Weekly Indiana American,
PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY
C. H. BINGHAM, Proprietor.
Office in the National Bank Building,
(third story.)

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION:
$2,50 PER YEAR, IN ADVANCE.
$3,00 " " IF NOT PAID IN ADVANCE.
No postage on papers delivered within this County.

The Indiana American.

"THE UNION, THE CONSTITUTION, AND THE ENFORCEMENT OF THE LAWS."

VOL. 7. NO. 25.] BROOKVILLE, IND., FRIDAY, JUNE 19, 1868. [WHOLE NO. 338.

[From the Congressional Globe.

CHEROKEE AND OSAGE LANDS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Wednesday, June 3, 1868.

Mr. JULIAN, from the Committee on the Public Lands, reported a joint resolution (H. R. No. 286) relative to the lands of the Cherokee and Great and Little Osage Indians; which was read a first and second time.

The joint resolution provides that the President of the United States shall be directed to withhold the issuing of patents [illegible] heretofore sold, or which may hereafter [illegible] under and by virtue of the treaty between the United States and the Cherokee Indians concluded on the 19th of July, 1866, and the treaty between the United States and the Great and Little Osage Indians, concluded on the 29th of September 1865, or under any Indian treaty which may here after be concluded until otherwise provided by law.

Mr. MAYNARD. I ask the gentleman for a few minutes.

Mr. JULIAN. I will yield to the gentleman presently.

Mr. Speaker, the Indian tribes of the United States have no power over their lands except the power of cession to the United States. This House so voted on yesterday. They have the right of occupancy merely, the title being in the United States; and up to the year 1860 the practice of the Government was in conformity to the principle which I state. Since that time our Indian treaties have so revolutionized the practice of the Government as to threaten the entire land policy of the Government. For example: in the year 1866 a treaty was made with the Cherokee Indians by which eight hundred thousand acres were authorized to be transferred in a body to a single purchaser at the rate of one dollar per acre, completely withdrawing that portion of what else would have been a part of the public domain from the control of Congress, which has the rightful constitutional power to make needful rules and regulations respecting the territory and other property of the United States. Another treaty, concluded in the year 1865 with the Great and Little Osage Indians, authorizes the disposition, in a peculiar way, of over three million acres. Similar treaties have been made with the Sacs and Foxes, the Delaware, the Kickapoo, and other Indian tribes since the date I have the news this morning of the conclusion of another treaty with the Great and Little Osage Indians, by which the remnant of their lands, being eight million acres, are transferred to the Leavenworth, Lawrence and Galveston Railroad Company; the treaty itself as I am reliably informed, having been fixed up here in Washington last summer by the attorney of Mr. Sturgis, the president of said railroad company, with a view to private and in utter disregard of the public interest. This treaty, should it be ratified by the Senate, will be a complete defiance of the control and jurisdiction of Congress, and commit to the tender mercies of a railroad company this large body of lands.

Mr. Speaker, it is for Congress, and not the treaty-making power, to say whether we will grant lands to aid in building railroads, and how the public domain shall be managed. By the treaty to which I refer two new reservations, still further West, are set apart for our Indian tribes, containing over seventy three million acres; and if we are to judge the future by the past, in a few years the whole of these lands will be swallowed up by railroad corporations and the Indians driven on to other lands. If this business is to go on in the wretched manner we have been pursuing we might as well abolish the General Land Office or remove it to the Indian Bureau at once and dispense with our land committees. Sir, it is not legally competent—and when I say this I have the concurrence of every lawyer in this House with whom I have conferred—it is not contepter by treaty with any Indian tribes to tade the disposition of the public domain out of the control of Congress. An Indian treaty cannot repeal the laws of Congress, but must itself conform to those laws.

And as a note of warning to the Senate and to these railroad corporations, whose "Indian ring" threatens to rival the "whisky ring," I have reported from the Committee on the Public lands the resolution that has been read by the Clerk; should it become a law, we shall be compelled to return to the old policy by which the Indians will cede their lands directly to the United States, which they are competent to do for a consideration they may agree to accept. Their lands thus ceded will thus fall under the operation of our preemption and homestead laws, and be disposed of as other public lands of the Government. This, Mr. Speaker, is a reason why the committee have reported this resolution, on the passage of which I now demand the previous question.

