

# Marshall Democrat



T. McDONALD, Editor.

PLYMOUTH, IND.

Thursday Morning, March 26th, 1857.

## Public Opinion.

We have seen and heard of many instances of attempts to manufacture public opinion, both for personal and party purposes; but we have never seen a more urgent and unscrupulous effort, nor one more unjust and libelous than has been presented in our community within the last two weeks, and is now being made, in relation to two of our citizens. Last week a small article appeared in the Republican, published here, in these words:

"We understand that a couple of Old Line leaders in this place have got themselves into a nice bit of a scrape, in their desire to oppress a Republican, by flinging money out of his pocket contrary to the Court records. As the matter will soon undergo a judicial investigation, we forbear mentioning names or other particulars, at present."

At the same time all sorts of rumors, stories and statements were afloat and being made. We took occasion to inquire into it, and have found out the facts, and feel called upon to set the matter right, so far as we can do so by giving place to the facts in our paper. They are simply these:

At the last term of our Court, there was a case pending, in which J. W. Bennett had appealed from an allowance of a doctor bill of his, by the board of Commissioners. On the 2nd day of the term—Feb'y 10—the case was tried, and Bennett got a verdict for less than the Commissioners had allowed him. Section 10, page 102, 1st volume of the Revised Statutes provides, that in such cases unless the party gets judgment for more than he was allowed, he shall pay the costs. Of course by that verdict, Bennett was in for the costs. He made a motion for a new trial, and so the matter stood until the last of the term—Feb'y 19th and 20th—when Bennett withdrew his motion for a new trial, and judgment was entered on the verdict. This should have been, judgment for Bennett for \$33—the jury allowed him, and judgment against him for the costs. But the Clerk in entering up the judgment, entered a judgment for Bennett both for his allowance and cost. S. B. Corbaley was the Deputy Clerk who made the Records, and in entering the judgment rendered at the last of the term, he turned back and entered it under the proceedings in the same case, entered and signed on the 2nd day of the term. This the Clerk says the Court directed. It looks on the record as though it had all been done on that day. When Court adjourned all the records were not made and the Court being anxious to leave on account of sickness of his family, signed the record, leaving space to finish up the unentered proceedings, and left the Clerk to make them. Some time before he left (and before he signed the record) on the last day, he said something about leaving the Clerk to make up the records and coming down afterwards to sign them; but inasmuch as he had resigned to take effect as soon as that Court was over, (we suppose) he concluded to sign before he left, and did so. C. H. Reeve was counsel for the Commissioners, and was not in Court when the judgment was entered, and supposed it stood on the motion for a new trial, and also supposed that the Court had gone away and left the records unsigned, and was to be back and sign them. The Clerk told him that a verdict had been rendered against the Commissioners—and Reeve said it was wrong, and should be altered before it was too late, (alluding to the signing of the record by the judge, which he expected he would be here to do.) The Clerk went away immediately after Court without correcting it. Sometime after, the matter was mentioned and Reeve asked Corbaley if the record had been corrected, and Corbaley said not, (Corbaley was deputy Clerk.) Reeve said he wished he would attend to it for he was too late. Corbaley said he would do so, and at his first leisure he corrected the judgment as it should be. Over this an attempt is made to charge Corbaley and Reeve with forgery in the estimation of public opinion, and to get such an impression generally abroad. Now the facts as stated will warrant no such thing, and we believe that the originators of the endless *false* reports in circulation, *know* all the facts, but *do* seek to have them misstated altogether. All that was ever said by Reeve and the Clerk or Corbaley, was said openly in a public office in presence of others. Reeve wanted it corrected before it was signed (thinking the judge was yet to sign it) and Corbaley corrected it because he had entered it erroneously, and thought it was his place to do so. We feel warranted in saying that the statements currently afloat that Reeve advised Corbaley to alter a Record, or that Corbaley would not have done it had he not been advised, and that as it is, it is a forgery, with many others, is an *unqualified falsehood*. If the record had not been signed, Corbaley had a right to alter it. As it was, it was an error; and unless Corbaley intended to defraud Bennett, it was no forgery. That Reeve would openly "advise" him to commit a forgery, or that Corbaley would act on that advice—given in the presence of others in a public office, and in relation to a public Record, is sheer nonsense, and we feel satisfied that no sane man will believe a word of it, when they once know the facts. And further, we feel as though it were the duty of every

