

Dear Telegraph: Winter continues here in all its glory. A few inches of snow, a sleeting rain, followed by a keen North-wester, has covered the streets again with a glare of ice, making pedestrianism dangerous. But, so far as we are concerned, it makes but little difference, as we have time to spend in that exercise. The House, for the last week, has been in a mood of the most intense industry, and every moment is employed either in session or in committee. But, with all the disposition to dispatch business which actuates the majority of the members, still the progress seems to be slow, and if a full consideration is given to all the bills now upon our tables, an adjournment is a thing of the far distant future.

Over three hundred bills, and more than fifty joint resolutions, have been introduced into the two Houses. Of these, eighteen have been passed; most of them making partial appropriations, and authorizing towns to borrow money. I have not time to count the number strangled on their way to the statute book, but the destruction has been very great.

When it is recollected that there are about one hundred and forty members in the two Houses—that each of these gentlemen has the right to introduce as many projects as he pleases, and on any manner of subjects, and that members fresh from the "Rural Districts" see a nascent immortality in every scheme, it will not be astonishing that the tables groan under the weight of "bills" that have but little chance to "develop" into the full proportions of authoritative "laws."

And when it is recollected further that each of these bills have to go through the process of being read three times on three separate days—referred to the Committee of the Whole, and there discussed to the heart's content of all the members—then referred to some standing committee, again discussed, amended, reported back to the House and again discussed—put to vote and either carried or lost, no matter—vote reconsidered, bill again referred, and again amended, discussed and passed, until the bill is finally disposed of as an intolerable nuisance, it will not be wonderful that time is consumed without much to show for it. But if any one will take the trouble to look over the bills introduced, and reflect upon all this routine, we think they will award the meed of praise to that Legislature which prevents the final passage of the greatest number of these crude projects.

Only think of it! Nearly four hundred bills and resolutions already introduced, and still pouring in every day in an increasing torrent, as the members become more expert in the use of the forms necessary to be observed in getting up these bills. Well, with this pleasant review of the daily proceedings of a legislative body, our readers can guess how very interesting the business will become, after the first novelty of the thing has worn off.

Our readers will remember the usatempted to be made of the celebrated "white admittance" law by the Democratic stumpers last Fall. They will also remember that we took the position that the law was unconstitutional, and ought to be repealed. The principle of that act has been before the Supreme Court, and by the unanimous decision of all the judges, pronounced unconstitutional and void. The decision was delivered by Judge Gholson, and concurred in by all the others. The opinion is a very able one, and settling, as it does, a very important constitutional principle, we enclose a copy for publication in the Telegraph. Our readers will see by this decision that the Court has taken the precise view of the subject which we did upon the stump. True, we claim no great credit for our view of the matter, for the position was so plain that it was always a matter of surprise how any one could honestly sustain the law.

This decision has given a grand illustration of the proverb that "circumstances alter cases." Every one will remember the perfect howl set up by the Statesman and other Democratic papers and orators over the failure of the Republicans to nominate Judge Swan, after his decision in the "rescue case." It was asserted that Judge Swan was stricken down because of that opinion, and from Gov. Ranney down, the cry was raised of "proscription," and to refuse to re-nominate Judge on account of his opinions was "striking at the independence of the Judiciary." But no sooner has the bill been passed, including Judges Peck and Scott, who were so extravagantly extolled by the Statesman than, delivered a clear, rational and just decision, maintaining the integrity of the Constitution and the rights of the people under it, than this same Statesman comes out with the most inflammatory and fanatical appeals to the basest passions and prejudices of the ignorant and depraved to strike down these very Judges, simply because of said opinion! If the failure to re-nominate Judge Swan was proscription, we would like to know by what name to call the raving of the Statesman, calling for the political death of Judges Peck, Scott and their associates?

