted, the officers of the land office refused to receive any bids, and I was obliged to make a public sale of the lands, as provided for in the section then amended. Can any one believe that Governor Whitcomb did not understand a bill so plain and simple in its provisions. Those who would assert it, are either ignorant of the law, or of the reputation for legal ability. Does any one suppose he would sign a bill the provisions of which he did not fully understand? Those who would thus contend, thereby impeach his ability to perform the duties of the station which he occupies. Where, then, is the fraud practised upon the Legislature, and upon the country? Admit the argument, its existence, is the committee who drew up the bill to be alone denounced and the Legislature who enacted it, and the Executive who signed it, to be held entirely innocent? Would this be right in the eyes of honest men. It does not exist, however, and it would never have been charged by any other than just such persons as those who figured in getting up the resolutions, to have been adopted at the public meeting at Peru on the 29th inst. I am "represented," because I understand, that since that publication, many of them were disavowed by several respectable gentlemen who were present and who would not have sanctioned the passage of resolutions so infamous in their character. I understand that the resolutions and address were drawn up by, and published in the name of, an individual, of whom I shall speak directly in a manner unbecomingly of the meeting. Having established beyond all controversy that the act which passed at the recent session makes no alteration in the existing law, diversely affecting, in any particular, the rights of purchasers of canal land—that it was passed by the Legislature, and that the act of the Executive, in signing it, is an act for the redemption of the canal lands, and after a discussion of its provisions—that it received the sanction of the Executive who may have examined it, the only question remaining is, whether I was justifiable in making the entries of the lands above mentioned.

Whatever view might be taken of the inquiry as a question in ethics, and thus considered, I do not believe it would be considered its not to be questioned by men, whose fortunes have been made by swindling Indians, first made drunk to facilitate its accomplishment, or, by a sworn conservator of the laws, who commits moral perjury by recommending their violation. These are not the men to determine this question satisfactorily for an enlightened community. From the resolutions I appeal to the sober judgment of honest men.

Jack Wright, who occupies, to the disgrace of the State, the station of a president judge of a circuit court, was the presiding genius of the Peru meeting. At his instance it was called. The resolutions and address could not have emanated from any other man this side of Jeffersonville, and the walk of the penitentiary, in the morning, would now be black at the avowal of the doctrines which they inculcate.

Were it not that these resolutions and address are sent forth as having received the approbation of a numerous assembly of the citizens of Miami county, I would not notice them. It would be unnecessary to do so: for those who are acquainted with Wright, know that he is not a man to be trusted, and that, as a somewhat mitigation for the offence, it is urged in his behalf, that, lying, with him, is a constitutional defect and that he is not, therefore, accountable for it. Let any man read the resolutions and address referred to, and then determine whether their author is not better suited, in morality and capacity, to lead a gang of highwaymen, than to preside in a Court of justice. The second resolution, passed by the Judge, recommends the appointment of a committee to rob an individual of his property. It is wrong for a person to purchase land under the provisions of the law, but perfectly right in a committee to steal money, although prohibited by the law! This is the morality inculcated by the resolutions, and the honesty of the remaining resolutions, which are nearly all of the same character, I wish to point out to the falsehoods which are asserted in the address.

It is false that Col. Reuben refused to have any thing to do with the passage of the amendment—but, on the contrary, thereof, favored its passage. It is false that "in the confusion of the moment, the bill was passed without the knowledge of the members," but, on the contrary thereof, it was acted upon by those directly interested in its passage, with a full knowledge of its purport. It is false that the bill re-quires any act which was not existence previous to its passage, nor does it make it more imperatively the duty of the Commissioner to permit the entry of forfeited lands, than did the law existing at the time of its passage; in fact, making no alteration whatever in that respect. It is false "that the clerk in the land office employed assistance, and that three persons were secretly employed in filing certificates;" but on the contrary thereof, the entries were made and the certificates were issued and the business transacted in the usual manner, in the presence of whoever chanced to be present. It is false that Mr. Fitzgerald's name was used by me, to cover entries made for me. The lands purchased by him (with the exception of about one section, which had been forfeited by the United States in the manner above mentioned, and in which only an interest was paid for with his own money, for his own use and benefit. The land, however, which he had made an affidavit that I had stolen the certificates, I believe to be untrue. I know not what effect the threats of a banditti may have had upon him, or what he may have been forced to do—but this I am certain, if he did so, he stated that which is untrue.

