[Reverdy Johnson's Argument Concluded from Fourth Page.]

and lives our ancestors thought could not only be safely vested, but could be safe nowhere else. If it be suggested that a secret trial, in whole or in part as the Executive might deem expedient, could not be had before any other than a military tribunal, the answer is that the Constitution, "in all criminal prosecutions," gives the accused the "right" to "public trial." So abhorrent were private trials to our ancestors, so fatal did they deem them to individual security, that they were denounced, and as they no doubt thought, so guarded against as in all future time to be impossible. If it be suggested that witnesses may be unwilling to testify, the answer is that they may be compelled to appear and made to testify.

But the suggestion upon another ground is equally without force. It rests on the idea that the guilty only are ever brought to trial; that the only object of the Constitution and laws in this regard is to afford the means to establish the alleged guilt. That accusation, however made, is to be esteemed *prima facie* presumption of guilt, and that the Executive should be armed, without other restriction than his own discretion, with all the appliances deemed by him necessary to make the presumption conclusive. Never was there a more dangerous theory. The peril to the citizen from a prosecution so conducted, as illustrated in all history, the very elementary principles of constitutional liberty—the spirit and letter of the Constitution itself—repudiate it.

Innocent parties, sometimes by private malice, sometimes for a mere partisan purpose, sometimes from a supposed public policy, have been made the subjects of criminal accusation. History is full of such instances. How are such parties to be protected, if a public trial, at the option of the Executive, can be denied them, and a secret one, in whole or in part, substituted? If the names of the witnesses and their evidence are not published, what obstacle does it not interpose to establish their innocence.

The character of the witnesses against them may be all important to that end. Kept in prison, with no means of consulting the outer world, how can they make the necessary inquiries? How can those who may know the witnesses be able to communicate with them on the subject? A trial so conducted, though it may not, as no doubt is the case with the present, be intended to procure the punishment of any but the guilty, it is obvious, subjects the innocent to great danger. It partakes more of the character of the Inquisition, which the enlightened civilization of the age has driven almost wholly out of existence, than of a tribunal suited to a free people. In the palmiest days of that tribunal Kings, as well as people, stood abashed in its presence and dreaded its power. The accused was never informed of the names of his accusors. Heresy suspected was ample ground for arrest; accomplices and criminals were received as witnesses, and the whole trial was secret and conducted in a chamber almost as silent as the grave.

It was long since denounced by the civilized world, not because it might not at all times punish the heretic, (then, in violation of all rightful human power, deemed a criminal,) but because it was likely to punish the innocent as the guilty. A public trial, therefor, by which the names of witnesses and the testimony are given, even in monarchical and despotic governments, is now esteemed amply adequate to the punishment of guilt, and essential to the protection of innocence. Can it be that this is not true of us? Can it be that a secret trial, wholly or partially, if the Executive so decides, is all that an American citizen is entitled to? Such a doctrine if maintained by an English monarch, would shake his government to its very centre, and if persevered in would lose him his crown. It will be no answer to these observations to say that this particular trial has been only in part a secret one and that secrecy will never be resorted to except for purposes of justice. The reply is that the principle itself is inconsistent with American liberty as recognized and secured by constitutional guarantees. It supposes that whether these guarantees are to be enjoyed in the particular case, and to what extent, is dependent on Executive will. The Constitution in this regard is designed to secure them in spite of such will.

Its patriotic authors intended to place the citizen, in this particular, wholly beyond the power, not only of the Executive, but of every department of the Government. They deemed the right to a public trial vital to the security of the citizen, and especially and absolutely necessary to his protection against Executive power. A public trial of all criminal prosecutions they therefore secured in general and unqualified terms. What would these great men have said, had they been asked so to qualify the terms as to warrant its refusal under any circumstances, and make it dependent upon Executive discretion? The member who made the inquiry would have been deemed by them a traitor to liberty, or insane. What would they have said if told that without such qualification the Executive could be able legally to impose it as incidental to the Executive power? If not received with derision, it would have been indignantly rejected as an imputation upon those who at any time thereafter should legally fill the office.

II. Let me present the question in another view. If such a commission as this, for the trial of cases like the present, can be legally constituted, can it be done by mere Executive authority?