good man to correct such reports, and stop the evils that flow from them. We have enough of things that cannot be helped, without the evils that flow from such wholesale slander like this.

Perhaps we ought to add that S. B. Corbaley is not the person lately charged here with forgery in another matter.

We heard a letter read from Judge Stanford on the subject. He states that he had not noticed the section of law referred to, and as an honest man would do, says the Judgment was wrong.

We have simply stated the facts in this case, in order that innocent men may be set right before the public.

Many of the Republican Journals are making strenuous efforts to cause dissatisfaction in the ranks of the Democracy of this State, because Indiana is not represented in Mr. Buchanan's Cabinet. Up to the present writing, their efforts have been attended with about as much success as they were during the last campaign. It is well known by those posted in the history of the prominent politicians in the State, that there has been a difficulty existing between Messrs. Bright and Wright, (the only candidates for Cabinet appointments,) for some time. The President, aware of this difficulty, and not knowing any mode of conciliation, concluded not to appoint either of them, which is generally conceded to be the best plan. We know nothing about the difficulty above alluded to, but we think if two men, possessing the intelligence and knowledge that Jesse D. Bright and Joseph A. Wright do, cannot live in the same atmosphere, on account of personal feuds, that neither of them deserves an appointment from Mr. Buchanan, or any body else. We do not charge that they have endeavored to discredit the organization of the Democracy of Indiana, but we do say that the course pursued by them is calculated to cause a disunion in the ranks of almost any organization, except the indomitable Democracy of this State. The Hoosier Democrats are not led about by one or two politicians but receive their rules for action from the masses— are led only by the star of Justice—do not seek the advancement of a few individuals, but the good of the whole people. The Democrats of this State are firmly united by the indissoluble bonds of genuine and enduring principles, and the personal disagreement of one or two politicians, or the entire Republican party, cannot impede their progress in carrying out the purposes for which their organization was effected—the good of the whole country.

So far as we have noticed, the appointments made by the President give general satisfaction, except the Republicans, whose preferences were not probably consulted by Mr. Buchanan in the discharge of his official duties.

M. Bright has been elected U. S. Senator; and it is thought that Gov. Wright will be appointed Minister to some foreign court. If he does receive a foreign appointment, we hope that it will be one that will not interfere with the discharge of the duties devolving upon them, or the harmony of the Democracy of Indiana.

