From the Washington Union.

French Spoliations.

The President's veto of the bill in relation thereto—the President sustained by the uniform practice of 46 years, and by the official reports of every leading whig who has been a member of the Committee of Claims during this century—viz: by Hon. Elisha Whittlesey, Governor Vance, (who is the oldest member now in the House,) Hon. Mr. Cowen, (the brother of the learned Judge Cowen, of New York.) Hon. Mr. Ramsey, of Pennsylvania, and even by Mr. J. R. Giddings, the abolitionist ! !

I have carefully read the veto message of President Polk upon the bill for the payment of damages sustained by our citizens, prior to 1800, from the unprovoked spoliations of the French. I have also read the able speech of Col. Benton in support of the veto, and that of senator Clayton in defence of the bill.

Mr. Polk is clearly and demonstrably right, and as I have some means at my command to show it, I will do so. I shall, however, pursue a different method from that followed either by Mr. Polk or Col. Benton; and although I have neither their ability nor their skill to call to my aid, I hope to be able to make the *justice* and the *necessity* of the interposition of the veto manifest and clear to the understanding of the most illiterate in the science of government.

I set out with the general proposition, that neither this nor any other civilized nation ever *guarantied* the property of its citizens against the hand of external violence.

The United States did not pay for the property, belonging to Americans, destroyed, either upon the sea or upon the land, by the British during the Revolutionary war. The losses were almost as numerous as the little neighborhood settlements, and the value of the property destroyed, both upon the sea and upon the land, was very great. The distress occasioned by the savage depredations committed by the British during that desolating war, it is altogether beyond our power to appreciate. Yet the property thus destroyed was not paid for by the United States.

Can any opposer of the veto assign a good reason why that property was not paid for by the United States?

Immense quantities of property were destroyed by the Indians prior and subsequent to the defeat of General St. Clair.

Can an opposer of the veto tell why the United States did not pay the value of it to the owners?

After the breaking out of the French revolution, in 1793, '94, '95, '96, '97, '98, and '99, vast amounts of property of American citizens were seized by the French, British, Spanish, and Tripolitan and Algerine cruisers.

Why did not the United States pay its value to the spoliated citizens?

During the war of 1812, large amounts of private property were wantonly destroyed by the British and Indians.

Why were not the owners of that property indemnified by the United States?

In none of these cases did the United States indemnify the citizens for their losses. I will let Governor Vance (not Mr. Polk) "give the reason why;" *his* authority certainly *ought* to be conclusive with the whigs.

An American citizen, by the name of John Robinson, had a house and other property worth $1,440, destroyed on the Niagara frontier on the 19th of December, 1813, by the British. He petitioned Congress to indemnify him for his loss; he thought it was the duty of government to protect his property, and if it failed to do so, that he ought to be paid the value of what was destroyed by the public enemy. The petition was referred by the House to the Committee of Claims, and Gov. Vance made the following report. Read it carefully!

"Claims for remuneration for losses inflicted by a public enemy have been frequently presented, and the subject has become familiar to those who have been called upon to examine them. Certain principles, having their foundation in the great code of public law, have been established, *which furnish precise and distinct rules by which cases of this description are to be examined and adjudged. By these principles, and by the practice of the government, the doctrine that the nation is to compensate all losses sustained by the citizen from the public enemy, has been distinctly repudiated.* No such obligation is imposed upon the government by any system of law, and no nation has ever assumed its existence; the revenues of no considerable nation would prove adequate to defray the charges upon the national treasury, which the discharge of such an obligation would impose upon it during the continuance of a long and desolating war. In a public war, every citizen is an object of hostility to the common foe, and must submit to those inconveniences, losses, and dangers, to which he, in common with every other individual in the community, is exposed.

"The committee, therefore, respectfully report to the House, for its adoption, the following resolution:

"*Resolved,* That the prayer of the petition be rejected."—Ho. Rep. No. 499, 1st sess. 28th Con.

This is the true doctrine. Congress is not bound to pay losses occasioned by the shameful spoliations of the French, British, Spanish, Algerines, Neapolitans, Peruvians, or Mexicans. But when those nations plunder our commerce, the administration endeavors, by negotiation, to obtain reparation for our spoliated merchants; and, if successful, brings home the sum obtained and divides it amongst those who have been plundered. But, if unsuccessful, the government does not indemnify them out of its *own* treasury; it labors to obtain justice for them, but if it fails to get it, the people are not taxed to make up to them those losses which the United States failed to persuade or force other nations to indemnify.

In other words, the government of the United States *guards,* but does not *insure* the property of the citizens thereof, against external and internal violence.

A civilized enemy violates the rules of war as recognised among civilized nations, if he wantonly destroys *private* property. Note this doctrine.

Hence, a man's property is safe, and he has nothing to fear from an invading foe, *unless* that foe violates the law of nations.

Hence, again, if the United States take a man's house and convert it into a fort, barracks, magazine, arsenal, or deposite, it, by such act, becomes *public* property; it loses its private character, and may lawfully be destroyed by an enemy. A house thus taken by the United States for public use, and destroyed by an enemy *because thus used,* must therefore be paid for by the United States; for the constitution itself makes provision to that effect. A law-making provision to this effect was passed by Congress in 1816.

Mr. Cary, of Maine, in commenting upon a private claim before Congress says, and it should be specially noted, as it contains the views of Mr. Whittlesey:

"That these buildings were ever used by the athorized agents of this government as forts, barracks, arsenals, military store-houses, magazines, or military depots, and, as such justifiably destroyable according to the laws of war, as recognized by civilized nations, this committee have seen no evidence of a character to command belief. The marching of companies of militia through a farm, or a settlement, or a country, does not warrant an invading enemy to destroy such farm, settlement, and country, even though such troops were to purchase and cook food at the places through which they pass; otherwise, an enemy would find authority to devastate all the invaded country through which he drove a retreating force.

"Mr. Whittlesey, in commenting upon a proposition *to extend* the provisions of the law of 1816, says with great force and propriety:

"'The question was raised,' (in 1816,) 'whether property destroyed by the enemy, *not in the military service of the United States,* should be paid for; and it was decided in the negative, principally on the ground that the act of the enemy was wanton and unauthorized by modern warfare between civilized nations; and that such payment might induce an enemy *whose object* would be to *exhaust the resources* of the government, to lay waste the country polluted by his march.

"'Another reason is entitled to much weight. If all property were to be paid for that an enemy might destroy, the frauds, as to the quantity and value of it would be incalculably great and extensive. Any class of cases not heretofore provided for must depend almost exclusively upon proof obtained after the lapse of seventeen years; which circumstance, of itself, would admonish the committee to proceed with great caution.

"'The law of April 9, 1816, was based on the moral obligation to compensate for losses incurred by the destruction of property by the enemy, *because its military use had changed its character from private to public property.*'—House Reports, No. 386, March 16, 1832.

"If evidence obtained seventeen years after the transpiration of events should be regarded with caution, with how much more caution should we regard evidence of events which transpired thirty years ago?

"But the evidence, aside from its character, fails to convince the committee that the British held that the buildings, because of their military use by the United States, had changed their character from private to public property, and were *therefore* by them destroyed, in accordance with the usages of civilized nations."