1. You are a court, and, if legally existing, endowed with momentous power, the highest known to man, that of passing upon the life or liberty of the citizen. By the express words of the Constitution, an army can only be raised, and governed, and regulated by laws passed by Congress. In the exercise of the power to rule and govern it, the act before referred to, of the 10th of April, 1805, establishing the articles of war, was passed. The act provides only for courts martial and courts of inquiry, and designates the cases to be tried before each, and the laws that are to govern the trial. Military commissions are not mentioned, and, of course, the act contains no provision for their government. Now, it is submitted as perfectly clear, that the creation of a court, whether civil or military, is an exclusive legislative function, belonging to the department upon which the legislative power is conferred. The jurisdiction of such a court, and the laws and regulations to guide and govern it, is also exclusively legislative. What cases are to be tried by it, how the judges are to be selected, and how qualified; what are the rules of evidence and what punishment are to be inflicted, all solely belong to the same department. The very element of constitutional liberty, recognized by all modern writers on government, as essential to its security, and carefully incorporated into our Constitution, is a separation of the legislative, judicial, and executive powers. That this separation is made by our Constitution, no one will deny. Article First declares that "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress." Article 2d vests "the executive power" in a President, and article 3d, "the judicial power in certain designated courts, and in courts to be thereafter constituted by Congress." There could not be a more careful segregation of the three powers. If, then, courts, their laws, modes of proceeding and judgments, belong to legislation (and this, I suppose, will not be questioned) in the absence of legislation in regard to this court, and its jurisdiction to try the present cases, it has for that purpose no legal existence or authority. The Executive, whose functions are altogether executive, cannot confer it. The offenses to be tried by it, the laws to govern its proceedings, the punishment it may award, cannot, for the same reason, be prescribed by the Executive. These, as we I as the mere constitution of the court, all exclusively belong to Congress. If it be contended that the Executive has the power in question because by implication they are involved in the war power or in the President's constitutional function as Commander-in-Chief of the army, then this consequence would follow, that they would not be subject to Congressional control, as that department has no more right to interfere with the power of the Executive than that power has a right to interfere with that of Congress. If this be so, if by implication the powers in question belong to the Executive, he may not only constitute and regulate Military Commissions and prescribe the laws of their government, but all legislation upon the subject by Congress would be usurpation. That the proposition leads to this result would seem to be clear, and if it does, that result itself is so inconsistent with all previous legislation, and all Executive practice, and so repugnant to every constitutional liberty that it demonstrates its utter unsoundness. Under the power given to Congress "to make rules for the government and regulation of the land forces," they have, from time to time, up to and including the act of the 10th of April, 1806, and since, enacted such rules as they deemed to be necessary as well in war as in peace, and their authority to do so has never been denied. This power, too to govern and regulate from its very nature, is exclusive. Whatever is not done under it is to be considered as purposely omitted. The words used in the delegation of the power, to "govern and regulate," necessarily embrace the entire subject, and exclude all like authority in others. The end of such a power cannot be attained except through uniformity of government and regulation, and this is not to be attained if the power is in two hands. To be effective, therefore, it must be in one, and the Constitution gives it to one, to Congress, in express terms, and nowhere intimates a purpose to bestow it, or any portion of it, upon any department. In the absence, then, of all mention of Military Commissions in the Constitution, and in the presence of the sole authority it confers on Congress by rules of its own enacting to govern and regulate the army; and in the absence of all mention of such commissions in the act of the 10th of April, 1856, and of a single word in that act, or in any other, how can the power be considered as in the President? Further, upon what ground, other than those I have examined, can his authority be placed?

Is it that the constitutional guarantees referred to are designed only for a state of peace? There is not a syllable in the instrument that justifies, even plausibly, such a qualification. They are secured by the most general and comprehensive terms, wholly inconsistent with any restriction. They are also not only not confined to a condition of peace, but are more peculiarly necessary to the security of personal liberty in war than in peace. All history tells us that war, at times, maddens the people, frenzies government, and makes both regardless of constitutional limitations of power. Individual safety at such periods is more in peril than at any other. Constitutional limitations and guarantees are then also absolutely necessary to the protection of the Government itself. The maxim "*salus populi suprema est lex*" is but fit for a tyrant's use. Under its pretence the grossest wrongs have been committed, the most awful crimes perpetrated, and every principle of freedom violated, until at last, worn down by suffering, the people, in very despair, have acquiesced in a resulting despotism. The safety which liberty needs, and without which it sickens and dies, is that which law, and not mere unlicensed human will affords. The Aristotelian maxim, "*salus publica suprema est lex*"—"let the public weal be under the protection of the law"—is the true and only safe maxim. Nature without law would be chaos, government without law anarchy, or despotism. Against both, in war and in peace, the Constitution happily protects us.

If the power in question is claimed under the authority supposed to be given the President in certain cases to suspend the writ of *habeas corpus* and to declare martial law, the claim is equally if not more evidently untenable. Because the first of these powers, if given to the President at all, is given "when in cases of rebellion or invasion" he deems the public safety requires it. I think he has this power, but there are great and patriotic names who think otherwise. But if he has it, or it be in Congress alone, it is entirely untrue that its exercise works any other result that the suspension of the writ—the temporary suspension of the right of having the cause of arrest passed upon at once by the civil judges. It in no way impairs or suspends the other rights secured to the accused.