Mr. MAYNARD. I want to offer an amendment striking out all that relates to the treaty between the Cherokee Indians and the United States; and I desire to state the reason why I offer it.

Mr. JULIAN. How much time?

Mr. MAYNARD. I hope not more than five minutes.

Mr. JULIAN. I will give the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. MAYNARD. The amendment I offer is to strike out of the resolution that which relates to the treaty between the Cherokees and the United States.

Mr. JULIAN. I cannot allow the amendment to be offered. I yield, however, five minutes to allow the gentleman to state his views.

Mr. MAYNARD. I wish to correct what seems to be an erroneous impression of the House in regard to these lands. By the treaty of 1835, which I have before me, these lands were ceded to the Cherokees by patent in fee-simple. The article of the treaty is in these words:

"Whereas it is apprehended by the Cherokees that in the above cession there is not contained a sufficient quantity of land for the accommodation of the whole nation on their removal west of the Mississippi, the United States, in consideration of the sum of $500,000, therefore hereby covenant and agree to convey to the said Indians and their descendants by patent, in fee simple, the following tract of land."

That was ratified by an act of Congress which is here before me. Now, this is the very tract of land embraced in this resolution.

Mr. JULIAN. I understand that perfectly well. If the gentleman had listened to the debate here the other day he would have seen that this resolution does not affect the gentleman's position in any way.

Mr. MAYNARD. I think, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman understood this fact and the other supplemental facts he would not feel justified in offering such a resolution as this to the House and ask its passage. If these lands do not belong to the United States, and if the United States can sell and convey anything for a pecuniary consideration to an Indian, if an Indian has "any rights which a white man is bound to respect," we are bound to respect the title to that tract of land. The treaty of 1866 that is spoken of here is one by which the Indians sell back to the United States this tract. They give back the title in trust to be sold to the United States, and they stipulate for payment for the land, and our action is going to deprive the Indians of the benefit of that treaty. In other words, it is going to take away their lands and give them nothing for it. I would like to have read a portion of a communication, not from speculators, but from the principal chief of that tribe and a number of delegates from the tribe who are here. I think they state that ought to commend it to the attention of the House.

Mr. JULIAN. I have only yielded five minutes.

Mr. VANHORN, of Missouri. I desire to ask the gentleman from Indiana if there is any request from the Cherokee nation, either from its Legislature or from a solitary individual, for the passage of anything of this kind? Has there been presented to the committee anything from the Indian nation on this subject in any form?

Mr. JULIAN. Mr. Speaker, I have not conversed with any representative of the Cherokee nation on this subject. It was neither material nor necessary that I should. The gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Missouri both seem to misunderstand my position. I agree that by patent this land was conveyed to the Cherokee Indians. I recognize the sacredness of their right thereto. Nobody here controverts it. What I say is that when they see fit to cede their land to the United States they must do so for a consideration agreed upon, and cannot make any conditions of cession that shall deprive Congress of the right thenceforward to dispose of and manage the land thus ceded. The Cherokees have no right to deed their lands to England or France, but only to us, and without any conditions as to what we shall do with them. That is my position. The Indians are mere occupants of the soil without title, and we are their guardians, and a treaty between these minor children of the nation and the treaty making power in contravention of the authority of Congress over the public domain and subversive of our laws, is a spurious treaty, a political abortion, a thing unknown to the Constitution, and unworthy of our respect. That is what I assert, and the effect of passing this joint resolution will be to make such treaties void, to restore to our Indian tribes their valid title to their lands until such time as valid treaties can be made.

Mr. VANHORN, of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield long enough to have the letter read? It is a communication addressed to the Speaker of the House by the principal chiefs and delegates of the Cherokee nation now in Washington; not minor children, but many of them the intellectual peers of any gentleman upon this floor.