In this important extract, notice that it is proved that Congress, in 1816, (before Mr. Polk came into public life,) solemnly decided that property wantonly destroyed by an enemy is not to be paid for, upon two grounds; first, because such destruction is contrary to the law of nations; second, because such payments would INDUCE an enemy to destroy property in order to exhaust the treasury, and thus prevent the raising and supporting of fleets and armies. He gives as a third reason, the frauds that would be practised upon the government after a lapse of seventeen years. What would he not have said, if the claims had been forty-six years old?

But I have even stronger doctrine than this. Read the following extracts from Governor Vance's report in the celebrated case of General Hernandez:

"It is a principal duty of governments to protect private citizens in the enjoyment of their rights, so far as it may be in their power. This obligation is not confined to cases of public and foreign enemies, nor to the security of such persons and property as may be within the territorial limits of the State; but it extends to every species of injury wherever the national sovereignty exists. The obligation to protect, does not carry with it the obligation *to make good* all losses which may arise from a failure to fulfil this duty. The government does not insure the citizen against loss of property, or injury of person, from the acts of foreign enemies, or domestic violence, or individual acts of fraud or force."

"It is our duty to administer justice with an even hand; and if General Hernandez be paid this claim out of the treasury, why should we not, upon the same principle, make good the losses which have been sustained by the unfortunate sufferers from similar injuries, during all foreign and Indian wars since, and even before the revolution?

"How many thousands of the adventurous pioneers, who have led the way as civilization has advanced westward, have been reduced from plenty to destitution, and from affluence to poverty—to say nothing of the cruel massacres of the unarmed and the defenceless? Upon what argument can this government stand justified in withholding compensation to those sufferers, if it be granted here? Why should those who were driven out into the wilderness, houseless and homeless, in the back settlements, during the revolutionary war, and in the northwest during the Indian wars, be denied relief, if the principle upon which this claim rests be sanctioned as of binding force? Shall we now undertake to make compensation for all the property destroyed by the Indians since the revolution?

"No one can contemplate these cases without feeling deep and strong sympathy for the sufferers. Looking at single and isolated cases, we are prompted by the best feelings of our nature to relieve. But when we consider that we are required to administer justice impartially, and upon fixed and general principles, considerations of paramount importance compel us to deny ourselves the pleasure of relieving one sufferer when we cannot relieve all. An application for relief for losses by Indian depredations came before the Senate as early as 1800. The committee to which that case was referred, in their report, say:

"'Knowing that an immense number of citizens of the United States have been plundered of property to a very great amount, *both by land and sea,* in the same unwarrantable manner; and believing that the whole revenue of the United States would scarcely be commensurate to meet the demands of applicants in similar cases should compensation be made in this, the committee are of opinion it would be inexpedient to open so extensive a field, and, therefore, that the prayer of the memorialist cannot be granted.')—See American State Papers, volume Claims, page 222.)

"At that early day it was thought that, if the principle (then and now contended for) were admitted, it would open a door for claims upon the treasury, which would very nearly absorb the entire revenues of the government. Since that day, they have accumulated to an extent far beyond the incoming revenue; and though many of the claims, on account of the death and dispersion of the claimants and their witnesses, would not be established, yet enough would be found to create an immense debt."

Governor Vance has furnished proof in the foregoing, that the door was shut in the year 1800 against paying for property wantonly destroyed by an enemy.

Hence, now when the greater part of the claimants are dead, shall that door be opened! If we let in *one* class, shall we be able to bar out the balance? If those persons who lost property by the French are to be paid, shall not those who lost property by the Indians be paid also? If so, where is the money to be got? Surely Mr. Polk was wisely employed when engaged in securing the bolts and bars of this door through which would flow in such a multitude of claims!

In this opinion—the propriety and wisdom of keeping the door shut—Gov. Vance and Mr. Whittlesey concur. See the following from the pen of Governor Vance in proof thereof, and also as showing a second decision of Congress, made 21 years ago, in accordance with the principles of the veto:

"Fourteen years after the rejection of the claim by Congress, the claimant again petitioned Congress for relief and submitted all of the papers in support of the claim that are now presented for the action of this committee. The petition was referred by the House to the Committee of Claims, where it seems to have received a thorough examination, and was fully reported upon by the committee, through its chairman, the Hon. E. Whittlesey. That report, which fully sets forth the merits of the claim, and which is adopted and made a part of this report, closes by remarking that "the loss is a severe one, and one the committee would recommend to the favorable consideration of Congress, *if they could do so without violating the rules established by Congress.*" In this sentiment of Mr. Whittlesey this committee fully concur. At this late day, (nearly 30 years after the war,) numerous claims are still before Congress, involving similar principles with the claim now under consideration; and the adoption by Congress of a conclusion different from that to which the committee have arrived, *would open a door* to most extensive appropriations to individuals from the national treasury. The principle involved has been repeatedly and elaborately discussed, and deliberately settled by law; *and it would seem to be at war with a sound policy to reverse it at this late day, in the absence of any national object to be gained by such unprecedented reversal.* The principal and the history of its adoption, and of its final settlement in 1825, are thus briefly set forth by Mr. Whittlesey, in his report upon this case ten years ago:

"By the laws of 1816 and 1825, one essential requisite for the claimant to prove, to entitle her to the benefits of either of those laws, was, *that her house or building was occupied as barracks, or as a place of military deposite, by the order of an officer.* Claimants had found much fault with the restrictions imposed by the law of 1816. Perhaps no section of country suffered more than the Niagara frontier by the devastating torch of the enemy. The representative from that district (the Hon. Albert H. Tracy) took a deep interest in behalf of his constituents, and urged upon Congress the passage of some law for their relief, after the act of 1816–'17 had expired. When the bill was before Congress in 1825, various attempts were made to renew the provisions of the act of 1816, so far as that act made any compensation to those who had lost their buildings by their being destroyed by the enemy. After a long and able discussion, the act of 1825 was passed—all amendments having been rejected for enlarging the class of cases, or for relaxing the rules of evidence. *The committee think, if these principles and rules shall be broken down, that all the rejected claims will be presented again, and that all the legislation upon the subject will have been in vain.* The committee think there is not evidence of military occupation of any of the buildings mentioned.'

"Entertaining these views of the merits and of the principles that govern this case, the committee concur in the conclusion of the committees of 1820 and of 1834, and therefore recommend to the House the adoption of the following resolution:

"*Resolved,* That the petitioner is not entitled to relief."

Is it possible for Mr. Polk to be more ably sustained by freshly written arguments than he is by these able reports of by-gone years? But Mr. Ramsay goes beyond all of these—he cuts off the French claims at a blow, by asserting that Congress has always refused to pay for *personal* property destroyed by an enemy; and he is right! Hear him:

"*The Committee of Claims, to whom was referred the petition of Mrs. Frances Swann and others, report:*

"That the claim appears to be unsupported by any testimony of a nature to constitute a legal demand upon the treasury. If the claim had been fully proved—which is, in a word, that the British had destroyed (in the last war) five hogsheads of tobacco belonging to the petitioner—its payment would be at war with the provisions of the acts of 1816 and 1825, and with the precedents established at various times by Congress. Congress has steadily refused to enlarge the provisions of those acts so as to take in claims for indemnity *for destruction of personal property by a public enemy.*"—House Report, No. 158, 2d session, 28th Congress.