In what court he is to be tried, how he is to be tried, what evidence to be admitted, and what judgment pronounced, are all to be what the Constitution secures and the laws provide in similar cases when there is no suspension of the writ. The purpose of the writ is merely, without delay, to ascertain the legality of the arrest. If adjudged legal, the party is detained; if illegal, discharged. But in either contingency, when he is called to answer any criminal accusation, and he is a civilian and not subject to the articles of war, constitutionally enacted by Congress, it must be done by presentment or indictment, and his trial be had in a civil court, having, by State and Congressional legislation, jurisdiction over the crime, and under the laws governing the tribunal and defining the punishment. The very fact, too, that express power is given in a certain condition of things, to suspend the writ referred to, and that no power is given to suspend or deny any of the other securities for personal liberty provided by the Constitution, is conclusive to show that all the latter were designed to be in force "in cases of rebellion or invasion," as well as in a state of perfect peace and safety.

III. I have already referred to the act of 1806 establishing the articles of war, and said, what must be admitted, that it provides for no military court like this; but, for argument's sake, let it be admitted. And I then maintain, with becoming confidence, and due respect for a difference of opinion, that it does not embrace the crime charged against these parties or the parties themselves.

First. The charge is a traitorous conspiracy to take the lives of the designed persons "in aid of the existing armed rebellion." Second. That in the execution of the conspiracy the actual murder of the late President and the attempted murder of the Secretary of State occurred. Throughout the charge and its specifications the conspiracy and its attempted execution are alleged to have been traitorous. The accusation, therefore, is not one merely of murder, but of murder designed and part accomplished with traitorous purpose. If the charge is true and the intent (which is made a substantial part of it) be also true, then the crime is treason and not a simple murder.

Treason against the United States, as defined by the Constitution, can "consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort," (3d art.) This definition not only tells us what treason is, but that no other crime than the defined one shall be considered the offense. And the same section provides that "no person shall be convicted of treason except on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in open court;" and gives to Congress the power to declare what its punishment shall be. The offense in the general is the same as in England. In that country, at no period since its freedom became settled, has any other treason been recognized. In the pendency of this rebellion (never before) it has been alleged that there exists with us the offense of military treason, punishable by the laws of war. It is so stated in the instructions of General Halleck to the then commanding officer in Tennessee, of the 5th of March, 1863. (Lawrence's Wheaton, supp't, p. 41) But Halleck confines it to acts committed against the army of a belligerent when occupying the territory of the enemy. And he says, what is certainly true, if such an offense can be committed, that it "is broadly distinguished from the treason defined in the constitutional and statutory laws, and made punishable by the civil courts." But the term military treason is not to be found in any English work or military order, or, before this rebellion, in any American authority. It has evidently been adopted during the rebellion, as a doctrine of military law, on the authority of continental writers in Governments less free than those of England and the United States, and in which, because they are less free, treason is not made to consist of certain specific acts, and no others.

But if Halleck is right, and all our prior practice, and that of England, from which we derive ours, is to be abandoned, the cases before you are not cases of "military treason," as he defines it. When the offenses alleged in these cases are stated to have occurred in this district, the United States were not, and did not claim to be in its occupation as a belligerent, nor was it pretended that the people of this district were, in a belligerent sense, enemies. On the contrary, they were citizens, entitled to every right of citizenship. Nor were the parties on trial enemies. They were either citizens of the District or of Maryland, and under the protection of the Constitution. The offense charged, then, being treason, it is treason known to the Constitution and laws, and can only be tried and punished as they provide. To consider these parties belligerents, and their alleged offense military treason, is not only unwarranted by the authority of Halleck, but it is in direct conflict with the Constitution and laws, which the President and all of us are bound to support and defend. The offense, then, being treason, as known to the Constitution, its trial by a Military Court is clearly illegal. And this for obvious reasons. Under the Constitution, no conviction of such an offense can be had "unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in open court." And under the laws the parties are entitled to have "a copy of the indictment and a list of the jury and witnesses, with the name and places of abode of both, at least three entire days before the trial. They also have the right to challenge peremptorily thirty five of the jury, and to challenge without limitation. And, finally, unless the indictment shall be found by a grand jury within three years next after the treason done or committed, they shall not be prosecuted, tried or punished." (Act 30th April, 1790, 1 Stat. at Large, pp. 118, 119.) Upon what possible ground, therefore, can this Commission possess the jurisdiction claimed for it? It is not alleged that it is subject to the provisions stated, and in its very nature it is impossible that it should be. The very safeguards designed by the Constitution, if it has such jurisdiction, are wholly unavailing. Trial by jury in all cases our English ancestors deemed (as Story correctly tells us) "the great bulwark of their civil and political liberties, and watched with an unceasing jealousy and solicitude. It constituted one of the fundamental articles of Magna Charta, "*nullus liber homo capiatur nec imprisonetur aut exulet, aut aliquo modo destruatur, &c., nisi per legale judicium parium suarum, vel per legem terræ.*" This great right the American colonists brought with them as their birthright and inheritance. It landed with them at Jamestown and on the rock of Plymouth, and was equally prized by Cavalier and Puritan, and ever since to the breaking out of the rebellion has been enjoyed and esteemed the perfection and proud privilege of their posterity. At times during the rebellion it has been disregarded and denied. The momentous nature of the crisis brought about by that stupendous crime, involving as it did the very life of the nation, has caused the people to tolerate such disregard and denial. But the crisis, thank God! has passed. The authority of the Government, throughout our territorial limits is reinstated so firm that reflecting men here and elsewhere are convinced that the danger has passed never to return. The result proves that the principles on which the Government rests have imparted to it a vitality that will cause it to endure for a time, in spite of foreign invasion or domestic insurrection; and one of those principles, the choicest one, is the right in cases of "criminal prosecutions to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury," and in cases of treason to the additional securities before averted to. The great purpose of Magna Charta and the Constitution was, (to quote Story again,) "to guard against a spirit of opposition and tyranny on the part of rulers, and against a spirit of violence and vindictiveness on the part of the people." "The appeal for safety can, under such circumstances, scarcely be made by *innocence*, in any other manner than by the severe control of courts of justice, and by the firm and impartial verdict of a jury sworn to do right, and guided solely by legal evidence and a sense of duty. In such a course there is a double security against the prejudices of judges who may partake of the wishes and opinions of the government, and against the passions of the multitude, who may demand their victim with a clamorous precipitancy." And Justice Blackstone, with the same deep sense of its value, meets the prediction of a foreign writer, "that because Rome, Sparta, and Carthage, at the time when their liberties were lost, were strangers to the trial by jury." (3 Bla., p. 379.) That a right so valued and esteemed by our fathers to be necessary to civil liberty, so important to the very existence of a free Government, was designed by them to be made to depend for its enjoyment upon the war power, or upon any power entrusted to any department of our Government, is a reflection on their intelligence and patriotism.