At the time of the trial, and judgment was entered on the verdict, Bennett got a verdict for less than the Commissioners had allowed him. Section 10, page 102, 1st volume of the Revised Statutes provides, that in such cases unless the party gets judgment for more than he was allowed, he shall pay the costs. Of course by that verdict, Bennett was in for the costs. He made a motion for a new trial, and so the matter stood until the last of the term—Feb'y 19th and 20th—when Bennett withdrew his motion for a new trial, and judgment was entered on the verdict. This should have been, judgment for Bennett for \$33—the jury allowed him, and judgment against him for the costs. But the Clerk in entering up the judgment, entered a judgment for Bennett both for his allowance and cost. S. B. Corbaley was the Deputy Clerk who made the Records, and in entering the judgment rendered at the last of the term, he turned back and entered it under the proceedings in the same case, entered and signed on the 2nd day of the term. This the Clerk says the Court directed. It looks on the record as though it had all been done on that day. When Court adjourned all the records were not made and the Court being anxious to leave on account of sickness of his family, signed the record, leaving space to finish up the unentered proceedings, and left the Clerk to make them. Some time before he left (and before he signed the record) on the last day, he said something about leaving the Clerk to make up the records and coming down afterwards to sign them; but inasmuch as he had resigned to take effect as soon as that Court was over, (we suppose) he concluded to sign before he left, and did so. C. H. Reeve was counsel for the Commissioners, and was not in Court when the judgment was entered, and supposed it stood on the motion for a new trial, and also supposed that the Court had gone away and left the records unsigned, and was to be back and sign them. The Clerk told him that a verdict had been rendered against the Commissioners—and Reeve said it was wrong, and should be altered before it was too late, (alluding to the signing of the record by the judge, which he expected he would be here to do.) The Clerk went away immediately after Court without correcting it. Sometime after, the matter was mentioned and Reeve asked Corbaley if the record had been corrected, and Corbaley said not, (Corbaley was deputy Clerk.) Reeve said he wished he would attend to it for he was too late. Corbaley said he would do so, and at his first leisure he corrected the judgment as it should be. Over this an attempt is made to charge Corbaley and Reeve with forgery in the estimation of public opinion, and to get such an impression generally abroad. Now the facts as stated will warrant no such thing, and we believe that the originators of the endless *false* reports in circulation, *know* all the facts, but *do* seek to have them misstated altogether. All that was ever said by Reeve and the Clerk or Corbaley, was said openly in a public office in presence of others. Reeve wanted it corrected before it was signed (thinking the judge was yet to sign it) and Corbaley corrected it because he had entered it erroneously, and thought it was his place to do so. We feel warranted in saying that the statements currently afloat that Reeve advised Corbaley to alter a Record, or that Corbaley would not have done it had he not been advised, and that as it is, it is a forgery, with many others, is an *unqualified falsehood*. If the record had not been signed, Corbaley had a right to alter it. As it was, it was an error; and unless Corbaley intended to defraud Bennett, it was no forgery. That Reeve would openly "advise" him to commit a forgery, or that Corbaley would act on that advice—given in the presence of others in a public office, and in relation to a public Record, is sheer nonsense, and we feel satisfied that no sane man will believe a word of it, when they once know the facts. And further, we feel as though it were the duty of every

good man to correct such reports, and stop the evils that flow from them. We have enough of things that cannot be helped, without the evils that flow from such wholesale slander like this.

Perhaps we ought to add that S. B. Corbaley is not the person lately charged here with forgery in another matter.

We heard a letter read from Judge Stanford on the subject. He states that he had not noticed the section of law referred to, and as an honest man would do, says the Judgment was wrong.

We have simply stated the facts in this case, in order that innocent men may be set right before the public.

Many of the Republican Journals are making strenuous efforts to cause dissatisfaction in the ranks of the Democracy of this State, because Indiana is not represented in Mr. Buchanan's Cabinet. Up to the present writing, their efforts have been attended with about as much success as they were during the last campaign. It is well known by those posted in the history of the prominent politicians in the State, that there has been a difficulty existing between Messrs. Bright and Wright, (the only candidates for Cabinet appointments,) for some time. The President, aware of this difficulty, and not knowing any mode of conciliation, concluded not to appoint either of them, which is generally conceded to be the best plan. We know nothing about the difficulty above alluded to, but we think if two men, possessing the intelligence and knowledge that Jesse D. Bright and Joseph A. Wright do, cannot live in the same atmosphere, on account of personal feuds, that neither of them deserves an appointment from Mr. Buchanan, or any body else. We do not charge that they have endeavored to discredit the organization of the Democracy of Indiana, but we do say that the course pursued by them is calculated to cause a disunion in the ranks of almost any organization, except the indomitable Democracy of this State. The Hoosier Democrats are not led about by one or two politicians but receive their rules for action from the masses— are led only by the star of Justice—do not seek the advancement of a few individuals, but the good of the whole people. The Democrats of this State are firmly united by the indissoluble bonds of genuine and enduring principles, and the personal disagreement of one or two politicians, or the entire Republican party, cannot impede their progress in carrying out the purposes for which their organization was effected—the good of the whole country.