In this position he is fully sustained by Governor Vance, who says: "No claim of indemnity for personal property taken or destroyed by the British during the late war has ever been recognized as forming the basis of a claim on government."—House Report, No. 343, 1st session, 28th Congress.

This is at once full and distinct, and shows that the claimants under the vetoed bill, even in *that* view, cannot be paid. *No other personal property has ever been paid for;* WHY SHOULD THIS BE MADE AN EXCEPTION? Upon the grounds taken by Mr. Ramsey, the bill was improper and ought to have been vetoed. Take it upon the grounds specified by Gov. Vance, Mr. Whittlesey, &c., and the bill ought to have been vetoed. In either case, and in both cases, Mr. Polk did right. Allow me to give you another *democratic* authority in addition to Mr. Cary. Mr. Cobb, of Ga., says:

"Claims for remuneration for losses inflicted by a public enemy have been presented by individual citizens; and the subject has, consequently, become familiar to those who have been called on to examine and provide for them.

"Certain principles have been established which have their foundation in the great code of public law, and which now may be said to be incorporated into our own practice, have furnished precise and distinct rules by which cases of this description are to be examined and adjudged.

"Since the formation of the government, the doctrine that the nation is to compensate for all losses sustained by the citizen from the public enemy has been distinctly repudiated. No such obligation is imposed upon the government by any system of law, and no nation has ever assumed its existence.

"In a public war, every citizen is an object of hostility to the common foe, and must submit to those inconveniences, losses, and dangers, to which he, in common, with every other individual in the community, is exposed."—House Report, (minority,) No. 58, 1st session, 28th Congress.

Mr. Cobb, in the same report, says further:

"That when the private property of the citizen has been taken and used by the nation for the common purposes of all, and, in consequence of such employment, it has been destroyed or damaged, the nation is bound to make good the loss. Cases of this description are as various in their peculiar circumstances as they are uniform in the recognition of the general principle. Where horses or wagons, vessels, or any other description of property, have been impressed into the public service, such exercise of the supreme power necessarily carries with it the obligation to pay for the use of the articles thus taken, and, in case of loss, to remunerate the owner. So, when provisions, the property of the private citizen, are imperatively required for the subsistence of the troops of the United States—when their crops are taken from the ground, and appropriated to this object—when their buildings are taken possession of, and occupied as barracks, for the habitation of the troops, as hospitals for the reception of the sick or wounded, or as places for defence against, or attack upon, the common enemy—in all these cases the same general principle involves the obligation of compensation for the use, and remuneration for the loss, of property thus taken and consumed, or destroyed in the public service."

This, undoubtedly, is the sound and the true doctrine: the first quotation clearly shows for what the government is *not* responsible to the citizen, and the latter shows for what the United States really *are* responsible to the citizen.

The testimony of the Hon. Mr. Cowen to the truth of the foregoing doctrine is introduced, because of its reference to Mr. Madison, who was also a believer in it, as all know who are acquainted with his summary dealings with Richard Bland Lee, commissioner of claims. Mr. Cowen says, (in a report upon a claim from Black Rock, New York:)

"Had Black Rock been a fortified or garrisoned town, and had it held out against the enemy until reduced by famine or the force of arms to unconditional surrender, the indiscriminate pillage and destruction of private property in such a place might have been, in former days, justified in some measure by precedents derived from the usage or practice of a conquering army in the eighth or ninth century. But to be obliged to trace, in the footsteps of a civilized nation in the eighteenth century, such wanton, indiscriminate destruction of private property as characterized the action of the British troops, not only in the destruction of Black Rock and Buffalo, but all along the Michigan, Ohio, and Niagara frontiers, as well as the shores of the Chesapeake, is calculated to produce in the feelings of every reader of the history of those times, not only the deepest sympathy for the sufferers, but abhorrence of such savage violation of all the rules of civilized warfare, and that, too, by a nation claiming for her armies the most exalted character for chivalrous magnanimity towards a fallen or conquered foe.

"Where property was so indiscriminately destroyed as it was on this frontier by the British and their savage allies in the late war, it is difficult to say what house or other property was or was not destroyed for its military character or occupation; hence the propriety of President Madison's cautious instructions to the commissioner of claims, giving his views of the letter as well as spirit of the act of April 9, 1816, pointing out clearly and distinctly the sort of evidence indispensably necessary to establish a claim under that act for the loss of property destroyed for its military occupation, showing what that law intended by such military occupation of private property as would make it a legitimate object of destruction by a civilized enemy.—(See American State Papers, vol. Claims, pages 497 and 490.

"The aggregate amount of property lost by this devastating war on these frontiers rendered it impossible to be met by the resources of the national treasury, if the principle upon which such claims rest was admissible. But no government can be expected to indemnify for losses arising to its citizens or subjects from the wanton destruction of private property by its enemy in time of war. Let that principle be once adopted, and it will operate as a premium to your enemies in time of war to avoid attacking your fortifications, armies, or other means of public defence, and steal upon your unprotected cities, towns, and villages, for the purpose of laying them waste, as the most effectual means of crippling the government, and rendering it incapable of performing its legitimate duty to the citizen, and defending the country against foreign invasion and final conquest. The committee therefore think that the petitioners are not entitled to relief, and offer to the House, for adoption, the following resolution:

Resolved, That the prayer of the petitioners ought not to be granted."

I will close my quotations with one from the well-known Mr. Giddings, taken from the report made by him in the equally well-known "Bulow case," in which payment had been asked for negro houses, &c. &c., which had been destroyed by the Indians. It will be seen that even *he* has been forced to take similar ground with the preceding members of Congress: will his authority be received by the abolition wing of the opposition? Hear Mr. Giddings:

"Immense sufferings and losses from Indian depredations were sustained by the frontier portion of our inhabitants during the revolution. Wyoming, and western Pennsylvania, western Virginia, and western New York, at various periods, suffered great loss of life and property, at the hands of our savage foes. After the close of the revolution, many of our people in the Northwestern Territory, western Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee, fell before the Indian rifle and tomahawk, while their entire property, in many instances, was burnt in the flames that consumed the bodies of its murdered owners. At a still more recent date, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, and Illinois, have presented scenes of slaughter and destruction by savage barbarity. The sufferings of our people from the cruelties of Indian warfare fill a large space in the page of our country's history; with their details all are familiar. With the sufferers, we, as individuals, deeply sympathise in their afflictions, and lament their losses; but, as legislators, we feel bound to follow the precedents, and to adhere to the policy, which for more than half a century has controlled the action of Congress in regard to Indian depredations.

"As early as the year 1800, a committee of the Senate expressed their belief "that the whole revenues of the United States would scarcely be competent to meet the demands of applicants for indemnity for Indian depredations, if the principle of relief was adopted. (See American State Papers, volume Claims, page 222.) The case of Elizabeth House, widow of Joseph House, is well calculated to exhibit the tenacity with which the policy of our government was adhered to. It was decided in 1822. The petitioner was a resident of Montgomery county, New York. In 1777, while her husband was from home in the service of his country, a party of hostile Indians attacked her house, burnt it, with all the property in it, took her prisoner with her two infant children, the oldest of which they murdered, and carried her with the other child to Niagara, and other distant places, where she suffered all that human nature can be supposed to be capable of enduring. She was held in captivity four years; and after her return and the death of her husband, she called on government for indemnity for the loss of property destroyed by the savages.