Mr. Johnson then proceeded, at considerable length, to establish the proposition that "the articles of war, if they provided for the punishment of crimes on trial, and authorized such a court as this, do not include such parties as are on trial; and, until the rebellion, I am not aware that a different construction was ever intimated. It is the exclusive fruit of the rebellion."

In the course of his elaborate argument Mr. Johnson says: As counsel for one of the parties I should esteem myself dishonored if I attempted to rescue my client from a proper trial for the offense charged against her by denying the jurisdiction of the commission upon grounds that I did not conscientiously believe to be sound. And if what I have done I have not more had in view the defense of Mrs. Surratt than the Constitution and the laws. In my view, in this respect, her cause is the cause of every citizen, and let it not be supposed that I am seeking to secure impunity to any one who may have been guilty of the horrid crimes of the night of the 14th of April. Over these the civil courts of this district have ample jurisdiction, and will faithfully exercise it if the cases are remitted to them, and if guilt is legally established, will surely award the punishment known to the laws. God forbid that such crimes should go unpunished. In the black catalogue of offenses these will forever be esteemed the darkest and deepest committed by sinning man, and, in common with the civilized world, do I wish that every legal punishment may be legally inflicted upon all who participated in them.

A word more, gentlemen, and, thanking you for your kind attention, I am done. I have not remarked on the evidence in the case of Mrs. Surratt, nor is it my purpose. But it is proper that I refer to her case in particular for a single moment. That a woman well educated and, as far as we can judge from all her past life, as we have it in the evidence, a devout Christian, ever kind, affectionate and charitable, with no motive disclosed to us that could have caused a total change in her very nature, could have participated in the crimes in question it is almost impossible to believe. Such a belief can only be forced upon a reasonable, unsuspecting, unprejudiced mind by direct and uncontradicted evidence coming from pure and perfectly unsuspected sources.

Have we these? Is the evidence uncontradicted? Are the two witnesses, Wiechman and Lloyd, pure and unsuspected? Of the particulars of their evidence I say nothing. They will be brought before you by my associates. But this conclusion in regard to these witnesses must have weight in the minds of the court, and is certainly strongly impressed upon my own, that if the facts which they themselves state as to their connection with Booth and Payne are true, their participation in them is much more satisfactorily established than the alleged knowledge and participation of Mrs. Surratt.

As far, gentlemen, as I am concerned, the case is now in your hands.

DAILY SENTINEL.

THE UNION—IT MUST BE PRESERVED.—[JACKSON

FRIDAY MORNING, JUNE 23.

GOVERNOR MORTON ON LIBERTY.

The Journal, the Court organ, thus reports Governor Morton's reception speech on Wednesday last:

"Jefferson had said that 'freedom could only be maintained by cherishing the sentiment that liberty was the gift of God to every creature in the world. If conferred by constitutions and charters, they might change.' So in regard to this country. It was too large to be held together as a confedesation, and could only endure on the principle of national unity."

These expressions of His Excellency are in direct antagonism, if he is correctly reported, as we suppose he is. The Governor is opposed, it appears, to any restraint upon the liberty of the citizen by constitutions or charters—he favors liberty without the restraints of law. While expressing this sentiment he holds, at the same time, that the principle of confederation is all wrong, and that the General Government cannot exist unless power is centralized. If he means anything by "the principle of national unity," it is that State Rights, and by this we do not mean the doctrine of nullification or secession by States, must be obliterated and that the States must bear the same relation to the Federal Government that counties do to the States. We should have a queer Government if the ideas of the Governor, as reported, were adopted. In the first place we should have liberty without the restraints of law, and then a centralized despotism, like France, Austria or Russia, which would overshadow the rights or individual liberty of the citizen. Either the Governor falls to comprehend our system of Government, or else he is very badly reported.