So far as we have noticed, the appointments made by the President give general satisfaction, except the Republicans, whose preferences were not probably consulted by Mr. Buchanan in the discharge of his official duties.

M. Bright has been elected U. S. Senator; and it is thought that Gov. Wright will be appointed Minister to some foreign court. If he does receive a foreign appointment, we hope that it will be one that will not interfere with the discharge of the duties devolving upon them, or the harmony of the Democracy of Indiana.

At the time of the trial, and judgment was entered on the verdict, Bennett got a verdict for less than the Commissioners had allowed him. Section 10, page 102, 1st volume of the Revised Statutes provides, that in such cases unless the party gets judgment for more than he was allowed, he shall pay the costs. Of course by that verdict, Bennett was in for the costs. He made a motion for a new trial, and so the matter stood until the last of the term—Feb'y 19th and 20th—when Bennett withdrew his motion for a new trial, and judgment was entered on the verdict. This should have been, judgment for Bennett for \$33—the jury allowed him, and judgment against him for the costs. But the Clerk in entering up the judgment, entered a judgment for Bennett both for his allowance and cost. S. B. Corbaley was the Deputy Clerk who made the Records, and in entering the judgment rendered at the last of the term, he turned back and entered it under the proceedings in the same case, entered and signed on the 2nd day of the term. This the Clerk says the Court directed. It looks on the record as though it had all been done on that day. When Court adjourned all the records were not made and the Court being anxious to leave on account of sickness of his family, signed the record, leaving space to finish up the unentered proceedings, and left the Clerk to make them. Some time before he left (and before he signed the record) on the last day, he said something about leaving the Clerk to make up the records and coming down afterwards to sign them; but inasmuch as he had resigned to take effect as soon as that Court was over, (we suppose) he concluded to sign before he left, and did so. C. H. Reeve was counsel for the Commissioners, and was not in Court when the judgment was entered, and supposed it stood on the motion for a new trial, and also supposed that the Court had gone away and left the records unsigned, and was to be back and sign them. The Clerk told him that a verdict had been rendered against the Commissioners—and Reeve said it was wrong, and should be altered before it was too late, (alluding to the signing of the record by the judge, which he expected he would be here to do.) The Clerk went away immediately after Court without correcting it. Sometime after, the matter was mentioned and Reeve asked Corbaley if the record had been corrected, and Corbaley said not, (Corbaley was deputy Clerk.) Reeve said he wished he would attend to it for he was too late. Corbaley said he would do so, and at his first leisure he corrected the judgment as it should be. Over this an attempt is made to charge Corbaley and Reeve with forgery in the estimation of public opinion, and to get such an impression generally abroad. Now the facts as stated will warrant no such thing, and we believe that the originators of the endless *false* reports in circulation, *know* all the facts, but *do* seek to have them misstated altogether. All that was ever said by Reeve and the Clerk or Corbaley, was said openly in a public office in presence of others. Reeve wanted it corrected before it was signed (thinking the judge was yet to sign it) and Corbaley corrected it because he had entered it erroneously, and thought it was his place to do so. We feel warranted in saying that the statements currently afloat that Reeve advised Corbaley to alter a Record, or that Corbaley would not have done it had he not been advised, and that as it is, it is a forgery, with many others, is an *unqualified falsehood*. If the record had not been signed, Corbaley had a right to alter it. As it was, it was an error; and unless Corbaley intended to defraud Bennett, it was no forgery. That Reeve would openly "advise" him to commit a forgery, or that Corbaley would act on that advice—given in the presence of others in a public office, and in relation to a public Record, is sheer nonsense, and we feel satisfied that no sane man will believe a word of it, when they once know the facts. And further, we feel as though it were the duty of every

good man to correct such reports, and stop the evils that flow from them. We have enough of things that cannot be helped, without the evils that flow from such wholesale slander like this.