"In reporting upon the case, the committee say they '*consider it unsafe and inexpedient to afford the relief prayed for. The sufferings of the petitioner, it is admitted, present strong claims upon our sympathies; but they are common to many others, upon whom the like cruelties have been practised by the Indians. If the present claim be allowed, others of a similar character cannot with propriety be rejected. Allow this claim, and a principle is established which makes the government responsible for all the outrages which have been or may be committed by a savage enemy upon the persons or property of our citizens—a principle, in the estimation of the committee, destructive to the resources of the nation.*'

"From the date of this report, it is believed that in no instance has Congress allowed indemnity for Indian depredations. Prior to that time, it is true, particular instances are found in which relief was granted; but these are cases which can be accounted for only by supposed hurry or inattentive legislation.

"The reports in such cases are generally brief, dealing only in facts; and in no instance do they exhibit the principles on which they are founded. But during the last twenty years it is believed that perfect uniformity has characterized the reports of this committee, on the subject of Indian depredations; and the principles upon which these reports are based may be found in report No. 1,001, H. R., 2d session 25th Congress, made by a former chairman of this committee, in considering the claim of Alexander Watson. (Vide reports Nos. 932 and 1,028 of the same session.) The principles governing cases of this description have been so long adhered to by this committee, and their reports have been so uniformly sustained by the House of Representatives, that a train of decisions have been established from which the committee at this time are unwilling to depart. If a departure from these principles be considered necessary by the House, the committee are of opinion that it should be the act of the House, and emanate from that body. Under these considerations, the committee feel bound to reject that part of the petitioner's claim in which he asks indemnity for property destroyed by the Indians, other than the buildings occupied by the troops as military stores or barracks at the time of their destruction. For these the petitioner claims that he is entitled to compensation agreeably to the ordinary legislation of Congress in other and analogous cases."—(Ho. Rep., No. 176, 3d session, 27th Congress.)

To all this evidence that the veto was called for to prevent a great change in the practice of the government, but one answer can be seriously attempted to be given. And that is, while admitting that the United States are not liable to pay for the damages sustained by citizens from the wanton depredations of enemies, the friends of the bill pretend to say that *government has received from France* the $5,000,000 asked for, or its equivalent, and has fraudulently withheld from the claimants what was thus received in trust for them. To this a flat denial is interposed, as the most suitable vindication of the fame of Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe. No proof can be adduced, or if it can, it has not been. They are upon the same footing as other claimants, and are entitled to no preference over other claimants.

The speech of the Hon. John M. Clayton, published in last night's Union, instead of disproving the propriety of the veto, furnishes matter highly justificatory of it. Read the following account of the action which *he* says Congress took in 1802 upon the claims for French spoliations—action, be it remembered, which was had immediately after the treaty with France was ratified—when the merits of the claims were known—and when they were pushed upon the attention of Congress by the heated, freshly-despoiled, recently-made-poor claimants themselves:

"On the 11th of March, Mr. Griswold laid the following motion on the table:

"*Resolved,* That it is proper to make provision by law towards indemnifying the merchants of the United States for losses sustained by them from French spoliations, the claims for which losses have been renounced by the final ratification of the convention with France, as published by proclamation of the President of the United States."

"On the ensuing day, a motion was made by Mr. Griswold to take up this motion for consideration, was lost without debate—yeas 35, nayes 39."

It is thus seen that the House refused to even *consider* a resolution declaring

1. That it was *proper* to pay the claims now just vetoed; and

2. That the claims against France had been *renounced* by the United States.

Not satisfied with *this* decision of the House, the claimants succeeded in persuading their congressional friends to make another effort for them on the 15th—four days afterwards. On that day a long debate—"which continued until the usual hour of adjournment"—ensued upon the declaratory resolution; and it was (after this long and able debate) defeated by a largely increased majority! The vote stood yeas 33, nays 54—16 additional members voting against the claim, and two refusing to vote for the resolution *after discussion,* who had voted for it before discussion had been had!

Mr. Editor, if these claims are to be paid, (after such an exposition, furnished by Mr. Clayton himself; for the more the veto is discussed, the more clearly does its justice appear,) then let all property ever destroyed by any public enemy likewise be paid for.

Public enemies, upon sea or land, including Indians and pirates, have destroyed an amount of property since July 4, 1776, worth a sum at least equal to one-half of the amount of the debt of England. Should the United States issue bonds in payment for such losses, and thus create a public debt of five hundred millions of dollars! *And yet this is what the whigs propose,* unless they are willing to pay for property destroyed by one enemy, and not for that destroyed bp another; they may choose the horn of the dilemma which they like best.

The plea which the Intelligencer puts in this morning, about private claims not being examined by the President, is unworthy of that print.

The rule is to pay for any property belonging to individuals taken for public use by the United States. Whether Congress pays too much or too little to petitioners in such cases, the President may be justly supposed unable in *all* cases to inquire.

But when Congress proposes to *add another "class of cases"* to the list of applicants worthy of indemnification against loss, it becomes the duty of the President to decide whether he can properly sanction *the innovation* proposed.

Mr. Polk has decided that he will *not* sanction the class to which the French claims belong.

The question is, therefore, distinctly put to the Intelligencer, whether it can point to *any* law enacted under *any* administration for payment out of the treasury of spoliations upon American property which were *committed by any nation whatsoever!*

If a negative answer is given, then *why* should those persons who have been despoiled by France be indemnified, when we *uniformly* refuse to indemnify, from our own national funds, those citizens who have been despoiled by any *other* nation! To have sanctioned the law, would have been to have sanctioned a gross departure from the uniform usages of the nation, and to have committed a very partial and unjustifiable act, unless he would have consented to create a national debt half as large as that of Great Britain, with the bonds creative of which to pay every *other* individual who has been plundered of his property by other nations. VETO.

Washington, Aug. 27, 1846

"Sons of Temperance."

Mr. Edward H. Barry (of Brookville, Franklin co., Ia.,) "Grand Worthy Patriarch Grand Division Sons of Temperance of Indiana" instituted "Franklin Division No 16" at Clinton, Vermillion county, Ind., Monday evening 31st ult. The officers are:—Dr. Isaac S. Palmer, W. P., Dr. Rollin Whitcomb, W. A., James M. Lyons, R. S., Otis Brown, A. R. S., Alonzo Lyons, F. S., Fielden Shepherd, T., Dr. John N. Perkins, C., William James, A. C., William P. Dole, I. S., ——— O. S.

MESSRS. CHAPMANS:—*Gents.:*—If you will give the above a gratuitous insertion in the State Sentinel you will much oblige myself.

Truly yours, in Friendship, Love and Truth,
CLINTON, Ia., Sept. 5. J. M. LYONS.