During the week there has been an array of legal talent employed in the Supreme Court, which, perhaps, was never before engaged in any single case. The case itself was the most important, and involved the largest amount of money of any case ever tried in the State. The amount of money involved was more than one hundred millions of dollars, and the points raised covered all the

rights, interests, liabilities, &c., of corporations, and especially railroads, to their creditors and to the public. The Attorney General, S. F. Vinton, Col. Swain, Judges Ranney, Thurman, Kenyon, Stanbery, and others of equal note were engaged as counsel, and their arguments are said to have been the ablest ever presented before the Court. The decision will not be delivered for some time.

But our letter is long enough and we must close.

Correspondence.

Editors of Telegraph: Your enlarged, neatly printed, and richly freighted Telegraph comes weekly to me; for which I am thankful. Although we see many dailies here, yet your paper is read with much interest by the boarders, and is pronounced by them a first class journal. T. A. Plants' excellent letters from Columbus are read with much pleasure by the lovers of political literature.

VARIETIES.

The Melodion Hall was uncomfortably crowded Saturday night, the 18th inst., with persons eager to see and hear that world-renowned woman, Lola Montez, lecture on "John Bull at Home." Her appearance, with a powerful operaglass to aid the natural vision, was, to me, of medium size, from one hundred to a hundred and ten pounds in weight, black glossy hair, sparkling black eyelashes, arched over with jet black eyelashes, brunette complexion, ivory white teeth, about forty. She came forward, unaccompanied on the stage, to the Speaker's desk, at precisely 8 o'clock, amid a hearty greeting from the audience, whom she gracefully bowed to, and commenced her lecture in a clear and forcible style, as if no word was to be lost or idea confused, but should make a lasting impression on the minds of her hearers. Yet her lecture was interspersed with anecdotes, which made it exceedingly amusing and pleasant. She dwelt much on the similarity of character, which she asserts exists in the Yankee of New England and the native Englishman. She claims that enterprise, impudence, energy, quackery and humbuggery are as rife in Britain as in our Eastern States. She denied that any difference existed even among the women. For she said the women's rights ideas were strenuously agitated and advocated more than fifty years ago by the strong minded women of England. As evidence that the Yankees are like Englishmen in their business, she says that the Pilgrims before taking the lands from the Indians met in solemn convention and passed resolutions, which was the way Englishmen done their important business. Resolution first was unanimously adopted—viz: The land is the Lord's. Secondly, they were the Lord's people; therefore his lands belonged to them.

The Countess delivered her second lecture, on "Fashion," Monday night, at the same place, to an immense audience, of both sexes, who greeted her appearance on the stage with a round of applause. Half an hour before her lecture began, 8 o'clock, seats and standing room were at a premium, or, rather, not to be had at any price. Scores left without getting a peep at, or hearing Lola, for the want of room in the spacious Hall. Her dress was made of black serge, over a white satin one, moderately hooped out, flounced with broad lace, embroidered white under-sleeves, embroidered cape, head dress, white embroidered handkerchief held in her right hand while speaking, no ornaments whatever, not even a finger-ring; in short, she was dressed in exceedingly good taste. The Countess condemned in strong terms low-necked dresses and high collars, as being unbecoming and highly detrimental to health. But approved of hoops for their lessening skirts and thereby diminishing weight. She began her lecture by saying that the tyrant, "Fashion," commenced its sway in the Garden of Eden, and had its origin in the sensins and follies of mankind. Then she occupied one hour in outlining different fashions which had prevailed among nations at various ages of the world, and in contrasting the extremes of both sexes. She says the best way to cure the evil of excessive fashion is by ridiculing it. She says that the gentlemen ought to be very thankful that the inflated balloons, which the ladies wear, are not so large but what they can get through the crowd.

Washington one hundred and twenty-eighth birthday was celebrated here on the 22d inst., by a general outpouring into the streets of the people of both sexes, as it was a love of a day, and by all of the military, and by the stars and stripes floating triumphantly over the city by thousands, by the city railroad cars being decorated outside with flags, wreaths of flowers around their entire bodies, and evergreens, life-like portraits in gilt frame on the tops and in front, of him who was "first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen." These rolling places were mostly drawn on this occasion, through the day, by four beautifully decorated horses, and the cars were loaded with people from morn till night, and the day's proceedings concluded by grand balls and concerts at night.