Perhaps we ought to add that S. B. Corbaley is not the person lately charged here with forgery in another matter.

We heard a letter read from Judge Stanford on the subject. He states that he had not noticed the section of law referred to, and as an honest man would do, says the Judgment was wrong.

We have simply stated the facts in this case, in order that innocent men may be set right before the public.

Many of the Republican Journals are making strenuous efforts to cause dissatisfaction in the ranks of the Democracy of this State, because Indiana is not represented in Mr. Buchanan's Cabinet. Up to the present writing, their efforts have been attended with about as much success as they were during the last campaign. It is well known by those posted in the history of the prominent politicians in the State, that there has been a difficulty existing between Messrs. Bright and Wright, (the only candidates for Cabinet appointments,) for some time. The President, aware of this difficulty, and not knowing any mode of conciliation, concluded not to appoint either of them, which is generally conceded to be the best plan. We know nothing about the difficulty above alluded to, but we think if two men, possessing the intelligence and knowledge that Jesse D. Bright and Joseph A. Wright do, cannot live in the same atmosphere, on account of personal feuds, that neither of them deserves an appointment from Mr. Buchanan, or any body else. We do not charge that they have endeavored to discredit the organization of the Democracy of Indiana, but we do say that the course pursued by them is calculated to cause a disunion in the ranks of almost any organization, except the indomitable Democracy of this State. The Hoosier Democrats are not led about by one or two politicians but receive their rules for action from the masses— are led only by the star of Justice—do not seek the advancement of a few individuals, but the good of the whole people. The Democrats of this State are firmly united by the indissoluble bonds of genuine and enduring principles, and the personal disagreement of one or two politicians, or the entire Republican party, cannot impede their progress in carrying out the purposes for which their organization was effected—the good of the whole country.

So far as we have noticed, the appointments made by the President give general satisfaction, except the Republicans, whose preferences were not probably consulted by Mr. Buchanan in the discharge of his official duties.

M. Bright has been elected U. S. Senator; and it is thought that Gov. Wright will be appointed Minister to some foreign court. If he does receive a foreign appointment, we hope that it will be one that will not interfere with the discharge of the duties devolving upon them, or the harmony of the Democracy of Indiana.

