

ELECTION OF GOVERNOR.

BY REQUEST.

From the Indiana Palladium.

MESSRS. EDITORS:—In my address to James B. Ray, Esq. in the 21st number of the Palladium, I intended nothing unfair; nor did I make any request, that under like circumstances I would not have been willing to have answered, and to which I did not expect Mr. Ray would have been unwilling to give a candid answer. Indeed I could not have anticipated an excuse upon the ground that the charge was made by an anonymous writer, for to me it is a matter of indifference who makes a charge, so that he gives evidence that it is founded on facts.

That Mr. Ray did vote on the subject referred to as stated, the Journals of the Senate were offered as official evidence, which were afterwards published by you, together with the section of the bill alluded to. With these circumstances staring him in the face, a candidate ought, without a moment's hesitation, to come forward and explain his views cheerfully, and not in the language of a writer in the last number of the Palladium, over the signature of "Truth," plead he was not obliged to respond, because the writer did not think proper to use his real name in his publication. As an individual, I had only a common interest in the politics of the state, and although I disapproved of Mr. Ray's vote, I did not wish to take upon myself the responsibility of asking the question in such a way as to create any personal difficulty. No enmity exists, that I know of, between Mr. Ray and myself, nor do I wish there ever should, yet I cannot support him for governor, because, from my view of his vote, we differ in a very important point, in what I call a fundamental principle in the politics of our country. In this Mr. Ray does not stand alone—many think with him, (perhaps a majority.) My only object was to bring the question fairly before the public, and to support measures in preference to men. In the course I have taken Mr. T. has charged me with ignorance, and aptness to censure. To the first charge I have no other plea to offer, than that I am not only willing but anxious to be better informed. To the second, my plea is, that I have not censured Mr. Ray, only by publishing the truth respecting his vote; while I willingly agree that he has as good a right to vote his own opinion, as Mr. Thompson and others in opposition to him. But says Mr. T., why be so illiberal as to charge Mr. Ray now, when he is a candidate, and not before? I answer he was a representative from Franklin county—I am a citizen of Dearborn—and consequently had no right to interfere with his vote; for to his constituents alone was he accountable, until by proclaiming himself a candidate for governor, he voluntarily gave every man in the state a right to inquire into his character, qualifications, and former public acts. I then published my objection to him, that he might have an opportunity to remove it. I did then, and still do believe, that his vote in the winter of 1823-24, gave evidence of a disposition to abridge the liberty of speech and the freedom of the press. The constitution of our state has laid it down as a principle, not to be departed from, that the press shall be free, and that every man who thinks proper, may investigate the official conduct of men in office; and in doing so, may speak and write freely, being accountable for the abuse of this privilege. Our laws, founded on that constitution, have provided that every man who feels himself aggrieved, or is injured by any individual, who has undertaken to investigate his official acts, shall have a remedy in a prosecution for a libel, when the circumstances may be fairly brought before a jury of the country, and justice awarded: and in my opinion this is going far enough to do justice to all parties. But Mr. Ray and others have thought it necessary to go farther, and not only to give the party injured his remedy at law, but subject the party complaining to an indictment and fine, not exceeding five hundred dollars. Had this plan succeeded, no man dare complain of any act of an officer, until he possessed all the means necessary to prove his charge in a court of justice. If he should, he might be called to traverse an indictment on an action the state has against him, and the person of whose conduct he has complained be a witness against him. After this he might be prosecuted for a libel, and have to pay all the damages the individual had sustained, when he, at the same time, has such evidence as will convince any impartial man that his charges were founded in truth, although they could not be admitted to go before a jury of the country. But, to put the matter to rest, says our writer, "Mr. Ray never voted for such a law"—"the merits of the bill were never tested"—"it is all a misrepresentation," &c. and then appeals to legislators to confirm his statement. Under the influence of that charity which suffereth long and is

kind, I will conclude the writer ignorant of legislative proceedings, rather than indulge the suspicion that he intended to deceive and mislead the people; at the same time, I state in the positive, that Mr. Ray (the Journal of the Senate is my evidence) did vote for such a section, and that his vote must have been an evidence of his favorable opinion of it. This was a section found among the 60 or 70 in our criminal code, embracing so many different crimes. A motion was made to strike it out—Mr. Ray opposed the motion; and had he succeeded in his opposition, it would have been contrary to rule to have made another motion to the same effect during the session. But, says Mr. T. the time to vote in opposition to a bill is on its final passage. Is it possible, that any person has appeared before the public as a writer, who is so "palpably" ignorant as to suppose that on the final passage of a bill, any member could vote against one section in it and not against the whole? or does he suppose that Mr. Ray, when he gave his vote upon that section, was so ignorant of rules that he did not know it was the only opportunity of voting against it, without voting against the whole criminal code? or are we to understand that he was opposed to any law that provided for the punishment of crimes? "To conclude," says Truth, (as he calls himself,) "this section does not punish any one for talking as much as he pleases," &c. It has heretofore been taught that words are signs of ideas, but Mr. T. cannot understand this part of the subject any better than he does the rules of legislation.