Spring is here in appearance, for rich varieties of beautiful hot-house flowers and hot-bed radishes have made their appearance in the markets. The merchants have been busy, and are now, in receiving their Spring stock of goods, which has not, as yet, had the effect to improve trade, owing to the coolness of the season; but a good trade is anticipated when warm weather makes its appearance.

Land sharks are in the market, purchasing soldiers' land warrants at 73 to 74 cents per acre, which will soon all pass into the hands of speculators, who will

locate them in large bodies of land, and prevent men of small means from getting hold of them and purchasing farms in the far West, and becoming actual settlers there, and improving the country. A man by the name of Hust had bought seven thousand acres of warrants the other day, and has gone West to locate them.

R. B. Opinion of the Supreme Court of Ohio on the question of the rights of citizens of the United States in the election of the President and Vice-President.

No. 119. Alfred J. Anderson vs. Thomas Millikin et al. Error to Court of Common Pleas of Butler County.

Gholson, J. This was an action brought by the plaintiff against the defendants, judges of an election, for the refusal of his vote. It was submitted by the parties to the Court of Common Pleas of Butler county, upon an agreed statement of facts, showing: "That the father of the plaintiff was a white man without any admixture of African blood, that the mother of the plaintiff is a mixture of three-fourths white and one-fourth African blood; that neither the plaintiff or his mother were slaves or held as such; that the said plaintiff for twenty-five years last past has been a resident of the second ward of the city of Hamilton, in Butler county, in the State of Ohio, and that in all respects he was at the time of the election hereinafter referred to, a citizen of the State of Ohio, and was entitled to vote at said election. That the said plaintiff, unless disqualified on account of the admixture of African blood, as aforesaid. That on the fourth day of November, A. D. 1856, the said plaintiff, at the polls of the said ward, offered to vote for electors of President and Vice-President of the United States, and that said defendants being then and there the judges of said election, refused to receive the vote of said plaintiff on account of his admixture of African blood, and for no other reason." The statement further showed that it was agreed: "that the said defendants were not actuated by malice or ill-will in the refusal of said vote, but supposed themselves to be in the line of their official duty, and that if the facts as herein agreed, he shall recover only nominal damages."

The case having been heard upon the agreed statement of facts, the Court of Common Pleas rendered judgment for the defendants, to which the plaintiff excepted. And to reverse that judgment a petition in error has been filed in this Court. The Constitution of 1802 contained the following provision as to the persons entitled to the exercise of the elective franchise: "In all elections, all white male inhabitants above the age of twenty-one years, having resided in the State one year next preceding the election, and who have paid or are charged with a State or county tax, shall enjoy the right of an elector; but no person shall be entitled to vote except in the county or district in which he shall actually reside at the time of the election." (Art. 4, Sec. 1.) The use of the word "white," in this section, necessarily excluded those inhabitants of the State, though otherwise qualified, who were not white, and called for a determination of the question, who should be deemed "white," within the meaning of the Constitution. This question was answered by repeated judicial decisions. It was considered in view of blood or race, and the rule adopted to meet the obvious difficulty of a mixture of blood or races, was, that the blood of the white race must predominate. There was a white race and a black race, and the obvious intent was to exclude the latter from the rights of citizenship. If an inhabitant of the State had an equal portion of the blood of each race, the exclusion still applied, but if he had a larger proportion of the blood of the white race, he was to be regarded as white, within the meaning of the Constitution. (Polly Gray vs. The State, 4 Ohio Rep. 353; Williams vs. School Directors, Wright's R. 379; Jeffries vs. Ankeny, 11 Ohio, 376; Thacker vs. State, 11 Ohio, 387; Chalmers vs. State, 11 Ohio, 386; Lane vs. Baker, 12 Ohio, 237; Stewart vs. Southard, 17 Ohio, 402.)