THE MILITARY TRIAL IN WASHINGTON.

We publish this morning the argument of Hon. REVERDY JOHNSON in the trials before the Military Court in Washington for the assassination of President LINCOLN. It is an able paper, and worthy of the most serious attention. A cotemporary remarks that "it reviews the history of liberty of persons as protected by law, and makes a noble appeal in the name of justice for the salvation of the pure reputation we have borne among nations as the defenders of liberty. It is idle to call ourselves a free people, or point to our Constitution as the exponent of free principles, if Mr. JOHNSON's argument be fallacious, and we may at any time find reasons for converting civil into military offenses. Words cannot be devised more simple, clear and commanding than those which he cites from the Constitution itself, and yet there are those who argue that the circumstances of the country may give new significance to such words, or may deprive them of all force and effect. President JOHNSON has now a noble opportunity of vindicating the great principles of American law and liberty, and we trust he will not let it pass."

Dodging the Issue—The Platform of the Ohio Republican Convention.

The Republicans of Ohio met in State Convention on Wednesday, and adopted the following platform:

Whereas, The Union people of Ohio, thankful to Almighty God for the overthrow of the rebellion, and the preservation of the national integrity; for the blessings of peace, and for all the favors which He has vouchsafed unto us as a people, do

Resolve, 1. That the name and fame of Abraham Lincoln stand out from the history of the epoch unrivaled and alone; and while we deplore his untimely and cruel death, and venerate his memory, it becomes us to imitate his wisdom, firmness and moderation in the treatment of vexed questions, and especially to imitate his example in waiting for the solution of difficulties, to be furnished by the progress of time and the logic of events.

2. That President Andrew Johnson, by his unswerving devotion to the Union through years of severest trial, has now our highest confidence; that we cheerfully endorse the policy of his Administration, looking to the restoration of peace and civil order in the so-called seceded States; and that, as Union men of Ohio, we will give him our hearty and undivided support.

3. That the thanks of Ohio and the nation are due to the heroic of our army and navy, whose labors and sufferings have served the republic. We honor our martyred dead, and joyfully welcome to their homes our returning veterans.

4. That the thanks of this Convention are due, and are hereby tendered, to the loyal men and women of Ohio at home, who have so nobly and liberally sustained and cheered our brave soldiers in the field, in their trying efforts to maintain the national authority in conflict with the armed rebellion.

5. That four years of sanguinary war, with its fearful sacrifice of life and of treasure, forced upon us by the slaveholders of the rebellion, has demonstrated to us and to the world, that slavery and its institutions are irreconcilably opposed to freedom and free institutions, and all the teachings of history, the dealings of Providence and our own bitter experience, point unerringly to their overthrow and eradication as our only safeguard against the recurrence of like evils in the future.

6. That while we are anxious for an early reconstruction of fraternal relations with the insurgent States, we demand that such reconstruction shall be at such time and upon such terms as will give unquestioned assurance of the peace and security, not only of the loyal people of the rebel States, but also of the peace and prosperity of the Federal Union.

7. That the the thanks of the loyal people of Ohio and the Union are due to the three war Governors of Ohio, Dennison, Todd and Brough, for the earnest, faithful and patriotic exercise of the Executive authority of our State during their respective administrations, and that through their efforts and the hearty co-operation of our loyal people, citizens and soldiers, Ohio stands in the front rank of the roll of honor among her sister States in the great struggle for national existence.

8. That the experience of the last four years shows the absolute necessity in all our political action, of keeping steadily in view the grand principles of our Government as set forth in the Declaration of Independence.

9. That we will cordially support the ticket this day nominated, and promise our collective and undivided efforts to secure its triumphant election.

We call attention especially to the second resolution. We judge from its tone that the Radicals had no show in the Convention, but were summarily laid upon the shelf. The Cincinnati Commercial, in commenting upon the proceedings of the Convention, remarks:

The army delegation was a notable feature. A good many military organizations sent private soldiers as delegates, but at least a dozen Brigadier Generals were in the Convention, and there was a smart sprinkling of them outside. The number of cripples—officers who had lost an arm or a leg in the service—was remarkable. There was a painful plenty of empty sleeves and of crutches.

In the army delegation there was an intense bitterness against Governor Brough, and the delegates "from the front" had a sense of disappointment in finding that they could not have a chance of pitching into the Governor. There were some exceptions, but the army representation generally was solicitous for a fight with the State Executive, and had determined to slaughter him. There was talk that they would have put up a candidate of their own if Brough had remained in the field and received the nomination.