It may be regarded by some, that I ought not to have noticed these publications, for the reason that they carry with them sufficient evidence of their vindictiveness as to preclude their working any injury to me. It may be that I owe an apology to the public for asking their attention to a matter purely personal. If so, it is to be found in the desire to preserve a reputation which I felt had been most unjustly and wantonly assailed. How far I have succeeded, I leave with posterity. I am, Sir, your obedient servant, A. W. MORRIS.

Indianapolis, Feb. 2d, 1846.

P. S. I trust such papers as may have published the charges above referred to, will do me the justice to publish this refutation.

What do they prove? Let a plain recital answer. After an interview with the gentlemen above named, with whom I had conversed on the subject of the amendment, I drew up and handed the law in question to Mr. Parker. It was introduced to the House by him, and the following proceedings had thereon:

An act to amend the 218th section of the 13th chapter of Revised Code, page 267.

Jan. 13, read 1st and 2d times, and referred to the Judiciary committee.

Jan. 19, read 1st, 2d and 3d times and passed. Enrolled. Gorman, Sec. Senate. (J. H. T., Secy.)

I hereby certify that the above is a true copy of the amendments, on the back of the above entitled bill, now on file in my office, which was passed at the recent session of the Legislature.

JNO. H. THOMPSON, Secretary of State. Jan. 20th, 1846.

Will candid men say that there was any fraud in the proceedings above shown to have taken place? Can it, with truth, be said the law was not understood by the ordinary community, composed, as it was, principally, by men of the highest reputation? Was it not understood by Mr. Osborn of Logansport and Mr. McDonald, (the last named gentleman being the chairman of the Judiciary committee,) who advocated its passage in speeches before the House, and who read the section of the Revised Law proposed to be amended, after an acquaintance with those gentlemen, each of whom represented a constituency interested in the question, can suppose that they did not understand it. Its passage through the Senate was favored by Col. Reuben, who protested against the ayes and noes being called on the motion to suspend the rules, that it might pass. They did understand it to mean just what it does mean, that purchasers should have the provisions of said Statute in force in the State from 1843, in which to redeem such lands as may have become forfeited, and to prevent a forfeiture taking place as soon by one year as provided for in the section then amended. Can any one believe that Governor Whitcomb did not understand a bill so plain and simple in its provisions. Those who would assert it, are either ignorant of the law, or of the reputation for legal ability. Does any one suppose he would sign a bill the provisions of which he did not fully understand? Those who would thus contend, thereby impeach his ability to perform the duties of the station which he occupies. Where, then, is the fraud practised upon the Legislature, and upon the country? Admit the argument, its existence, is the committee who drew up the bill to be alone denounced and the Legislature who enacted it, and the Executive who signed it, to be held entirely innocent? Would this be right in the eyes of honest men. It does not exist, however, and it would never have been charged by any other than just such persons as those who figured in getting up the resolutions, to have been adopted at the public meeting at Peru on the 29th inst. I am "represented," because I understand, that since that publication, many of them were disavowed by several respectable gentlemen who were present and who would not have sanctioned the passage of resolutions so infamous in their character. I understand that the resolutions and address were drawn up by, and published in the name of, an individual, of whom I shall speak directly in a manner unbecomingly of the meeting. Having established beyond all controversy that the act which passed at the recent session makes no alteration in the existing law, diversely affecting, in any particular, the rights of purchasers of canal land—that it was passed by the Legislature, and that the act of the Executive, in signing it, is an act for the redemption of the canal lands, and after a discussion of its provisions—that it received the sanction of the Executive who may have examined it, the only question remaining is, whether I was justifiable in making the entries of the lands above mentioned.

and what do they prove? Let a plain recital answer.