Mr. JULIAN. I suppose the amount of it is that the Cherokee Indians are said to desire the ratification of this treaty.

Mr. VANHORN, of Missouri. It explains the whole matter of the title to these lands.

Mr JULIAN. I ask the gentleman if there is or can be anything in that letter to effect my position that these Indians have no power to dictate our land policy by treaty?

Mr. VANHORN, of Missouri. It will enlighten the House on the merits of this questions.

Mr. JULIAN. Under the unfortunate limitation of the morning hour the Committee on the Public lands will never get through their pressing and important business if documents of that kind are to be read.

Mr. VANHORN, of Missouri. Then I ask the House not to second the previous question on this resolution. Here is a communication addressed by the authorities of the Cherokee nation to the House explaining this whole matter from beginning to end, and I undertake to say that if any member will read it it will satisfy them upon this question. Now, I deny that the Cherokee Indians or any person in their interest has asked this, and they are, many of them, educated, and the equals of the gentleman from Indiana and myself in the management of their own business. I will state further that this matter has come up within a very few days upon the representations of outside parties, who have proposed to me that the opposition shall be withdrawn if they are paid a certain sum of money.

I do not suppose that the party to whom I refer has approached the committee in the way he has me, or this resolution would not have been reported; but I ask the House to pass over this matter until all the facts can be laid before them; and I pledge myself to lay the facts before them fully, so as to satisfy them on this question.

Mr. MAYNARD. I hope the gentleman from Indiana will withdraw that part of the resolution which relates to the Cherokee Indians, as I am satisfied it does injustice to those Indians.

Mr. WASHBURN, of Wisconsin. I hope the joint resolution will pass, and I hope the gentleman from Indiana will not withdraw that part of it which relates to the Cherokee neutral lands.

Now, as I understand this question—I do not know that I understand it correctly—a treaty was made authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of these lands, and one clause of it authorized the Secretary to dispose of them in one body, if he saw fit, for one dollar an acre. The lands were so disposed of by Mr. Harlan, but not in accordance with the terms of the treaty, he giving a long credit for the payment of the entire sum, with the exception of a very small amount. There was a disturbance created about it, and Mr. Browning rescinded that contract and made a new contract with an individual, Mr. James F. Joy, for the transfer of this entire body of land, the former contract having been made with a pretended emigrant company. Mr. James F. Joy, perhaps not having $800,000 on hand, and finding he can make a good thing of it by entering into a compromise with this emigrant company, agrees to have his contract rescinded and come in under the contract with the emigrant company by which he receives the eight hundred thousand acres, and has a long time for payment, and at a very low rate of interest.

The proposition, therefore, is simply whether James F. Joy shall have this land, some eight hundred thousand acres, for the sum of one dollar per acre, on very long time for payment and very low rate of interest, or whether the Government shall buy these lands for that amount.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. VANHORN, of Missouri. I desire to state that under this treaty of sale settlers are protected in their rights. Each settler upon the land prior to the ratification of the treaty will be allowed one hundred and sixty acres of land at the appraised value.

Mr. WASHBURN, of Wisconsin. Why not let the Government buy this land?

Mr. VAN HORN, of Missouri. The Indians have been trying for thirty years to sell this land to the Government, and the Government would not buy it.

Mr. LAWRENCE, of Ohio. Will the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Julian] yield to me for a few minutes?

Mr. JULIAN. Very well.

Mr. LAWRENCE, of Ohio. It seems to me that the question involved in the bill now before the House is one of vastly more importance than gentlemen are aware of. I think I can state the matter in a very few words so that it can be understood. Prior to the 19th of July, 1866, the Cherokee Indians owned a tract of land in Kansas known as the "Cherokee neutral lands," the title to which they held under a patent from the United States. I make no question now about the validity of the title. By a treaty entered into on the 19th of July, 1866, the Cherokee Indians ceded these lands to the United States in trust to be sold and the proceeds to be paid over to the Indians. The seventeenth article of that treaty is as follows:

"ART. XVII. The Cherokee nation hereby cedes, in trust to the United States, the tract of land in the State of Kansas which was sold to the Cherokees by the United States, under the provisions of the second article of the treaty of 1835; and also that strip of the land ceded to the nation by the fourth article of said treaty which is included in the State of Kansas, and the Cherokees consent that said lands may be included in the limits and jurisdiction of the said State.