To me it appears difficult to understand what Mr. T. would wish to be at; such a confused compound of positive assertions, and contradictions, as, "Mr. Ray, or those who voted with him, never voted for such a section;" "no such vote was ever given;" "it is all a misunderstanding and misrepresentation;" then, "seven with Mr. Ray voted against it;" that is against striking it out. Then, "what would the vote of Mr. Ray and others, if successful, have effected? It would only have retained the law for further consideration." Thus denying the vote, then acknowledging that such vote was given by Mr. Ray, but that he might afterwards have voted different from his first vote, leads almost to the belief, that it was assuming too much, to take on himself the signature of "Truth."

A REPUBLICAN.

TO THE VOTERS OF WAYNE COUNTY.

Fellow-citizens—My present situation will perhaps justify me in making a short reply to a communication, signed C. J. which was published in the Public Leger of the 25th ult., although under other circumstances I should have passed it by unnoticed, until the author should have given his proper name. It appears that C. J. endeavors by stratagem to influence the public to believe, from the circumstance of my voting in favor of retaining the 24th section of the law relative to crimes and punishments, at the last session of the Legislature, that I had supported and voted for the law relative to, and providing for the retaking of fugitives from labor, at least all that appears in any degree oppressive. C. J. appears further to insinuate that I am really an advocate for slavery, by observing that "little did he think that he was voting and urging his friends to vote for a man that would advocate such sentiments—that would vote for a law to allow one man to oppress and enslave another." But whilst I acknowledge he has displayed ingenuity in his plan of electioneering, I think his ambition has led him rather too far to effect what he most anxiously anticipated. In speaking of the law prescribing the manner of retaking fugitives from labor, which he has placed conspicuous, and the framing and supporting of which he has dealt out so lavishly to me, there appears to be a misrepresentation of facts. In proof of this assertion I appeal to the Journal of the last session of the Legislature, at the 197th page, where my vote will be found recorded in favor of repealing that part of the law relative to fugitives from labor, which allows strangers greater privileges than the citizens of our own state enjoy. As to the vote in question, on the criminal law, it has nothing to do with the law providing for retaking fugitives. It appears to me that the 24th section of the aforesaid law has some excellent provisions, which are to punish the crime of forgery or violence, if such means should be used, to prevent the retaking of fugitives from labor. Agreeably to law it was my opinion that neither violence or forgery could be honorably tolerated by the legislature. If I have erred it was in judgment: I am sure there was no evil intended, as I have ever considered it an indispensable duty incumbent on me, in whatever station I may be placed, to advocate the cause of that oppressed people to the best of my abilities. This I have endeavored to do in a manner that seemed the most likely to effect their general emancipation. I might say much more on this subject, but

in replying to C. J. I only wish to do the public and myself justice.

ABEL LOMAX.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

THE GREEKS.—The following important information from Greece, is the latest which we find in the papers before us. It is contained in the Courier of the 13th May:

"Official despatch from Geo. Conduriotti, president of the executive body, to the Greek deputies, Orlando and Luriotte.

"TRIPOLITZA, March 18, (30).

"The day before yesterday I quitted Napoli, after having signed different despatches for you, of which P—— will be the bearer.

"I have received your despatches of the 2d (14th) February last, from which I perceive that you have contracted in London a second loan for the government and I transmit, at present, those despatches to Napoli de Romana.

"Our fleet has sailed out, and I hope it will be able to meet that of the enemy, which left Modon immediately after having landed troops there, perhaps on account of its having heard that ours was on the way to attack it. The Egyptian troops, disembarked at Modon, amounted, as detailed in the despatches which P—— takes, to about 10,000 men, and I have the satisfaction to announce to you, that according to intelligence which I have this moment received from head-quarters, the enemy has experienced what might have been expected from so rash an enterprise; for, in a sanguinary engagement near Navarin, on the 15th (27th) instant, our troops, under the command of generals Caratasos, H. Cristos, Caraiscakis, Zavelas, and Scourtiis, after a great slaughter, put the enemy to flight. A body of 3000 Egyptians was surrounded on all sides, and, it is thought they all perished or were taken prisoners.

"I cannot give you more satisfactory intelligence. I shall remain here two or three days, to send forward different corps of troops; and afterwards I shall proceed, in the first place, to Modon, to inspect the divisions which are there; and thence I shall go through Arcadia to Patras, to join the troops which blockade that fortress; and from that place I hope I shall be able to give you other pleasing news."

THE KING OF FRANCE has the merit of being about the least inattentive to business of any man in the nation. Every one likes to be distinguished for something—some peculiar characteristic, and, to acquire reputation, many affect to be what they are not: but the King of France, Charles X. is perfectly free from affectation, as to his prominent quality; and, in his own person, verifies the saying of Napoleon, that the Bourbons had not learned any thing by their expulsion from the throne.

When the king is pleased to meet the council, at which the royal presence is oftentimes indispensable to the transaction of business, whether his majesty takes any part in the matters discussed or not—he sometimes suddenly leaves his ministers without expressing an opinion, and, while they wait in hope of his return, that he may give the necessary order, or sign some paper to give effect to what has been resolved on, they, perhaps, behold him on horseback, with a retinue of dogs at his heels and puppies around him, galloping away to the chase.