After an interview with the gentlemen above named, with whom I had conversed on the subject of the amendment, I drew up and handed the law in question to Mr. Parker. It was introduced to the House by him, and the following proceedings had thereon:

An act to amend the 218th section of the 13th chapter of Revised Code, page 267.

Jan. 13, read 1st and 2d times, and referred to the Judiciary committee.

Jan. 19, read 1st, 2d and 3d times and passed. Enrolled. Gorman, Sec. Senate. (J. H. T., Secy.)

I hereby certify that the above is a true copy of the amendments, on the back of the above entitled bill, now on file in my office, which was passed at the recent session of the Legislature.

JNO. H. THOMPSON, Secretary of State. Jan. 20th, 1846.

Will candid men say that there was any fraud in the proceedings above shown to have taken place? Can it, with truth, be said the law was not understood by the ordinary community, composed, as it was, principally, by men of the highest reputation? Was it not understood by Mr. Osborn of Logansport and Mr. McDonald, (the last named gentleman being the chairman of the Judiciary committee,) who advocated its passage in speeches before the House, and who read the section of the Revised Law proposed to be amended, after an acquaintance with those gentlemen, each of whom represented a constituency interested in the question, can suppose that they did not understand it. Its passage through the Senate was favored by Col. Reuben, who protested against the ayes and noes being called on the motion to suspend the rules, that it might pass. They did understand it to mean just what it does mean, that purchasers should have the provisions of said Statute in force in the State from 1843, in which to redeem such lands as may have become forfeited, and to prevent a forfeiture taking place as soon by one year as provided for in the section then amended. Can any one believe that Governor Whitcomb did not understand a bill so plain and simple in its provisions. Those who would assert it, are either ignorant of the law, or of the reputation for legal ability. Does any one suppose he would sign a bill the provisions of which he did not fully understand? Those who would thus contend, thereby impeach his ability to perform the duties of the station which he occupies. Where, then, is the fraud practised upon the Legislature, and upon the country? Admit the argument, its existence, is the committee who drew up the bill to be alone denounced and the Legislature who enacted it, and the Executive who signed it, to be held entirely innocent? Would this be right in the eyes of honest men. It does not exist, however, and it would never have been charged by any other than just such persons as those who figured in getting up the resolutions, to have been adopted at the public meeting at Peru on the 29th inst. I am "represented," because I understand, that since that publication, many of them were disavowed by several respectable gentlemen who were present and who would not have sanctioned the passage of resolutions so infamous in their character. I understand that the resolutions and address were drawn up by, and published in the name of, an individual, of whom I shall speak directly in a manner unbecomingly of the meeting. Having established beyond all controversy that the act which passed at the recent session makes no alteration in the existing law, diversely affecting, in any particular, the rights of purchasers of canal land—that it was passed by the Legislature, and that the act of the Executive, in signing it, is an act for the redemption of the canal lands, and after a discussion of its provisions—that it received the sanction of the Executive who may have examined it, the only question remaining is, whether I was justifiable in making the entries of the lands above mentioned.

Whatever view might be taken of the inquiry as a question in ethics, and thus considered, I do not believe it would be considered its not to be questioned by men, whose fortunes have been made by swindling Indians, first made drunk to facilitate its accomplishment, or, by a sworn conservator of the laws, who commits moral perjury by recommending their violation. These are not the men to determine this question satisfactorily for an enlightened community. From the resolutions I appeal to the sober judgment of honest men.

Jack Wright, who occupies, to the disgrace of the State, the station of a president judge of a circuit court, was the presiding genius of the Peru meeting. At his instance it was called. The resolutions and address could not have emanated from any other man this side of Jeffersonville, and the walk of the penitentiary, in the morning, would now be black at the avowal of the doctrines which they inculcate.