"The lands herein ceded shall be surveyed as the public lands of the United States are surveyed, under the direction of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, and shall be appraised by two disinterested persons, one to be designated by the Cherokee national council and one by the Secretary of the Interior, and, in case of disagreement, by a third person, to be mutually selected by the aforesaid appraisers; the appraisement to be not less than an average of $1 25 per acre, exclusive of improvements.

"And the Secretary of the Interior shall, from time to time, as such surveys and appraisements are approved by him, after due advertisements for sealed bids, sell such lands to the highest bidders for cash in parcels not exceeding one hundred and sixty acres and not less than the appraised value: *Provided*, That whenever there are improvements of the value of fifty dollars made on the lands not being mineral, and owned and personally occupied by any person for agricultural purposes at the date of the signing hereof, such persons so owning, and in person residing on such improvements; shall, after due proof, made under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, be entitled to buy, at the appraised value, the smallest quantity of land in legal subdivisions which will include his improvements, not exceeding in the aggregate one hundred and sixty acres, the expenses of survey and appraisement to be paid by the Secretary out of the proceeds of sale of said land: *Provided*, That nothing in this article shall prevent the Secretary of the Interior from selling the whole of said neutral lands in a body to any responsible party, for cash, for a sum not less than $800,000."

Under this provision of the treaty the Secretary of the Interior undertook to sell these lands. The objection which I now make is not to the title of the Indians to these lands, but it is that the *treaty-making power* cannot execute such a trust imposed upon the Government or any officer thereof, in any form, without the aid of an act of Congress. Sir, if the Indians who occupy the Territories and reservations can by treaty convey their lands to the Government of the United States in trust, to be sold for their benefit as in this case, without the intervention of an act of Congress, then almost the entire public lands of this country can, and I fear will be, disposed of in this way, and the public domain will be given up to monopolies and speculators, and the whole homestead and land policy of the Government be subverted. I deny that any such thing can be done.

In the remarks I have made on several occasions during the present session of Congress, I have referred to authorities without quoting them at large, giving construction to the treaty-making power of this nation. To these I may now add another. Attorney General Cushing, in an opinion found in volume 8, pages 440, 444 of the "Opinions of the Attorneys General," decided in substance that *where a treaty is executory, requiring the action of the legislative branch of the Government in appropriating money, the act of Congress making the appropriation, and not the treaty, must govern the executive officers of the Government.* In other words, the treaty-making power, has limits, and when it attempts to go beyond this it is subject to the control of the law-making power. Whatever under the Constitution may be properly subject to the control of an act of Congress cannot be claimed as falling within a rightful exercise of the treaty-making power. This Government cannot under cover of the treaty-making power, *execute a trust* for the sale of lands. The officers who are to execute such trust owe their existence to an act of Congress which may be repealed at pleasure, and thus leave no officer to execute it. A patent cannot be issued in execution of such trust without the authority of an act of Congress. The Government holds the legal title to the trust lands, and under the Constitution Congress alone can—

"Make rules and regulations for the disposition of the public lands."