There was, probably, no word in the constitution of 1802, the meaning of which had been more fully and authoritatively settled by judicial construction, than the word "white," as connected with the exercise of the elective franchise. And undoubtedly, at the time of the adoption of the constitution of 1851, persons coming within the description above stated, in whom the blood of the white race predominated, and who were in other respects qualified, had a right to the exercise of the elective franchise. The first section of the fifth article of that constitution provides that: "Every white male citizen of the United States, of the age of twenty-one years, who shall have been a resident of the State one year next preceding the election, and of the county, township, or ward in which he resides, such time as may be provided by law, shall have the qualifications of an elector, and be entitled to vote at all elections." And the question presented in this case is, whether it was the intention of the framers of the constitution above described of a right which had before enjoyed—and of a right so valuable and highly prized as that of an elector?

In any ordinary case—in any case in which feeling and prejudice did not enter as elements to disturb the judgment, no one would probably claim that a most important right once enjoyed, and, necessarily, in its nature continuing, should be taken away, and annulled, unless the intent to do so was clearly and explicitly expressed. Argument and inference from the use of doubtful and indefinite terms would not be deemed sufficient. We trust that, without influence from any prejudice we might personally feel, or from any which we might suppose to be felt by others, we can, in the language of the Chief Justice, administer justice without respect to persons. And, regarding this as a case to be governed by the ordinary rules of construction, we might safely stop, by adopting the language of a distinguished and lamented judge, expressed while acting as a member of the convention which framed the present Constitution, and say of the section of it under consideration, that it is substantially the same as the corresponding provision of the old Constitution." (Mr. Hitchcock of Georgia, 2 Debates of Convention 639, 640.)

But the interest and importance of the question demands from us further remarks. We are bound to presume that those who framed the present constitution knew what judicial construction the words of the former had received. If we look at the record of their proceedings, published under their authority, we know as a fact, that the construction which had been given to the word "white," was expressly and directly brought to their attention. A proposition was made to strike out the word so as to remove the exclusion of persons

not white, and it was contended "that the term 'white' is vague in its significance, and has no practical meaning." In answer to this, it was stated that it had been the case, if the word had not received a practical construction for nearly fifty years, but there is now no question that may, with more safety be submitted to any of our tribunals, from the Supreme Court to the Justice of the Peace." (Mr. Worthington, 2 Debates of Convention, 639.) And a member in favor of the proposition, commenting on the decision of the courts, as one they had been obliged to make to get over the difficulty from the use of the word "white," expressly stated that decision to be, "that a person having less than half black blood, shall have the rights of a white man." (Mr. Humphreill, 2 Debates of Convention, 653.) In view of this knowledge, presumed and actual, of the construction of the word "white," had received in reference to the exercise of the elective franchise, we find the same word in the same connection in the present constitution. By the clear and well settled rules of construction, we are bound to conclude, that the word was used in the same sense, and was intended to include all persons whom the meaning it had received would embrace. To induce any doubt as to the correctness of this conclusion, reference must be had to words in the context, not found in the corresponding provision of the old Constitution. The only words from which any such doubt can possibly arise, are the words "inhabitants," substituted for the word "inhabitants" in the former provision. And we do not suppose that this doubt was ever entertained, until after a recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. (Dred Scott vs. Sandford, 19 How. 393.) But it is a mistake to suppose that the question, whether any descendant of the original inhabitants would prevent a person from being a citizen of the United States, was presented or decided in that case. On the contrary the plaintiff in that case was alleged in the plea in abatement to be, "a negro of African descent, whose ancestors were of pure African blood, and who were brought to this country and sold as slaves." (19 How. 409.) And it was said by Taney, C. J., in the opinion of the Court: "The question is simply this: Can a negro, whose ancestors were imported into this country, and sold as slaves, become a member of the political community formed and brought into existence by the Constitution of the United States, and as such become entitled to the immunities and privileges guaranteed by that instrument to the citizen? One of which rights is the privilege of suing in a court of the United States in the case specified in the Constitution. It will be observed, that the plea applies to that class of persons whose ancestors were negroes of the African race, and imported into this country, and sold and held as slaves.—The only matter in dispute is, whether the descendants of such persons, who are the descendants of Africans who were imported into this country and sold as slaves, are citizens of the State, in the sense in which the word citizen is used in the Constitution of the United States. And this being the only matter in dispute on the pleadings, the Court must be understood as speaking in this opinion of that class of the population of the United States, who are the descendants of Africans who were imported into this country and sold as slaves." (19 How. 403.)