Were it not that these resolutions and address are sent forth as having received the approbation of a numerous assembly of the citizens of Miami county, I would not notice them. It would be unnecessary to do so: for those who are acquainted with Wright, know that he is not a man to be trusted, and that, as a somewhat mitigation for the offence, it is urged in his behalf, that, lying, with him, is a constitutional defect and that he is not, therefore, accountable for it. Let any man read the resolutions and address referred to, and then determine whether their author is not better suited, in morality and capacity, to lead a gang of highwaymen, than to preside in a Court of justice. The second resolution, passed by the Judge, recommends the appointment of a committee to rob an individual of his property. It is wrong for a person to purchase land under the provisions of the law, but perfectly right in a committee to steal money, although prohibited by the law! This is the morality inculcated by the resolutions, and the honesty of the remaining resolutions, which are nearly all of the same character, I wish to point out to the falsehoods which are asserted in the address.

It is false that Col. Reuben refused to have any thing to do with the passage of the amendment—but, on the contrary, thereof, favored its passage. It is false that "in the confusion of the moment, the bill was passed without the knowledge of the members," but, on the contrary thereof, it was acted upon by those directly interested in its passage, with a full knowledge of its purport. It is false that the bill re-quires any act which was not existence previous to its passage, nor does it make it more imperatively the duty of the Commissioner to permit the entry of forfeited lands, than did the law existing at the time of its passage; in fact, making no alteration whatever in that respect. It is false "that the clerk in the land office employed assistance, and that three persons were secretly employed in filing certificates;" but on the contrary thereof, the entries were made and the certificates were issued and the business transacted in the usual manner, in the presence of whoever chanced to be present. It is false that Mr. Fitzgerald's name was used by me, to cover entries made for me. The lands purchased by him (with the exception of about one section, which had been forfeited by the United States in the manner above mentioned, and in which only an interest was paid for with his own money, for his own use and benefit. The land, however, which he had made an affidavit that I had stolen the certificates, I believe to be untrue. I know not what effect the threats of a banditti may have had upon him, or what he may have been forced to do—but this I am certain, if he did so, he stated that which is untrue.

It may be regarded by some, that I ought not to have noticed these publications, for the reason that they carry with them sufficient evidence of their vindictiveness as to preclude their working any injury to me. It may be that I owe an apology to the public for asking their attention to a matter purely personal. If so, it is to be found in the desire to preserve a reputation which I felt had been most unjustly and wantonly assailed. How far I have succeeded, I leave with posterity. I am, Sir, your obedient servant, A. W. MORRIS.

Indianapolis, Feb. 2d, 1846.

P. S. I trust such papers as may have published the charges above referred to, will do me the justice to publish this refutation.

and what do they prove? Let a plain recital answer.

After an interview with the gentlemen above named, with whom I had conversed on the subject of the amendment, I drew up and handed the law in question to Mr. Parker. It was introduced to the House by him, and the following proceedings had thereon:

An act to amend the 218th section of the 13th chapter of Revised Code, page 267.

Jan. 13, read 1st and 2d times, and referred to the Judiciary committee.

Jan. 19, read 1st, 2d and 3d times and passed. Enrolled. Gorman, Sec. Senate. (J. H. T., Secy.)

I hereby certify that the above is a true copy of the amendments, on the back of the above entitled bill, now on file in my office, which was passed at the recent session of the Legislature.

JNO. H. THOMPSON, Secretary of State. Jan. 20th, 1846.