Whether held in trust or otherwise, I will not now stop to inquire into the power to accept or execute such trusts or the expediency of assuming its exercise. Nor will I now inquire how far the Indian chiefs, who executed the treaty of July 19, 1866, could convey in trust a title held by the Cherokee tribe or nation of Indians. But assuming that the Indian chiefs had power to convey the lands of their tribe or nation, and that a treaty is a proper mode of making the conveyance yet it does not follow that either a *duty* or a *power* is thereby devolved on the officers of this Government to execute the trust by making sales. The treaty to which I have referred attempts to clothe the Secretary of the Interior with the power, and to require of him the performance of the duty. But whence are his powers derived and how are his duties defined? By acts of Congress, no one of which has authorized him to execute trusts like this on behalf of Indian tribes. Who is authorized to receive and pay out the money, and by what authority? What is the liability in case of a misapplication of moneys? Who shall determine the mode of its distribution? The whole scheme rests on no valid authority whatever. To assert that the treaty-making power is competent to execute such a trust, is to assert that it can create the officers necessary to accomplish the end, if they do not, as they may not, exist in pursuance of an act of Congress. But by the Constitution all offices not therein provided for must be created by a law of Congress. Such officers can only exist "in pursuance of a law" of Congress.

In the brief space of time allotted to me I cannot discuss this question fully, but I have said enough to show that this trust cannot be executed without the aid of act of Congress. I have shown that the treaty-making power has attempted to encroach on the rights of the law making power. It is subverting the prerogatives and powers of Congress, and its encroachments are all the more alarming because it is attempting to subvert the homestead and land policy enacted in solemn laws by Congress. It is encroaching on the rights of labor and of the people by creating huge monopolies of lands which ought to be dedicated to the sacred purpose of making homes for the homeless and landless poor.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Van Horn] in all that he has said in commendation of the chiefs or agents of the Cherokee Indians. I know some of them personally as intelligent and worthy gentlemen. The Cherokees have just ground of complaint against our Government. And for one, I would do them justice. Let the Government buy their lands at once, pay for them $800,000 in money or bonds or other lands, as may be agreed, and then put them into market to actual settlers at the minimum price of $1 25 an acre until the Government is reimbursed for its expenditures, and then open up the residue of the lands to homestead entries. This will bring railroads, with thriving villages and independent farmers, and Kansas will rejoice in the wisdom of the policy which will secure these results.

Mr. MAYNARD. I desire to ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Julian] a question.

Mr. JULIAN. Very well.

Mr. MAYNARD. These lands having been conveyed by patent in fee simple to the Cherokee tribe of Indians, a civilized people, a community recognized as such, by virtue of what authority do we assume any control over these lands after the date of that conveyance? Was there any condition, express or implied, attached to the grant by the United States to these Indians?

Mr. JULIAN. In answer to the gentleman I will say that I do not pretend that we have any control at all over these lands; the Cherokees were the absolute owners under their patent. But what I say is, that when they undertook to dispose of these lands by treaty, they have no power thereby to repeal the land laws of Congress, or to take away our jurisdiction over the lands ceded as a part of the public domain. A treaty cannot repeal a law of Congress.

Mr. MAYNARD. The gentleman certainly does not call these lands a part of these lands a part of the public domain any more than a lot here in the city of Washington which the United States may become possessed of in payment of a debt.

Mr. JULIAN. It is very remarkable, if these Indians having the title to these lands by patent, conveyed them to us, and yet they do not belong to us. As I have repeatedly stated, they had no power other than to cede these lands to the United States. The gentleman himself, in defending this treaty, necessarily asserts title in the United States; and what I ask is, that henceforward our Indian tribes shall content themselves with the simple power of cession.

Their power by treaty is exhausted by the cession, and it is not competent for them to annex any conditions subversive of the land policy of the United States.

I demand the previous question

The previous question was seconded and the main question ordered; and under the operation thereof the bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time.

The question being on the passage of the bill.

Mr. VANHORN, of Missouri, moved that the bill be laid on the table.

The question was taken, and the motion was declared not agreed to.

Mr. VAN HORN, of Missouri, called for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

So the motion to lay on the table was not agreed to.

The bill was passed.

Mr. JULIAN moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The Record of Schuyler Colfax.

The following are extracts from the Congressional speeches of Schuyler Colfax. He said of the employment of negro troops:

"I do not call negro soldiers better than white ones. If I were to express my own opinion it would be that those of my own color are better and braver. For I have always told you, in spite of charges to the contrary, that I believed the Anglo Saxon race was superior to any other that walks the footstool of God!"