An effort was made by the State Central Committe to break the unity of the military power in the Convention, by distributing the delegates among their respective Congressional Districts. This was hotly resisted, and there was a period of great doubt as to what was to be done with the military gentlemen. Fortunately the Convention was held in a theatre, and this allowed the representatives of the army to be distinguished from the civilians, by being placed upon the stage with the reporters and officers of the Convention. Some of the military men exhibited a disposition somewhat greedy in respect to the offices, while other were, perhaps, unnecessarily sensitive, lest the military should get more than the proper proportion.

The stay-at-home patriots might as well recognize, at once, that in seeking far office, they labor under difficulties. Meritorious service in the army is, as it ought to be, a stronger recommendation for public favor than the noisiest possible home-guard performances. Taking care of the baggage in the rear may be a very useful occupation, but it will not, for a long time, count for much before the conventions of the Union war party.

Among the civilians, the manifest disposition of the majority was to avoid any decided expression upon the agitating question of negro suffrage in the States under treatment for reconstruction. The radicals were pretty strong, but, with a few exceptions, did not urge making an issue with the President. The army delegates instructed their representatives in the Committee on Resolutions to "*insist upon an unequivocal indorsement* of the policy of the President." These are the words of the resolution adopted by the caucus.

STATE ITEMS.

THE WHEAT CROP.—From accounts received from various parts the prospects for a good crop is not favorable. While there are some fields of excellent wheat, others adjoining are very poor. We have been shown specimens of wheat taken from several fields which are injured by smut to the extent of two-thirds of the crop. The wet, sultry weather has been unfavorable, and rust has ruined many fields.—Hendricks Union.

WEEVIL IN WHEAT.—J. H. Stine writes us that the weevil has made its appearance in wheat, but says the early will not be damaged much by it, as the berry has passed the milky state. He thinks late wheat may suffer some.—Randolph Journal.

Negroes and Equal Rights.

We are glad to learn from this article that the Courier, in the negro suffrage question, secedes from that portion of the Democratic party which insists on making the exclusion of the colored race from equal rights with the white the new corner stone of the Democratic creed.—New York Tribune.

The Democratic party does not "insist" on excluding negroes from equal rights. The Democratic party, as a party, asserts nothing on this question, save that the franchisement or otherwise of the negroes is lodged by the Constitution in the States. It "insists" simply that Illinois, for instance, is the best and only judge as to who shall vote in Illinois, and that Horace Greeley, of New York, has nothing to do with the matter.—Chicago Times.

A FEMALE begging impostor, importuning a gentleman to give her a "copper," the benevolent gentleman said she should have one if she would only leave off begging and take in washing.

MASONIC.

ANCIENT LANDMARKS LODGE, NO. 319, WILL meet at their Lodge room, at ½ before 12 this morning, to participate in the celebration. All the members are requested to meet promptly at the hour.

CLAIM AGENCY.

WAR CLAIMS!

SOLDIERS AND OFFICERS WHO HVVE NOT BEEN paid full pay and the Government BOUNTY to which they are entitled, can have their claims adjusted promptly and correctly and obtained at

BLAKE'S MILITARY CLAIM AGENCY.

Claims for PENSIONS, Horses killed in battle or lost in the line of duty, Steamboats and all other property lost in the Military Service, and every class of claims founded in law, justice or equity secured.

Business transacted by mail.

Office in Sheets' Building, next Masonic Hall, opposite Metropolitan Hall, Washington street.

J. W. BLAKE,
(Late Colonel Fortieth Indiana Volunteers,)
Je23-d1f Attorney and Claim Agent.

LOST.

LOST.—A NOTE OF TWO HUNDRED DOLLARS, dated May 31st, 1865, drawn by Conrad Spencer in favor of Thomas Adams, and endorsed by William Willetts, payable five months from date. The finder will be suitably rewarded by leaving it at this office. J22-3t

NOTICE.

EXCISE TAX NOTICE.

INTERNAL REVENUE.

ASSESSOR'S OFFICE, SIXTH DISTRICT OF INDIANA, INDIANAPOLIS, June 21, 1865.

THE CITIZENS OF MARION COUNTY, INDIANA, are hereby notified that the Assessors' Annual Lists are now on file in my office (No. 14 New & Talbott's Block) and will remain open for inspection and correction until the 5th day of July next, at which time we will hear and decide upon all appeals which may be made. No deduction can be made after that time.

W. A. BRADSHAW,
Je22-d1d Assessor, Sixth District of Indiana.

ALES.

SANDS'

CELEBRATED CHICAGO

STOCK AND CREAM ALES,

AND XXX PORTER

JOS. O'CONNER, Sole Agent.

No. 54 South Illinois Street,

INDIANAPOLIS, IND

THE undersigned has always on hand a large supply of Barrels and Half Barrels for the Trade, and Quarter Barrels for Private Families.

He also bottles Ale and Porter expressly for Private Families, as it is strongly recommended by Physicians for its medicinal properties.

Je21 d1f JOS. O'CONNER.

TO TRAVELERS.