At the time of the trial, and judgment was entered on the verdict, Bennett got a verdict for less than the Commissioners had allowed him. Section 10, page 102, 1st volume of the Revised Statutes provides, that in such cases unless the party gets judgment for more than he was allowed, he shall pay the costs. Of course by that verdict, Bennett was in for the costs. He made a motion for a new trial, and so the matter stood until the last of the term—Feb'y 19th and 20th—when Bennett withdrew his motion for a new trial, and judgment was entered on the verdict. This should have been, judgment for Bennett for \$33—the jury allowed him, and judgment against him for the costs. But the Clerk in entering up the judgment, entered a judgment for Bennett both for his allowance and cost. S. B. Corbaley was the Deputy Clerk who made the Records, and in entering the judgment rendered at the last of the term, he turned back and entered it under the proceedings in the same case, entered and signed on the 2nd day of the term. This the Clerk says the Court directed. It looks on the record as though it had all been done on that day. When Court adjourned all the records were not made and the Court being anxious to leave on account of sickness of his family, signed the record, leaving space to finish up the unentered proceedings, and left the Clerk to make them. Some time before he left (and before he signed the record) on the last day, he said something about leaving the Clerk to make up the records and coming down afterwards to sign them; but inasmuch as he had resigned to take effect as soon as that Court was over, (we suppose) he concluded to sign before he left, and did so. C. H. Reeve was counsel for the Commissioners, and was not in Court when the judgment was entered, and supposed it stood on the motion for a new trial, and also supposed that the Court had gone away and left the records unsigned, and was to be back and sign them. The Clerk told him that a verdict had been rendered against the Commissioners—and Reeve said it was wrong, and should be altered before it was too late, (alluding to the signing of the record by the judge, which he expected he would be here to do.) The Clerk went away immediately after Court without correcting it. Sometime after, the matter was mentioned and Reeve asked Corbaley if the record had been corrected, and Corbaley said not, (Corbaley was deputy Clerk.) Reeve said he wished he would attend to it for he was too late. Corbaley said he would do so, and at his first leisure he corrected the judgment as it should be. Over this an attempt is made to charge Corbaley and Reeve with forgery in the estimation of public opinion, and to get such an impression generally abroad. Now the facts as stated will warrant no such thing, and we believe that the originators of the endless *false* reports in circulation, *know* all the facts, but *do* seek to have them misstated altogether. All that was ever said by Reeve and the Clerk or Corbaley, was said openly in a public office in presence of others. Reeve wanted it corrected before it was signed (thinking the judge was yet to sign it) and Corbaley corrected it because he had entered it erroneously, and thought it was his place to do so. We feel warranted in saying that the statements currently afloat that Reeve advised Corbaley to alter a Record, or that Corbaley would not have done it had he not been advised, and that as it is, it is a forgery, with many others, is an *unqualified falsehood*. If the record had not been signed, Corbaley had a right to alter it. As it was, it was an error; and unless Corbaley intended to defraud Bennett, it was no forgery. That Reeve would openly "advise" him to commit a forgery, or that Corbaley would act on that advice—given in the presence of others in a public office, and in relation to a public Record, is sheer nonsense, and we feel satisfied that no sane man will believe a word of it, when they once know the facts. And further, we feel as though it were the duty of every

good man to correct such reports, and stop the evils that flow from them. We have enough of things that cannot be helped, without the evils that flow from such wholesale slander like this.

Perhaps we ought to add that S. B. Corbaley is not the person lately charged here with forgery in another matter.

We heard a letter read from Judge Stanford on the subject. He states that he had not noticed the section of law referred to, and as an honest man would do, says the Judgment was wrong.

We have simply stated the facts in this case, in order that innocent men may be set right before the public.

Many of the Republican Journals are making strenuous efforts to cause dissatisfaction in the ranks of the Democracy of this State, because Indiana is not represented in Mr. Buchanan's Cabinet. Up to the present writing, their efforts have been attended with about as much success as they were during the last campaign. It is well known by those posted in the history of the prominent politicians in the State, that there has been a difficulty existing between Messrs. Bright and Wright, (the only candidates for Cabinet appointments,) for some time. The President, aware of this difficulty, and not knowing any mode of conciliation, concluded not to appoint either of them, which is generally conceded to be the best plan. We know nothing about the difficulty above alluded to, but we think if two men, possessing the intelligence and knowledge that Jesse D. Bright and Joseph A. Wright do, cannot live in the same atmosphere, on account of personal feuds, that neither of them deserves an appointment from Mr. Buchanan, or any body else. We do not charge that they have endeavored to discredit the organization of the Democracy of Indiana, but we do say that the course pursued by them is calculated to cause a disunion in the ranks of almost any organization, except the indomitable Democracy of this State. The Hoosier Democrats are not led about by one or two politicians but receive their rules for action from the masses— are led only by the star of Justice—do not seek the advancement of a few individuals, but the good of the whole people. The Democrats of this State are firmly united by the indissoluble bonds of genuine and enduring principles, and the personal disagreement of one or two politicians, or the entire Republican party, cannot impede their progress in carrying out the purposes for which their organization was effected—the good of the whole country.

So far as we have noticed, the appointments made by the President give general satisfaction, except the Republicans, whose preferences were not probably consulted by Mr. Buchanan in the discharge of his official duties.