So he said of moral faithfulness in legislation.

"Whatever traveling in the valley of humiliation or disaster, or keeping my eye fixed on the heavens, I believe God reigns! I don't believe blessings will fall upon the Confederacy. God's ways are sometimes dark, but sooner or later they reach the shining hills of day!"

He first announced the Republican platform after the breach with Mr. Johnson thus:

"Let us make haste slowly, and we can then hope that the foundations of our government, when thus reconstructed on the basis of indisputable loyalty, will be as eternal as the stars.

In like manner, on the 10th of April, 1866, when he made mild but manly issue with Johnson, he said of the civil rights bill, in the first moment of its enactment:

"That law, misrepresented as it has been by its opponents in Congress, will never be repealed, and in the years that are coming it will be the proudest recollection and the crowning honor of those men who stood up in the national councils, that they gave to that American Magna Charta their cordial support."

He treated in this way a taunt of the Democracy:

"The new nick-name flung at us is "Radicals." I would rather be called a Radical than a rebel, at any time I am a Radical for right against wrong; for liberty against slavery; for justice against tyranny—a Radical friend of my country, and Radical hater of every enemy of my native land. I believe in a Radical Government "of the people by the people" the world over and my sympathies go out toward the Radicals who are trying to imitate our free institutions in Greece, Italy, France, Ireland and Mexico. I wish to see a belt of Republics encircle the globe."

Here is another curt passage:

"I am for leveling up rather than for leveling down. God do so to me and more also, if I do aught more to crush any man down lower."

Grant the Planner of Sherman's March.

In an address to the Philadelphia Union League the other night, Gov. Geary related the following important fact:

On a certain occasion, when dining with Grant at Chattanooga, after the cloth had been removed he called for his maps, which he spread before me, and said: "Sir, you and your division have been instrumental in obtaining the victories around this city. The plan for the next campaign is already formed, and it is proper that you should know it. I intend to concentrate my troops around this place, and pour them on Atlanta, while a strong attack is made on Richmond. After Atlanta falls, a line will be taken for the sea shore, ending either at Charleston or Savannah; and having thus made our point, we will enter the Carolinas and attack Richmond.' This was in 1863, nine months before the city of Atlanta was taken. Justice should be done, and I tell you so that you will know who it was that planned the march to the sea, and bisected the Confederacy and brought the rebellion to a termination.

Why are good husbands like dough? Because women need them.

Prize fighting may not be penny-wisdom, but it is certainly pound-folly.

The Chase Movement.

There appears to be a strong feeling among the more politic Democratic leaders of the Eastern States in favor of giving Chief Justice Chase the nomination for President by the Democratic National Convention. They argue that as the slavery question has been settled and the Democrats of the South would be content to concede qualified negro suffrage, there is nothing to prevent the party from constructing a platform satisfactory to Mr. Chase, and that his nomination would bring to the support of the Democracy a sufficient number of conservative Republicans to insure the defeat of Grant and Colfax, and thus restore to the long hungering politicians of the Democratic party their ancient stalls at the public crib. They do not believe that the country is yet prepared to place at the head of the Government a man who was opposed to the war for the suppression of the rebellion, and, therefore, they dread the consequences of the nomination of Mr. Pendleton, or any other candidate of like copperhead antecedents. Says the New York *Herald*:

"The people of this country are not prepared to ignore the principles and results of the war which are so fresh in their minds, and Mr Pendleton, who stands in direct antagonism to these, would be defeated."

It calls on him, therefore, to patriotically forego the barren honor of a nomination, for the sake of the country, the Democratic party and the defeat of the Republicans. This done, the *Herald* would have the Convention nominate Mr. Chase, with General Dix as Vice President. This, it says, is just the ticket to win "and give assurance of an able and conservative movement."

Governor Seymour, and all the prominent leaders of the Democratic party in New York are in favor of this policy, and if the mass of the party managers were as shrewd as they, we should anticipate the nomination of the ticket suggested by the *Herald*, but they might as well sing psalms to a congregation of Hindoos as to attempt to get rid of Mr. Pendleton in this way. He is the representative of the virulent copperheads of the Northwest, and they will give him up only when beaten by a square vote in the New York Convention.