UNITED STATES MAIL LINE

—FOR—

CALIFORNIA,

VIA THE ISTHMUS OF PANAMA.

GREATLY-REDUCED RATES OF PASSAGE FOR THE SUMMER MONTHS.

Including Railroad Transportation from Aspinwall to Panama, and Provision on board the Steamers.

Through to San Francisco in 22 days.

Steerage	$125
Second Cabin	250
First Cabin	325

PAYABLE IN GREENBACKS.

Officers and enlisted men who have entered the army from the Pacific States, and who have been honorably discharged the service, will be furnished passage at half the regular rates.

For passage, or further information, apply to the General Agent of the Line,

D. B. ALLEN,
No. 5 BOWLING GREEN,
je21-d3weod&w3w NEW YORK CITY.

MILITARY CLAIM AGENCY.

PRISONERS OF WAR!

ALL UNITED STATES SOLDIERS WHO HAVE been captured and imprisoned at Andersonville, Columbia, Millen, Savannah, Libby Prison, Florence, Salisbury, or other Rebel Prisons, or their Heirs, if the Soldier is dead, and the heirs of the lost on the Steamer Sultana, will find it to their interest to call at

BLAKE'S MILITARY CLAIM AGENCY.

Those who cannot visit the city will correspond.

OFFICE—In Sheets' Building, next to Masonic Hall, opposite Metropolitan Theatre.

J. W. BLAKE,
Attorney at Law and Claim Agent.
Indianapolis, Ind., June 16th, 1865. Je20-d1m

ICE CREAM.

Ice Cream Saloon and Confectionery

MRS. REED

HAS FITTED UP HER ROOMS, NO. 39 PENNsylvania street, nearly opposite the Postoffice, and will be pleased to serve every one that may favor her with a call to a dish of pure Ice Cream, an excellent glass of Soda, or anything they may want in the Confectionery line. je17-d1w

HOTELS.

SHERMAN HOUSE,

Opposite Union Depot,

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.,

Scott, Burgess & Co., Proprietors.
je19-d1f

MACY HOUSE,

Corner Market & Illinois Sts.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

E. PENTECOST, Proprietor.

I TAKE PLEASURE IN ANNOUNCING TO MY friends and numerous patrons, that I am now established in this house, which I have refurnished and now thrown open for your reception.

I take the opportunity of thanking my many former friends for their patronage during the two years while I was conducting the Oriental House, and will at all times be glad to see them at my new stand.

my3-d1f E. PENTECOST

PARTNERSHIP.

Notice of Copartnership.

THE undersigned have this day formed a copartnership under the name of Dunn & Karney, to carry on the business of Gas Fitting, Steam Fitting and Plumbing business.

All work done by us will be guaranteed and done at the lowest rates.

We ask the public to give us a trial and solicit their patronage.

J. C. DUNN,
JOHN KARNEY.

DUNN & KARNEY,

GAS & STEAM FITTERS & PLUMBERS,

38 and 40 Kentucky Avenue.

ALL SORTS OF FIXTURES ON HAND AT ALL times and furnished at the lowest rates.
my4-d1f

COPARTNERSHIP.

I HAVE associated with myself in the Livery, Sale and Boarding Stable Business John A. Drew, who from this day has become a partner in said business.

The business of the new firm will be conducted at the old stand, No 10 East Pearl street, in the rear of the Sentinel Building.

Thanking the public for past patronage, I hope they may see fit to continue the same.

JOHN B. SULLIVAN,
of SULLIVAN & DREW.
Indianapolis, May 6, 1865—my8-d1f

AMUSEMENTS.

METROPOLITAN THEATRE.

Corner of Washington and Tennessee Streets.

Manager.....Mr. W. H. Riley.

Friday Evening, June 23d, 1865.

FAREWELL BENEFIT OF

Mr. B. Macauley.

BELLE OF THE SEASON.

PRICES OF ADMISSION.—Parquette and all reserved seats 75c. Dress Circle 50c; Private Boxes, for six persons, $5 00; Orchestra Seats, 75 cents; Gallery and Family Circle, 25 cents; Children in arms, $15.

CHANGE OF TIME:

Doors open at 7½ o'clock precisely. Overture commences at 8 o'clock precisely.

PARTICULAR NOTICE.—The Horse Cars leave the Theater every evening at the close of the performance. People living at a distance can rely on this.

MASONIC HALL

DUPREZ & GREEN'S

ORIGINAL NEW ORLEANS AND METROPOLITAN

MINSTRELS!

FIVE EVENINGS ONLY, COMMENCING

Friday, June 23d, 1865.

ADMISSION.....50 Cents.

CHAS. H. DUPREZ, Manager.

SAM'L POND, J. BLAKESLEE, Advertising Agents.
Je21-d7t

BANKS.

MERCHANTS'

NATIONAL BANK

—OF—

INDIANAPOLIS,

No. 23 North Meridian Street,

Special Agents for the Sale of the 7 3-10 Loan.