The Miama Indians refuse to emigrate—probably persuaded to do so by interested whites. The Chief of the tribe we understand keeps a grocery, where, although worth an immense fortune himself, he deals out whisky to his tribe at three cents a glass, showing himself to be almost as corrupt as a white man. The true policy is to remove the Indians west and where they may be beyond the contamination of the vices of the whites, and every good citizen must desire to see this policy peaceably effected.—*Goshen Democrat.*

A man by the name of Hamlin, of Vevay, Ind., who was in the habit of abusing his wife, was warned by somebody to leave the place in due time. This he did not heed. Mr. Somebody and somebody's friends went to the house of said Hamlin and rode him on a rail to the river, where they put him in a skiff and transported him to the Kentucky side, gave him a dollar, and ordered him to leave. His wife the next day followed him, notwithstanding his ill treatment of her was so outrageous, as to awaken the indignation of the community.—*Lou. Democrat.*

"MR CLAY *never can be elected President*—and it would be as unjust to him as it would be disastrous to his friends, to put him again in nomination.—*Lafayette Journal.*

Tut, tut, Major! You shouldn't lacerate the man's feelings in that heartless way. Don't pull in the latch-string and bar the door of the white-house upon him forever. Let him try it once more—*only* once more—do now, there's a good soul! There's no knowing what *might* turn up.—*Lafayette Courier.*

☞Two hundred and fifty of the Lowell factory girls were married during the past year. They are no doubt all of them in favor of 'protection'—SUCH protection, at any rate.

The Markets.

CINCINNATI, Sept 5.—*Four*—Market very quiet. Sales of 120 bbls from canal last evening at $2.80; 151 do. at $2 84; 40 do. from railroad at $2 81.

WHISKY—Sales at 16½ to 16¾ c per gallon.

Corn Meal—33 c per bushel.—*Chronicle.*

☞The Cincinnati Gazette reports sales of flour same day, of 50 bbls. from railroad at 2 90, and 100 bbls city mills 2.90, delivered.

A Rare Chance.

We are requested to state that W. H. TALBOTT is preparing to leave for the east in four weeks; and that during that time he will dispose of any of his stock of Watches, Jewelry, Silver Plate, &c. &c. at bare cost. We think those in want of any article in his line will do well to call *soon.* 26-3wis

MARION COUNTY SEMINARY.

THE fall and winter session will commence on Monday, the 28th of September. J. P. SAFFORD,
Indianapolis, Sept. 9, 1846. 29-3w H. B. HIBBEN.

HORTICULTURAL.

THERE will be a Fall Exhibition of the Indiana Horticultural Society held in this city on Friday and Saturday, the 25th and 26th of September, present. Nurserymen, and all who take an interest in the productions of the soil, are requested to send or bring in specimens of Fruits, Vegetables, Grains, Flowers, Seeds, &c. for exhibition. To prevent confusion, Fruits, Flowers, and Vegetables should be labelled, containing a description of the same, with the contributor's name, &c. Specimens of fruit will be exhibited from the Cincinnati Horticultural Society. Articles should be at the Society's rooms by the 25th, that they may be examined by the committee. Premiums will be awarded. There will be speaking on Saturday morning, 26th, by several gentlemen, on topics interesting to the Farmer, the Gardener, and the Florist.

By order of the President. 29-3w E. MAY, *Secretary.*

W. B. PRESTON & CO.

HAVE on hand and are constantly receiving direct from New York, a well selected assortment of DRY GOODS, which they will sell as cheap or cheaper than any store in these diggins. Their assortment consists in part of the following articles: Cloths, Cassimeres, Satinetts, Jeans, Hardtimes, Tweeds, Prints, Muslins, Drillings, Vestings, Florence Braid Bonnets, Ribbons, Flowers, Ladies' and Gentlemen's Cravats, Dress Handkerchiefs, Shawls, &c. Also a good assortment of ready made Clothing, and a splendid assortment of CUSTOM MADE BOOTS AND SHOES, which they are enabled to sell nearly as cheap as others do their Eastern work, which, unless carried with extreme care, will fall to pieces before it can be got out of town. A good assortment of Palm Leaf, Leghorn, Fur, Brush, and Silk Hats will be kept constantly on hand. They have also, Coffee, Sugar, Madder, Indigo, Copperas, Alum, Red Pepper, Spice, Ginger, Nails, Cotton Yarn, &c. 95

NEW DRUG STORE.
Wholesale and Retail.

S. J. WADE respectfully informs the public that he has opened in the store lately occupied by Capt. John Cain, on Washington street, Indianapolis, a new Drug Store. He invites the attention of Physicians, Druggists, Merchants, and the public generally, to his extensive and complete assortment of DRUGS, MEDICINES, PAINTS, OILS, VARNISHES, DYE STUFFS, GLASS, &c. His stock was purchased in Boston a few weeks since, are all fresh, pure and genuine in quality, which he offers at wholesale or retail on as reasonable terms as they can be purchased in the west.

N. B. Particular attention paid to the compounding of physicians' prescriptions with accuracy. 90-3m

By the President of the United States.

IN pursuance of law, I, JAMES K. POLK, President of the United States of America, do hereby declare and make known that public sales will be held at the undermentioned land offices in the territory of WISCONSIN, at the periods hereinafter mentioned, to-wit:

At the land office at MINERAL POINT commencing on Monday, the thirtieth day of November next, for the disposal of the public lands within the undermentioned townships and fractional townships, viz:

North of the base line and east of the fourth principal meridian.

Townships eleven, twelve, and thirteen, of range one.
Townships eleven, twelve, and thirteen, of range two.
Townships eleven, twelve, and thirteen, of range three.
Townships ten, eleven, twelve, and thirteen, of range four.
Townships ten, eleven, twelve, and thirteen, of range five.
Townships eleven and twelve, and fractional township thirteen, of range six.
Township twelve, and fractional township thirteen, of range seven.
Fractional townships twelve and thirteen, of range eight.

North of the base line and west of the fourth principal meridian.

Townships twelve and thirteen, of range one.
Townships twelve and thirteen, of range two.
Townships twelve and thirteen, of range three.
Townships twelve and thirteen, of range four.
Townships twelve and thirteen, of range five.
Townships twelve and thirteen, of range six.
Fractional townships twelve and thirteen of range seven.

At the land office at GREEN BAY, commencing on Monday, the fourteenth day of December next, for the disposal of the public lands within the undermentioned townships and fractional townships, viz:

North of the base line and east of the fourth principal meridian.

Fractional township twelve, west of the Wisconsin river, of range nine.
Fractional township twenty-two, east of Wolf river, of range fourteen.
Fractional townships twenty six and twenty-seven, east of Wolf river, of range fifteen.
Fractional townships twenty-three, twenty-four, and twenty-six, east of Wolf river, and fractional township twenty-seven, of range sixteen.
Fractional sections two, three, nine, and ten, the south half of fractional section twenty-one, the south fraction of fractional section twenty-six, the south half of the south west quarter, and the south half of the south-east quarter of fractional section twenty-seven, section thirty-four, and fractional section thirty-five contiguous to the former Menomonie Mills reservation, in fractional township twenty, (east of Lakes Winnebago and Little Butte des Morts,) township twenty six, fractional township twenty-seven, and township twenty-eight, of range seventeen.
Townships twenty six and twenty seven, of range eighteen.
Townships twenty-six and twenty-seven, of range nineteen.
Townships twenty nine, thirty, and thirty-one, of range twenty.
Townships twenty nine and thirty, of range twenty-one.

Lands appropriated by law for the use of schools, military, or other purposes, will be excluded from sale.