Vallandigham, Brick Pomery, Milligan and the vast constituency they represent, would almost as soon commit suicide as to vote for General Dix for Vice President, the man who gave the famous order to shoot down any man who fired upon the American flag. They think just as little, too, of Chase as they do of Dix, and will dismiss with contempt the proposition to make the life-long abolitionist, Salmon P. Chase, their candidate for President.

The Eastern Democrats do not seem to realize that the strongest bond of union among Western Copperheads is hatred of the negro, and a fanatical hostility to negro suffrage: if they did, they would perceive at once that the acceptance by the latter of a candidate who owes all the influence and reputation he possesses to his advocacy of the rights of the negro, and who is a known supporter of the principle of negro suffrage, is simply impossible.

With Chase and Dix for their candidates the Western Democrats would be so metamorphosed that they would not know themselves, and they do not intend to lose their identity.—[Journal.

TO-MORROW presents its "easy pillow" in vain to those who believe in the tremendous importance of to day, and are aware of the possibility of no succeeding to morrow. But those who are allowed to see the sun of the morrow will look in vain for that resting-place which fancy offered to their indolent humor. When to day has become yesterday, and to morrow has settled into to day, we shall not find that pillow every easy which is crowded with postponed duties of so many yesterdays, besides its own appropriate demands.

DOGS seem to have been largely introduced into some parts of Belgium as an article of food, though in a more unostentatious manner than horses have been in France. So many dogs have latterly disappeared in Antwerp that some special investigation was made. Two persons were apprehended who confessed that within the year they had stolen some two hundred dogs, the skins of which, sold to toy makers, went for the manufacture of children's drums; the grease made excellent pomade; and the carcasses were passed through the sausage-making machines.

A MAINE man obtained, a few weeks since, a pair of fowls in Massachusetts styled Magenta, from their beautiful Magenta-colored plumage. They were universally admired, and the lucky owner engaged to sell more eggs than his handsome biddy could possibly have laid in a life time. Unfortunately the pretty pair were exposed to the damp weather, and got thoroughly wet, when the Magenta disappeared, leaving nothing but a pair of common white barn-yard fowls.

A Connecticut Democrat has lately been receiving a Republican paper but it disturbed him so much that he ordered it discontinued. It still kept coming, however, and on stating his greivances to some of his friends, one of them remarked: "They think they can make a Republican of you."—"Not by a d—d sight," he replied; "*they'll find out they're casting pearls before swine!*"

EXCELLENCIES.—There is nothing purer than honesty, nothing sweeter than charity, nothing stronger than love, nothing brighter than virtue, nothing more steadfast than faith. These united in one character form the purest, sweetest, richest, holiest and most enduring happiness.

An early spring—jumping out of bed at four o'clock in the morning.

A BAD DEBT—The owing of a grudge.

TERMS OF ADVERTISING.

TRANSIENT.
One square, (10 lines,) one insertion.....$1 00
One square, two insertions.....1 50
One square, three insertions.....2 00
All subsequent insertions, per square.....50

YEARLY.
One column, changeable quarterly.....$75 00
Three-quarters of a column.....50 00
One-half of a column.....35 00
One-quarter of a column.....20 00
One-eighth of a column.....12 00

Transient advertisements should in all cases be paid for in advance.

Unless a particular time is specified when handed in, advertisements will be published until ordered out and charged accordingly.

Definitions of Character.

Fine Fellow—The man who advertises in your paper, the man who never refuses to lend you money, and the fellow who is courting your sister.

Gentle People—The young lady who lets her mother do the ironing for fear of spoiling her hands, the miss who wears thin shoes on a rainy day, and the young gentleman who is ashamed to be seen walking with his father.

Industrious People—The young lady who reads romances in bed, the friend who is always engaged when you call, and the correspondent who can not find time to answer your letter.