Will candid men say that there was any fraud in the proceedings above shown to have taken place? Can it, with truth, be said the law was not understood by the ordinary community, composed, as it was, principally, by men of the highest reputation? Was it not understood by Mr. Osborn of Logansport and Mr. McDonald, (the last named gentleman being the chairman of the Judiciary committee,) who advocated its passage in speeches before the House, and who read the section of the Revised Law proposed to be amended, after an acquaintance with those gentlemen, each of whom represented a constituency interested in the question, can suppose that they did not understand it. Its passage through the Senate was favored by Col. Reuben, who protested against the ayes and noes being called on the motion to suspend the rules, that it might pass. They did understand it to mean just what it does mean, that purchasers should have the provisions of said Statute in force in the State from 1843, in which to redeem such lands as may have become forfeited, and to prevent a forfeiture taking place as soon by one year as provided for in the section then amended. Can any one believe that Governor Whitcomb did not understand a bill so plain and simple in its provisions. Those who would assert it, are either ignorant of the law, or of the reputation for legal ability. Does any one suppose he would sign a bill the provisions of which he did not fully understand? Those who would thus contend, thereby impeach his ability to perform the duties of the station which he occupies. Where, then, is the fraud practised upon the Legislature, and upon the country? Admit the argument, its existence, is the committee who drew up the bill to be alone denounced and the Legislature who enacted it, and the Executive who signed it, to be held entirely innocent? Would this be right in the eyes of honest men. It does not exist, however, and it would never have been charged by any other than just such persons as those who figured in getting up the resolutions, to have been adopted at the public meeting at Peru on the 29th inst. I am "represented," because I understand, that since that publication, many of them were disavowed by several respectable gentlemen who were present and who would not have sanctioned the passage of resolutions so infamous in their character. I understand that the resolutions and address were drawn up by, and published in the name of, an individual, of whom I shall speak directly in a manner unbecomingly of the meeting. Having established beyond all controversy that the act which passed at the recent session makes no alteration in the existing law, diversely affecting, in any particular, the rights of purchasers of canal land—that it was passed by the Legislature, and that the act of the Executive, in signing it, is an act for the redemption of the canal lands, and after a discussion of its provisions—that it received the sanction of the Executive who may have examined it, the only question remaining is, whether I was justifiable in making the entries of the lands above mentioned.

Whatever view might be taken of the inquiry as a question in ethics, and thus considered, I do not believe it would be considered its not to be questioned by men, whose fortunes have been made by swindling Indians, first made drunk to facilitate its accomplishment, or, by a sworn conservator of the laws, who commits moral perjury by recommending their violation. These are not the men to determine this question satisfactorily for an enlightened community. From the resolutions I appeal to the sober judgment of honest men.

Jack Wright, who occupies, to the disgrace of the State, the station of a president judge of a circuit court, was the presiding genius of the Peru meeting. At his instance it was called. The resolutions and address could not have emanated from any other man this side of Jeffersonville, and the walk of the penitentiary, in the morning, would now be black at the avowal of the doctrines which they inculcate.

Were it not that these resolutions and address are sent forth as having received the approbation of a numerous assembly of the citizens of Miami county, I would not notice them. It would be unnecessary to do so: for those who are acquainted with Wright, know that he is not a man to be trusted, and that, as a somewhat mitigation for the offence, it is urged in his behalf, that, lying, with him, is a constitutional defect and that he is not, therefore, accountable for it. Let any man read the resolutions and address referred to, and then determine whether their author is not better suited, in morality and capacity, to lead a gang of highwaymen, than to preside in a Court of justice. The second resolution, passed by the Judge, recommends the appointment of a committee to rob an individual of his property. It is wrong for a person to purchase land under the provisions of the law, but perfectly right in a committee to steal money, although prohibited by the law! This is the morality inculcated by the resolutions, and the honesty of the remaining resolutions, which are nearly all of the same character, I wish to point out to the falsehoods which are asserted in the address.

It is false that Col. Reuben refused to have any thing to do with the passage of the amendment—but, on the contrary, thereof, favored its passage. It is false that "in the confusion of the moment, the bill was passed without the knowledge of the members," but, on the contrary thereof, it was acted upon by those directly interested in its passage, with a full knowledge of its purport. It is false that the bill re-quires any act which was not existence previous to its passage, nor does it make it more imperatively the duty of the Commissioner to permit the entry of forfeited lands, than did the law existing at