The sales will each be kept open for two weeks, (unless the lands are sooner disposed of) and no longer; and no private entries of land in the townships so offered, will be admitted until after the expiration of two weeks from the commencement of said sales.

Given under my hand, at the city of Washington, this seventeenth day of August, Anno Domini one thousand eight hundred and forty-six.

By the President: JAMES K. POLK.

JAMES H. PIPER,
Acting Commissioner of the General Land Office.

NOTICE TO PRE-EMPTION CLAIMANTS.

Every person entitled to the right of pre-emption to any land within the limits of the townships and parts of townships above enumerated, is required to establish the same to the satisfaction of the Register and receiver of the proper land office, and make payment therefor, *as soon as practicable after seeing this notice,* and before the day appointed for the commencement of the public sale of the lands embracing the tract claimed; otherwise such claim will be forfeited. JAMES H. PIPER.
Acting Commissioner of the General Land Office.
August 27. 25-10wis

By the President of the United States.

IN pursuance of law, I, JAMES K. POLK, President of the United States of America, do hereby declare and make known that public sales will be held at the undermentioned Land Offices in the Territory of IOWA, at the periods hereinafter designated, to-wit:

At the Land Office at DU BUQUE, commencing on Monday, the twenty-third day of November next, for the disposal of the public lands within the undermentioned townships, to wit:

North of the base line and west of the fifth principal meridian.

Townships eighty-seven and eighty-eight, of range eleven.
Townships eighty-four, eighty-five, eighty six, eighty seven, and eighty-eight, of range twelve.
Townships eighty-four, eighty-five, eighty-six, eighty-seven, and eighty-eight, of range thirteen.
Townships eighty-four, and eighty five, of range fourteen.

At the Land Office at IOWA CITY, the site designated by the President, under the act of eighth August, 1846, for the office of the Iowa district, commencing on Monday, the thirtieth day of November next, for the disposal of the public lands within the undermentioned townships, to-wit:

North of the base line and west of the fifth principal meridian.

Townships eighty-two and eighty-three, of range twelve.
Townships eighty, eighty-one, eighty-two, and eighty-three, of range thirteen.
Townships eighty-one, eighty-two, and eighty-three, of range fourteen.
Townships seventy-seven and seventy-eight, of range sixteen.
Sections one to six inclusive, the north-east quarter of section seven, sections eight to fifteen inclusive, the north-east quarter of section seventeen, the north half of section twenty-two, sections twenty-three, twenty four, and twenty-five, the north east quarter of section twenty-six, and the north-east quarter of section thirty-six, in township seventy-six; and townships seventy seven and seventy-eight, of range seventeen.
The north half of section one, in township seventy-six; township seventy-seven, (except sections nineteen, twenty, twenty-eight, twenty-nine, thirty, thirty-one, thirty-two, thirty-three, thirty-four, and the south-west quarter of section thirty-five,) and township seventy-eight, of range eighteen.

At the Land Office at FAIRFIELD, commencing on Monday, the seventh day of December next, for the disposal of the public lands within the undermentioned townships and parts of townships, viz:

North of the base line and west of the fifth principal meridian.

Townships seventy and seventy one; township seventy-two, (except section one, the north half and south-east quarter section two, the north east quarter of section three, and the north half of section twelve;) the west half of section eighteen, section nineteen, the south-west quarter of section twenty, sections twenty-nine, thirty, thirty one, and thirty two, and the west half and south east quarter of section thirty three, in township seventy-three, of range sixteen.
Townships seventy, seventy one, and seventy-two; township seventy-three, (except the north half and south-east quarter of section one, and the north-east quarter of section twelve) the south half of section twenty nine, the south half of section thirty, sections thirty-one, thirty two, thirty-three, the west half and south-east quarter of section thirty four, and the south west quarter of section thirty-five, in township seventy-four, of range seventeen.
Townships seventy, seventy-one, seventy-two, and seventy-three; the south half of section five, sections six, seven and eight, the south-west quarter of section nine, the south east quarter of section fifteen, sections seventeen, eighteen, nineteen, twenty, twenty-one, and twenty-two, the south-west quarter of section twenty-three, sections twenty-five, twenty-six, twenty seven, twenty eight, twenty-nine, thirty, thirty one, thirty two, thirty-three, thirty-four, thirty-five, and thirty six, in township seventy-four, of range eighteen.

Lands appropriated by law for the use of schools, military, or other purposes, will be excluded from the sale.

The sales will each be kept open for two weeks, (unless the lands are sooner disposed of) and no longer, and no private entries of land in the townships so offered, will be admitted until after the expiration of two weeks from the commencement of said sales.

Given under my hand, at the City of Washington, this fourteenth day of August, Anno Domini one thousand eight hundred and forty six.

By the President: JAMES K. POLK.

JAMES H. PIPER,
Acting Commissioner of the General Land Office.

NOTICE TO PRE-EMPTION CLAIMANTS.

Every person entitled to the right of pre-emption to any lands within the townships above enumerated, is required to establish the same to the satisfaction of the Register and Receiver of the proper Land Office, and make payment thereof, *as soon as practicable after seeing this notice,* and before the day appointed for the commencement of the public sale of the lands embracing the tract claimed; otherwise such claim will be forfeited.

JAMES H. PIPER,
Acting Commissioner of the General Land Office.
August 27. 25-10wis

TO SINKING FUND BORROWERS.

SINKING FUND OFFICE,
Indianapolis, August 24, 1846.

THE Supreme Court having lately decided it illegal to charge (as has been the custom at this office) interest on the interest unpaid, without an agreement on the part of the borrower to pay such compound interest; and the last Legislature having provided for one sale only of mortgaged lands in each year, the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund have considered that it would not be proper to continue the indulgence that has been heretofore usual on Sinking Fund Loans; and an order has therefore been made, to advertise all lands mortgaged, where the *interest shall have been due and unpaid on the first day of July last.*

The order will not, however, operate in the case of those who do not owe for more than one year's interest, and who shall forward to this office, by the 20th of September next, a written consent to pay *interest on the interest due and withheld.*

25-4wis J. MORRISON, *President.*

The Jeffersonian and Palladium, Richmond; Express and Courier, Terre Haute; Free Press and Courier, Lafayette, will publish the above three successive weeks from the reception hereof. Accounts for the same, with papers containing the advertisement, to be forwarded to the Sinking Fund Office for liquidation.

NOTICE.
Boone County Taxes, 1846.

THE Treasurer and Collector of Boone county, Indiana, hereby gives notice that the duplicate for the present year is now in his hands. The amount of taxes charged for the year 1846, on each one hundred dollars' worth of taxable property, is, for state purposes, twenty-five cents, and one cent for a lunatic asylum; five mills for a deaf and dumb asylum; two mills for the education of the blind. For County purposes twenty cents. For road purposes, ten cents. And on each poll, for state purposes, seventy five cents; and for county purposes, thirty-seven and a half cents.