SPAIN.—Nothing remarkable occurs in this kingdom. Hanging, strangling and imprisoning of persons, suspected of being contumacious, goes on as usual; and it may be said, without lightly using the word, that the priests are devilish busy and powerful. The Courier Francaise announces the receipt of a curious document from Barcelona. It is a pastoral letter, by which the archbishop establishes an apostolic junta, consisting of three priests of the order of St. Dominick, "to proceed to the investigation and cononical punishment of all those transgressions which were formerly in the resort of the holy tribunal of the inquisition."

NETHERLANDS.—A Portsmouth, (Eng.), paper says—The Dutch frigate Pallas, captain Ryk, will sail shortly on an experimental cruise, and for the exercise of numerous officers embarked in her. She will proceed to the Chesapeake to land his serene highness the prince of Saxe Weimar, who intends making a tour of the United States. He will embark at Plymouth.

Publishers of newspapers sometimes receive queer letters concerning the fate of some of their papers—the following note, pithy and to the point, was received by us this morning from the country.

M. Y. American.

June, 1825.

Sir,—The paper you send to this office for —, is not taken out—one of the firm having run away, and the other I think not able to pay—you had better therefore stop it. We think so too.

On the New-York custom of wearing scarfs as Funerals.

We noticed a funeral last week, and the minister over his canonical robes had suspended four or five yards of white cotton or linen, with a corkade of extraordinary size on the part of it which hung on his shoulder. Had the color been scarlet instead of white, we should have known the meaning, having frequently seen them worn in "olden times" by staff officers at a regimental muster. We have heard it suggested, that in thus borrowing the fashion of the military in the shape and wearing of the thing, that it is intended to represent an union between church and state; and as it is the practice where this union actually exists, the intimation is not without some weight. We are inclined to doubt this, because red would have been the color selected, and not the modest one now worn. Whether a man feels more grieved, or has a purer remembrance for the dead, with this ensign of folly upon his shoulder, than he would if he attended a funeral without one, we are not capable of judging. To a feeling man there is nothing serious in funeral pomp, in external show; the heart sickens at such boyish nonsense, although the actors are men we are accustomed to reverence and respect. Such trappings seem more than mere fashionable folly; it is carrying to the very grave the emblems of pride. The only feelings produced by it is that of disgust at such unmeaning mummery. If people must have these things worn, in honor of their departed friends, they ought to hire some one to wear them, and not make the minister of the Gospel the bearer of this outward emblem of vanity.—N. Y. Courier.

From the Connecticut Mirror.

The decent and solemn observance of the sabbath is one thing—and the extraordinary performances of great feats of devotion are another. We republish the following merely to express a decided opinion against all who would encourage them:

CONCORD, (N. H.) May 30.—*Rapid reading and articulation.*—On Sabbath day, May 15, 1825, Miss Polly Edgerly, of Gilman-town, daughter of David Edgerly, Esq. read, vocally and distinctly, between seven o'clock in the morning and five minutes before nine in the evening, the whole of the New Testament from beginning to end.

We heartily concur in opinion with the Editor of the Mirror, on the impropriety of exacting so laborious and injurious a task from any young female. We say injurious, because it is contrary to common-sense to suppose that an effort which kept three of the faculties constantly on the stretch, for near fourteen hours, could be sustained without some injury. It is impossible to suppose, for a moment, that religious feeling could have mingled in the motives of those who required this task. Quite the reverse! Religion teaches humility; and there was more of pride than humility in this act, and in its publication to the world. Nat. Journal.

CONSUMPTION.—Completely to eradicate this disorder, I will not positively say the following remedy is capable of doing but I will venture to affirm that by a temperate mode of living, (avoiding spiritous liquors wholly) wearing flannel next to the skin, and taking every morning half a pint of new milk, mixed with the expressed juice of green hoarhound, the complaint will not only be relieved, but the individual shall procure to himself a length of days beyond what the mildest fever could give room to hope; for I am myself a living witness of the beneficial effects of this agreeable, and though innocent, yet powerful application—four weeks use of the hoarhound and milk relieved the pains of my breast and gave me to breathe deep, long and free, strengthening and harmonizing my voice; and restored to me a better state of health than I had enjoyed for many years.

TERMINATION OF THE ERIE CANAL.—On Thursday evening the 4th inst. the gates at the foot of Black Rock harbor were opened, and lake Erie, for the first time commenced feeding the western extremity of the Erie canal. This new line of canal which winds along the margin of the Niagara for nine miles, between Black Rock and Tonawanta, is said to be remarkably beautiful, having been laid out with great taste and judgment, and faithfully executed. It is wider and deeper than are the other sections, for the purpose of throwing forward from the lake into the basin, formed by the bed of the Tonawanta, an ample supply of water for the whole line west of Rochester.—Niles.

There is in press, in Philadelphia, an Abridgement of all the Acts of Congress now in force, except those of private or local application, with notes of all the decisions of the Supreme Court, on questions of constructions, &c. By Edward Ingersoll, of the Philadelphia Bar.