Indeed it is not probable that the Supreme Court of the United States would have announced a rule excluding persons, having any admixture of the blood of the African race, from the rights of citizenship, without reference to the constitutional and legal provisions then and now in force in many of the States, having a strong bearing upon the question, and upon the effect of such a rule. In North Carolina, where, before the adoption in 1835, of amendments to the Constitution of that State, it is well known, that free blacks and mulattoes, under the general designation of "free citizens," had the right of suffrage, and then made is in these words: "No free negro, free mulatto, or free person of mixed blood, descended from negro ancestors to the fourth generation inclusive, (though one ancestor of each generation may have been a white person,) shall vote for members of the senate or house of commons." (Rev. Code, N. C. 23.) The first section of the fourth article of the Constitution of the State of Tennessee provides that: "Every free white man, of the age of twenty-one years, being a citizen of the United States, and a citizen of the county wherein he may offer his vote, six months next preceding the day of election, shall be entitled to vote for members of the General Assembly, and other civil officers, for the County or district in which he resides, without reference to the exclusion of witnesses is thus stated in the Code of Tennessee: "A negro, mulatto, Indian, or person of mixed blood, descended from negro ancestors to the third generation inclusive, though one ancestor of each generation may have been a white person, whether bond or free, is incapable of being a witness in any cause, civil or criminal, except for or against each other." (Section 3808.)

It is well known that in some of the States there are three classes of persons—white citizens, slaves, and free negroes, and mulattoes, who are usually designated. To this third class another designation, mulattoes, has been added, and with this addition it was said in South Carolina that "the law recognizes only three classes of persons: freemen under the constitution, or citizens; slaves; and free negroes, mulattoes and mulattoes, who constitute the third class." (Tax Collector, 3 Rich. 136-139.) Now it is evident that to determine whether a person belongs to this third class, either some rule must be adopted, or must be left to the uncertainty, and to a great extent, arbitrary discretion of those called on to act in particular cases. In most of the States whose laws or decision we have been able to examine, a definite rule founded upon the degree or quantity of the blood of the excluded class has been adopted. In Virginia the designation is "free negroes and mulattoes" and the term is defined by statute. "Every person who has one-fourth part of a mulatto, and the word negro in any other section of this, or in any other statute, shall be construed to mean mulatto as well as negro." (Code of Virginia, c. 103, Sect. 3.) There is a definition also in the same words in the statutes of Kentucky; (2 Revised statutes of Kentucky, 359.) of Arkansas; (Revised statutes of Arkansas, 534.) of Florida; (Thompson's Dig. 587.)

The Constitution of Georgia provides that the electors of the General Assembly

shall be citizens of the State. A statement of the State provides a somewhat singular mode by which citizens are to be determined. "Whoever is a free white citizen is allowed to file a petition in court as a suit of a civil nature, against any person who may claim to exercise the rights and privileges of a free white citizen of the State, in which he shall allege that the person so claiming is of mixed blood, and not a free white person. After process issued for process, trial and judgment, two concurring verdicts being required, it is provided that 'it shall be lawful for the plaintiff to prove that the defendant is descended from, and stands in the third generation to him or her who was or is not a free white citizen of the State, or any other State whose constitution and laws tolerate involuntary servitude, or that said defendant has one-eighth of Negro or African blood in his or her veins.'" (T. R. R. Cobb's New Digest, 531.) And as a result of this statute, it is said in Bryan vs. Walton, (20 Georgia B. 479-512) of a person having less than one-eighth of African blood, that "he may exercise the rights and privileges of a freeman."