For the purpose of receiving taxes, he will attend at the usual places of holding elections in the several townships in the said county, on the following days, to wit:

In Marion township, on Friday, 18th September;
In Clinton township, on Saturday, 19th September;
In Washington township, on Monday, 21st September;
In Sugar Creek township, on Tuesday, 22d September;
In Jefferson township, on Wednesday, 23d September;
In Union township, on Thursday, 24th September;
In Eagle township, on Friday, 25th September;
In Perry township, on Saturday, 26th September;
In Harrison township, on Monday, 18th September;
In Jackson township, on Tuesday, 29th September;
In Centre township, on Wednesday, 30th September.

He will attend at his office, in Lebanon, except when absent in the several townships, until the first day of January next.

J. T. McLAUGHLIN,
Treasurer and Collector Boone County, Ind.
Lebanon, August 12, 1846. 21-6wis

COMMISSIONERS' SALE.

NOTICE is hereby given that the undersigned, commissioners appointed by the probate court of the county of Marion, State of Indiana, will, on Saturday, the nineteenth day of September, A. D. 1846, by order of the said probate court, proceed to sell the following described real estate, to wit: the west half of lot number four (4) in block number thirteen (13) in the town of Indianapolis, in said county of Marion. Also, the west half of the southwest quarter of section nine (9) in township eighteen (18) north, of range one (1) east, and the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of the same section, situated in the county of Boone, State of Indiana. The said sale will be held in front of the Washington Hall, in the town of Indianapolis aforesaid, at two o'clock, p. m., of said day, upon the following terms of payment: one half of the purchase money to be paid cash in hand, and the other half to be paid in six months from the day of sale, to be secured by promissory note with sufficient freehold security, made payable without any relief from valuation or appraisement laws.

JOSHUA STEVENS,
ANDREW A. LOUDEN, } *Commissioners.*
THOMAS LUPTON,
21-4wis

SALE OF PERSONAL PROPERTY.

NOTICE is hereby given that we will expose to public sale, on Friday and Saturday, the twenty fifth and twenty sixth of the present month, at the late residence of John H. Wright, deceased, a part of the personal property of the said deceased, consisting of horses, wagon, carriage and harness, household furniture, pork house and appurtenances, set of blacksmith's tools, &c. A credit of three months will be given on all sums over three and under twenty dollars, and of six months on all over twenty—the purchaser giving his note with approved security.

MARY ANN WRIGHT, Administratrix.
JEREMY MANSUR, Administrator.
By W. & J. MANSUR.
28

NAVY BEEF AND PORK FOR 1847.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF PROVISIONS AND CLOTHING,
August 7, 1846.

SEALED PROPOSALS, endorsed "Proposals for Beef," and "Proposals for Pork," as the case may be, will be received at this office until 3 o'clock, P. M., on Monday, the 14th day of September next, for furnishing and delivering, free of all cost and risk to the United States,—

Five thousand four hundred barrels of navy beef, and four thousand eight hundred barrels of navy pork.

Each barrel to contain not less than two hundred pounds nett weight of beef or pork; no excess of weight in either article will be paid for. To be delivered at the respective navy yards, as follows:

	Barrels Beef.	Barrels Pork.
At Charlestown, Mass.,	1,800	1,600
At Brooklyn, New York,	1,800	1,600
At Gosport, Virginia,	1,800	1,600
	5,400	4,800

Said beef and pork must be delivered, one-half between the first day of January, 1847, and the first day of April, 1847; and the other half between the 15th day of April, 1847, and the 15th day of June, 1847, unless earlier deliveries should be required by the chief of this bureau. Offers must be made for each half separately and distinctly—that is, for the half deliverable between the first of January and 1st of April, and for the half deliverable between the 15th of April and 15th June, 1847. Payment for the first half to be made within thirty days after delivery; and for the second half in thirty days after the 15th June, 1847.

The beef must be from well-fatted cattle, slaughtered between the first day of November, 1846, and the first day of February, 1847, and weighing not less than six hundred pounds, nett weight, each. The legs and leg rands of the hind quarters, and the shins and shoulder clods, and at least eight pounds from the neck end of each fore quarter, or the parts marked Nos. 1, 2, and 3, on the drawing or delineation of the fore and hind-quarters of an ox, which will be attached to and form a part of the contract, must be wholly excluded from each barrel and half barrel, and the remainder of the carcass must be cut in pieces of not less than eight pounds each.

The pork must be packed from corn-fed, well fattened hogs, slaughtered between the first day of November, 1846, and the first day of February, 1847, and weighing not less than two hundred pounds each, excluding the heads, joles, necks, shoulders, hams, legs, feet, and lard, and all refuse pieces; and must be cut in pieces weighing not less than six pounds each.

Both the beef and pork must be salted with at least one statute bushel of Turk's Island, Isle of May, or St. Ube's salt; and the beef must have five ounces of fine pulverized saltpetre to each barrel, exclusive of a pickle, to be made from fresh water, as strong as salt will make it.

One-fourth the quantity of beef, and one-fourth the quantity of pork, must be packed in half barrels, and contain one hundred pounds nett weight of each, as the case may be; and, in estimating the price, two half barrels are to be considered as one barrel.

The barrels must be made of the best seasoned white oak or white ash staves and heading; if of the former, to be not less than three fourths of an inch thick, if of the latter, to be not less than an inch thick for barrels, and three-fourths of an inch for half barrels, and to be hooped at least three-fourths over with the best white oak or hickory hoops.

Each barrel and half barrel must be branded on the head "navy beef" or "navy pork," as the case may be, with the contractor's name, and the year when packed.

The beef and pork will, unless otherwise directed by the chief of this bureau, be inspected by the inspecting officers at the respective navy yards aforesaid, and by some "sworn inspector of salted provisions," who will be selected by the respective commanding officers; but their charges for such inspection must be paid by the respective contractors, who must likewise have the barrels put in good shipping order to the satisfaction of the commandants of the respective navy yards aforesaid, after inspection, and at their own expense.

Bidders must specify their prices separately and distinctly in separate offers for the beef and for the pork, and for each of the places of delivery, covering all expenses and all charges.

Bonds in one third the amount of the respective contracts will be required, and ten per centum in addition will be withheld from the amount of each payment to be made, as collateral security for the due and faithful performance of their respective contracts, which will on no account be paid until the contracts are complied with in all respects, and is to be forfeited to the United States in the event of failure to complete the deliveries within the prescribed periods. And in case of failure on the part of the contractor to deliver the aforesaid beef and pork within the time specified, the chief of the bureau of provisions and clothing shall have the right to direct purchases to be made to supply the deficiencies, and any excess of cost shall be charged to and paid by the contractors. Payment will be made by the United States at the periods above specified, (excepting the ten per centum to be withheld until the completion of the contracts as before stated,) after the said beef and pork shall have been inspected and received, and bills for the same shall have been presented to the navy agents respectively, duly approved by the commandants of the respective navy yards, according to the terms of the contract.

The parts of the beef to be excluded will be particularly designated in the engraving to be attached to the contracts. Persons interested can obtain them on application to this office.

No proposal will be considered unless it be accompanied by a guarantee, signed by one or more responsible persons, in the following form, viz:

"The undersigned ——— ——— guarantee that ———, if his (or their) proposal to furnish beef or pork (as the case may be) for the navy be accepted by the chief of the bureau of provisions and clothing shall enter into an obligation prior to the 6th day of October, 1846, with good and sufficient sureties for the fulfilment of his (or their) engagements.

"——— ———."