THIS BANK IS NOW OPEN FOR THE TRANSaction of business; will do a General Banking business.

Government Securities of all kinds kept constantly on hand and for sale at the most reasonable rates.

HENRY SCHNULL, President.
V. T. MALOTT, Cashier. je9 d1f

MILITARY CLAIM AGENTS.

SAMUEL DELZELL, JONATHAN BROWN, BARTON D. JONES, Attorney at Law.

DELZELL, BROWN & JONES,

MILITARY CLAIM AGENTS

—AND—

ATTORNEYS,

No. 37 East Washington Street,

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

TO RESIGNED, DISCHARGED OR DISMISSED OFFICERS.

AS the Army is now being mustered out, and many Officers will soon be discharged from service, we would call your attention to our facilities for adjusting Officers' accounts and settling claims against the government.

We will procure Certificates of Non-Indebtedness for Officers, and promptly adjust their accounts with the different Bureaus at Washington.

We also Collect Claims for Back Pay, Bounties, Pensions, Horses lost in service, Prize Money, Damaged or Lost Property, Property Lost or Impressed, Quartermasters' Vouchers, Transportation Claims, &c., &c.

We can also supply Ordnance, Clothing, Quartermaster and Medical Returns, Muster-Out Rolls and other Military Papers.

No claims bought or sold.

Officers and others interested in the settlement of Claims against the Government, are invited to call at our office, or address

DELZELL, BROWN & JONES,
No. 37 East Washington street,
my20-d3m Indianapolis, Ind.

COLLARS.

THE LARGEST COLLAR MANUFACTORY

IN THE NORTH-WEST.

BIGELOW'S SATIN-ENAMELED

BYRON COLLARS,

A NEW article of invention. This Collar excels all other Paper Collars for comfort, neatness and economy.

Also a large assortment of

SATIN-ENAMELED GARROTES, LINEN PAPER BYRONS, AND LINEN PAPER GARROTES.

Ladies Satin Enameled Collars and Cuffs; a new and convenient article. The trade supplied at the lowest market prices.

BIGELOW & CO.,
Manufacturers,
my5-d3m 11 La Salle Street, Chicago.

INSURANCE.

TRAVELERS' INSURANCE CO.,

HARTFORD, CONN.

Capitol.....$500,000.

INSURES AGAINST

ACCIDENTS OF EVERY DESCRIPTION.

General Accidental Policies

FOR Five Hundred Dollars, with $3 per week compensation, can be had for $3 per annum, or any other sum between $500 and $10,000 at proportionate rates.

Ten Dollars Premium

Secures a policy for $2,000, or $10 per week compensation for all and every description of accidents—traveling or otherwise—under a general accident policy, at the ordinary rates.

Thirty Dollars Premium

Secures a full policy for $5,000, or $25 per week compensation, as above, at the special rates.

Foreign Risks.

Policies issued for Foreign, West India and California travel. Rates can be learned by application to the Office or Agencies.

Short Time Tickets.

Arrangements are in course of completion by which the traveler will be able to purchase, at any Railway Ticket Office, Insurance Tickets for One or Thirty Days' Travel. Ten cents will buy a ticket for One days' travel, insuring $1,000, or $15 weekly compensation. Ticket Policies may be had for Three, Six and Twelve months, in the same manner.

Hazardous Risks taken at Hazardous Rates. No Medical Examination required. Policies written by the Company's Agents.

Policies for $10,000, and for Five years, can be had by application to the State Agent at Indianapolis, and at the Home Office.

DIRECTORS.

GUSTAVUS F. DAVIS, THOMAS BELKNAP, Jr.
W. H. D. CALLENDER, CHARLES WHITE,
JAS. L. HOWARD, CORNELIUS B. ERWIN,
GEO. W. MOORE, HUGH HARRISON,
MARSHALL JEWELL, GEO. S. GILMAN,
EBENEZER ROBERTS, JONATHAN B. BUNCE.

RODNEY DENNIS, Sec. J. G. BATTERSON, Pres't.
G. F. DAVIS, Vice Pres't.
HENRY A. DYER, General Agent.

H. C. MARTIN, State Agent,
No. 7 Temperance Hall, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. B. DAVIS, Local Agent,
No. 6 Odd Fellows' Hall.

N. B. Agents and Solicitors wanted in every part of the State. may25-d5w

B. M. SPICER & CO.,

REAL ESTATE AGENTS,

AND NOTARIES PUBLIC,

No. 20 1-2 North Illinois Street

Indianapolis, Ind.

5'64 d1y

U. S. LOAN.

UNITED STATES

7.30 LOAN!

THIRD SERIES.

$230,000,000.

By authority of the Secretary of the Treasury, the undersigned, the General Subscription Agent for the sale of United States Securities, offers to the public the third series of Treasury Notes, bearing seven and three-tenths per cent. interest per annum, known as the

7.30 LOAN.

These notes are issued under date of July 15, 1865, and are payable three years from that date in currency, or are convertable at the option of the holder into

U