It has been said that "the least disposition to consider persons to be white who have any proportion of African blood, had admitted that persons possessing only one-eighth part of such blood should be regarded as white." (Bailey vs. Fiske, 34 Maine, 77-78; 2 Kent's Com. 36, note, 7th ed.) The prevalent feeling of the society in which the degree of blood affords the most decisive rule, but in South Carolina a different rule prevails. No rule as to degree of blood has been prescribed by Statute or settled by decision, and there appears to be a difference of opinion as to the propriety of such a rule. In the first case in which the question arose, reference was made to the Constitution of the State, and the Code Noir of France for her colonies, as providing that "the descendant of a white and a quadroon, or a person having only one-eighth part of negro blood is accounted white." And, it is added: "Perhaps it would be desirable the Legislature should adopt some such uniform rule here." (State vs. Davis, 2 Bailey, 558-560.)

But in a subsequent case, it is said: "It would be difficult, if not impolitic, to define by precise and inflexible rules the line of separation between the two classes." (White vs. Tax Collector, 3 Rich. 136-139.) The decisions in the State show that no rule has remained fixed. In the case of the State vs. Davis, the rule stated was, "that each individual, and visible admixture of negro blood, the person is to be denominated a mulatto, or person of color." (2 Bailey, 558-559.) But in the case of The State vs. Cantey, it was said: "The condition of the individual is not to be determined solely by the distinct and visible mixture of negro blood, but by reputation, by his reception into society, and his having commonly exercised the privileges of a white man." (2 Hill, S. C. 614-616.) And it is said that it is not every admixture of negro blood, however slight and remote that will make a person of color, within the meaning of the law." (Id. 616; White vs. Tax Collector, 3 Rich. 136.)

But it is useless to multiply instances or authorities. We do not think one can be found which will countenance the idea that any the least admixture of African blood, will preclude a person from being considered a citizen of the United States. Of course we cannot conjecture, and it is a matter with which we are not properly concerned, what rule upon the subject the courts of the United States will adopt, and in what cases which may hereafter present the question for their determination. We feel entirely clear, that no restriction or limitation upon the meaning of the term "citizen of the United States" supposed to result from the decision which has been recently made by the Supreme Court of the United States, or from any other authority, can affect its meaning as used in our Constitution. There is no doubt that those who framed our Constitution, had the power to confer the right of suffrage upon any class or description of persons.

This is nowhere more fully and clearly admitted than in the case of Dred Scott vs. Sandford. (19 How. 408.) If we were satisfied that the framers of the Constitution had clearly defined the right of suffrage upon a particular description of persons, and, in doing so, used a phrase in a sense, which as then understood was sufficient for the purpose, and which is shown to be a mistaken one only by subsequent research and newer light, we would still be bound to give effect to the sense in which the phrase was used.—We afford revenue and encourage suffering industry. The committee on ways and means reported the fortification and Indian appropriation bills to-day, and will complete others by the closing of next week. The committee on the tariff, preparatory to general legislation. Immediately afterward the tariff will be taken up, with the intention of bringing forward a moderate and well considered bill, founded on the best practical information, and having stability and proper discrimination for leading ideas. The friends of protection do not ask any excessive measures, but a tariff which will afford revenue and encourage suffering industry. Mr. Augustus Wattles was to-day examined before the Harper's Ferry Committee. Mr. W. said he did not believe Captain Brown contemplated the invasion of the slave States until after he was driven from Kansas, and then only as a measure of defense to Kansas. He had no funds, and every man with him, which was not over half a dozen from Kansas. Mr. W. presented letters from Brown, written in 1857, '58 and '59.—These were read and explained. One of them requested him to see Wm. Phillips and others, and wished them to meet him (Brown) at Labor, Iowa, on every important business. He showed the letter to Mr. Phillips, and asked him what the meeting was for. Mr. Phillips replied that he did not know, but he could not attend. No one mentioned in the letter went to that meeting. He also had letters from Mrs. Hinton, of Wanshwa, who was Secretary of the Female Aid Society of Kansas, and also from Prof. Edward Davis, State Geologist, of Wisconsin, which he showed with funds and clothing for the poor people of Kansas, who had been robbed and driven from the Territory in the summer of 1856. He had never received arms and ammunition from any quarter, nor supplied them to any one. The only allusion which Brown ever made to his invasion of Virginia, was when he was leaving Kansas for the last time. Mr. Wattles being sick, Brown called to see him when Mr. W. expressed his regret that he had been into Missouri and taken slaves, and especially condemned the killing of Cruise. Brown replied that he was stopping at a house on the North Osage, when the men went down to Fort Scott to liberate Ben. It was then that a poor colored man came along looking for some one to help him to get his wife and children out of slavery in Missouri. I told him to go home and prepare, and I would come for him. I did so, and have brought eleven human souls out of bondage, without firing a gun or snapping a cap.