This should be accompanied by the certificate of the United States district attorney, navy agent, or some other officer of the general government, that the guarantors are able to make good their guarantee.

The bidder's name and residence, and the name of each member of a firm, where a company offers, should be distinctly stated.

The person or persons whose proposals are accepted (and none other) will be forthwith notified thereof by the transmission of a contract and bond, which contract and bond must be executed before the 6th day of October next, and deposited in the post office, addressed to the chief of this bureau.

Proposals should be sent under seal, addressed to the Bureau of Provisions and Clothing, with "Proposals for Navy Beef or Pork" (as the case may be) written on the face of the letter; and should be despatched in time to be received by or before the 14th day of September next, at 3 o'clock, p. m. 22-lawtSept14

VOICE OF THE PEOPLE

SUGAR COATED.
C. V. Bay Smith.
INDN. VEGE. PILLS.

The Improved Indian Vegetable Pills,

(MADE BY A REGULAR PHYSICIAN.)

A most excellent, pleasant, and never failing Medicine, for the cure of Fevers, Ague, Dyspepsia, Indigestion, Costiveness, Foul Stomach, Head Ache, Influenza, Impure Blood, Want of Appetite, Worms, Coughs and Colds, Liver Complaint, General Debility, Pains of all kinds, Female Complaints, and all Diseases that Pills, of any kind, can possibly cure.

NEED NOT FORCE THEM DOWN—Those who have conscientious scruples will please read the following, never before published—facts regarding the Sugar Coated Improved Indian Vegetable Pills for Consumption, Colds, Rheumatism, Dyspepsia and Fevers.

Having been attacked some months since, with a bad cough, weakness in my chest and loss of appetite, I used Wright's Indian Vegetable Pills, but grew worse; with cold sweats at night—could not sleep, and believed I was in a consumption. I procured a box of Dr. Smith's Sugar coated Improved Indian Vegetable Pills, which restored my health within six days, and I believe them to be the best remedy I ever used. GEORGE W. GRANGER.
Cambridge, October 19, 1844.

Extract from A. G. Page's letter, dated Bath, January 1, 1845.

The Sugar Coated Indian Vegetable Pills you sent me sell well and give good satisfaction. They sell better than any I have had.

Extract from Levi Borrett's letter, dated
Canaan, Maine, February 3, 1845.

The Pills which I received from you have given such universal satisfaction where they have been purchased, and the sale has been so uniform, that I thought best to request you to send me on some more of them immediately, &c.

Extract from William N. Packard's letter, dated
Monson, Massachusetts, January 22, 1845.

Sir—Enclosed is the payment for the last Pills. You will please send me by express another lot, say 6 or 8 doz. They give good satisfaction. I have not on hand more than 6 boxes, and do not wish to be cut out of them one day.

Extract from Daniel Taft & Son's letter, dated
Taftsville, Vermont, February 6, 1845.

Your Pills were received a few days since, and we have sold some of them, and have used some of them ourselves and think very favorably of them, and they are liked by those who have used them.

Mr. J P Smith of Gloucester states that he has sold all and wishes 8 dozen more immediately; and they give such universal satisfaction that he has determined to sell no other kind of Pills.

Mr A Allen of Palmer Depot, states that "he was very thankful he was appointed agent, as his wife has been an invalid for some time, and a box of these pills immediately cured her, also that they had performed alike wonderful cures in the town, and was entirely out and wanted some immediately—was agent for other pills, but should only recommend these."

Extract from J B Danforth's letter, dated
Barnard, Vermont, January 11, 1845.

Please send me immediately 6 dozen Smith's Sugar Coated Indian Vegetable Pills. Those you sent a short time since are nearly all sold and give universal satisfaction.

The following letter from the South shows in what high estimation these pills are held:

Harper's Ferry, Virginia, April 21, 1845.

Dr H W Andrews—Sir—I am in want of more Sugar Coated Indian Vegetable Pills. I have not one in store. There has been much sickness, and as I have been much engaged, the pills run out before I was aware of it. They are well liked here.

A M CRIDER.

Baltimore, April 15, 1845.

Benjamin Smith, M D—Dear Sir—I herewith send you a draft on Messrs Swift, Briggs & Co, and you will please send me that amount in the Sugar Coated Improved Indian Vegetable Pills. I have but 2 10 12 dozen on hand of the last 22 gross. I send you the enclosed letter from Mr. Cridler. H W ANDREWS, Druggist.

From the West.

Extract from Messrs G & J Hill's letter, dated
Detroit, March 29, 1845

Dr Smith—Dear Sir—We received this day per express 14 gross of your sugar-coated Indian Vegetable Pills which came very appropos—we had been out of them for some time, and the calls for them had been frequent. All who have called a second time speak of these pills in the highest terms, and when our supply was running down, those who came for one box would take four or five. We have the highest opinion of your pills, and it affords us peculiar pleasure to sell a medicine that gives such universal satisfaction.

☞PRICE 25 CENTS PER BOX.☜

No "SUGAR COATED PILLS" can be genuine, without the signature of the sole inventor, *G Benjamin Smith,* M D, President of the New York College of *Health,* upon every box.

Office devoted exclusively to the sale of this medicine.
179 Greenwich street, New York.

Sold by D. CRAIGHEAD, Indianapolis; WILLIAMS & MCCLELLAN, Franklin; W. MOUNTS, Columbus; BROWN & THOMPSON, Crawfordsville; JOHN F. KING, Terre Haute; R. H. ELDRIDGE, Lafayette; BRUCE & ELDRIDGE, Logansport; J. M. DEFREES, Peru; H. B. REED Fort Wayne; AMES & HOLLIDAY, Michigan City, ROBERT MEEKER, F. W. ROBERTS, Laporte; and sold throughout the United States and Canada.

☞Beware of imitations 78-6miswasw

SHERIFF'S SALE.

BY virtue of an execution to me directed from the clerk's office of the Marion circuit court, I will expose to public sale on the 24th day of September, 1846, at the court house door in the town of Indianapolis, within the hours prescribed by law, the rents and profits for seven years of the following real estate, to-wit: the east half of the northeast quarter of section number eight, township number fifteen north, of range number four east; and on failure to realize the full amount of judgment, interest, and costs, I will at the same time and place expose the fee simple of said real estate. Taken as the property of Mary Ann Atherton, at the suit of Joshua Stevens, administrator of the estate of Benjamin Atherton, deceased. 27 3w $1 50 A. W. RUSSELL, *Sheriff Marion Co.*

State of Indiana, Marion County, Sct.

MARION CIRCUIT COURT, OCTOBER TERM, A. D. 1846.
Daniel Yandes and John Wilkins *vs.* Henry M. Ormsby.—*In Chancery to Foreclose Mortgage.*

THE above defendant, Henry M. Ormsby, who is not a resident of the State of Indiana is hereby notified that on the 19th day of August, A. D. 1846, the above named complainants filed their bill of complaint in the above entitled cause against him; that the said suit is now pending in said court; and that unless he appear and plead to or answer said bill on or before the calling of this cause at the next term of said court, the same will be taken as confessed and true against him.

Attest: R. B. DUNCAN, *Clerk,* by C. F. ROOKER, *Dep.*
BARBOUR & REYNOLDS, *Sols.* 21-3wis