Unpopular Personages—The fat man in an omnibus, a tall man in a crowd, and a short man on a parade.

Timid People—A lover about to pop the question, a man who does not like to be shot at, and the steam-boat company with a case of cholera.

Dignified Men—A chit in a country town, a midshipman on a quarter-deck, and a school committee on examination-day.

Persecuted People—Women by that tyrant man, boys by their parents and teachers, and all poor people by society at large.

Unhappy People—Old bachelors and old maids.

Humble Person—The husband who does his wife's churning, the wife who blacks her husband's boots, and the man who thinks you do him much honor.

Mean people—The man who kicks people when they are down, and the subscriber who refuses to pay for his paper.

Sensible People—You and I.

Dr. Johnson's Prayer.

Perhaps Dr. Johnson never composed anything so truly excellent as his prayer against inquisitive and perplexing thoughts. We insert it here, in the expectation that it will reach some heart which needs it:

"Oh Lord, my maker and protector, who has graciously sent me into this world to work out my salvation, enable me to drive from me all such unquiet and perplexing thoughts as may hinder or mislead me in the practice of those duties which thou hast required. When I behold the works of thy hands, give me grace always to remember thy thoughts are not my thoughts, nor thy ways my ways. And while it shall please thee to continue me in this world, where much is to be done and little to be known, teach me by thy Holy Spirit to withdraw my mind from unprofitable and dangerous inquiries, from difficulties vainly curious, and doubts impossible to be solved. Let me rejoice in the light which thou has imparted, let me serve thee with active zeal and humble confidence, and wait with patient expectation for the time in which the soul which thou receivest, shall be satisfied with knowledge. Grant this, O Lord, for Jesus Christ's sake. Amen."

"I Will!"

We like that strong, robust expression. No one, having uttered it in sincerity, was ever a mean, crying man. The pigmies of the world did not trouble him, although they rose in masses to pull him down. He speaks, and the indomitable will prevails. His enemies fall before him. He rides forth a conqueror. Would you be great? Would you be distinguished for your scientific or literary attainments? Look not mournfully at your lot, but with "I will" breathing from your lips and bursting from a great heart, you can not but prevail. Show us the man that never rose higher than a toad-stool, and whose influence died with his breath, and we will point you to a groping, cringing wretch, who trembles at the approach of a spider, and faints beneath a thunder cloud. Let the fires of energy play through your veins, and if your thoughts are directed in right channels you will startle the slumbering universe.

There is mountebank in London who hurls up a potato many feet in the air, and catches in (in both senses) on his bare brow. The forehead, subjected to this visitation is constantly kept inflamed. 'You know,' says he, 'there isn't another man in London that can do the potato trick. I'll give any man round me a sovereign that will attempt it, letting the potato fairly strike his head. What, no bidders? Then I must try once more myself.' And with this he flings up a big potato as high as he can, and down it comes presently upon his bumpy forehead, where it flies into twenty pieces, much to the delight of the spectators, who pelt him with half pence.

LYING supplies those who are addicted to it with a plausible apology for every crime, and with a supposed shelter for every punishment. It tempts them to rush into danger from the mere expectation of impunity; and, when practiced with frequent success, it reaches them to confound the gradations of guilt, from the effects of which there is, in their imaginations at least one sure and common protection. It corrupts the early simplicity of youth; it blasts the fairest blossoms of genius, and will, most assuredly, counteract every effort by which we may hope to improve the talents and mature the virtues of those whom it infects.

A FRENCH journal records a remarkable case of transfusion of blood. A young man who had been poisoned by carbonic acid, was found lying insensible on the floor of his room. Artificial respiration was resorted to, and by perseverance breathing was restored and the pulse returned; but two hours later the patient relapsed into a state bordering on death. Transfusion of blood was then recommended, and the effect produced was astonishing; the pulse rose at once, breathing became more regular, the eyes opened, and after a few minutes the patient was enabled to drink a little water. His state continued precarious for upward of nine hours, after which he speedily recovered.