He was then told that another company went to another place and brought away four, and in doing so had killed one man to save their own lives. Brown replied that he regretted it exceedingly; the taking of human life was a terrible

thing, but, he continued, "I have considered the matter well. You will have no more invasions from Missouri. The poor people of Kansas have suffered enough; my heart bleeds for them. I now see it my duty to draw the scene of excitement to some other part of the country. You may never see me again. Farewell. God bless you," and he departed. To-day the Committee demanded the attendance of Hyatt before them, but he sent a letter declining. This will be considered a case of contempt, and will bring Hyatt before the Senate.

(Special dispatch to the Cincinnati Gazette.) Washington, Feb. 24. There is no change in the Printer question. Probably the Republican caucus, to-morrow, will determine on a candidate who can be elected, if the party are united. Haskin's Committee to investigate the public expenditures are working vigorously. They start on the Public Printing, and will thoroughly ventilate that case to-day. His contestant, Williamson, replies to-morrow in writing. The Majority Committee hold that Williamson has not made a good case against Sickles. Stephen Whitney, the millionaire, who died in New York, a few days ago, at the age of 84, began life as a poor Connecticut boy. At his death he left the second, or, according to other accounts, the third richest man in the city in which his fortune was acquired. His wealth is stated in one paper at two, and in another at twelve millions. The difference is quite material, but the true estimate will probably be found between these extremes. Pugh Piled Up! In announcing the fact that Mr. Pugh, of Ohio, has just thirteen months more of Senatorial life allowed him, the Boston Traveller says he will then be "added to the Democracy by the fact that they have set up in their desire to engrat the fetich worship of Africa on the institutions of America."

regular Gallipolis & Parkersburg Packet. (SPECIAL EXPRESS FOR THE TRADE.) The fast-running light-draught Steamer, "J. J. CADOT," S. COX, Master. J. MORROW, Clerk. Will leave Gallipolis every Monday and Thursday at 6 o'clock A. M., and Parkersburg every Wednesday and Saturday at 8 o'clock A. M. Feb. 28, 1860.—247.

FARM FOR SALE. THE subscriber offers his farm for sale, lying 3 miles from Racine and seven miles from Pomeroy, containing 80 acres, 50 acres under cultivation, and 30 acres in pasture, with a good barn, 200 bearing fruit trees, and is well watered. For further information apply to the subscriber on the premises. Feb. 25, '60.—347. B. B. GIBBS.

Probate Court. THE STATE OF OHIO, MEigs COUNTY, ss.—Final Settlement of Accounts.—Notice is hereby given that the accounts of the following persons have been filed in the Probate Court for settlement: Paul Shahl, Adm'r of John W. de Quin, dec'd; Oren B. Guavian, of Cyrus Russell 2d, W. G. Russell and Lorenzo A. Russell, which accounts are set for hearing and settlement on the 21st day of March next, at 10 o'clock A. M. in the Court Room of the County of Meigs, Ohio. Feb. 28, 1860.—347. Probate Judge.

Attachment Notice. BEFORE P. HUGG, J. P. of Salisbury Township, Meigs County, Ohio.—D. R. Starkey vs. George Silvers.—On the 13th day of February, 1860, said attachment was made, with attachment in the above action for the sum of forty-three dollars and eighty cents. Middleport, February 20, 1860.—347. D. R. STARKEY.

Charles Milburn Giles' Estate. NOTICE is hereby given that the subscriber has been appointed and qualified as Administrator on the estate of Charles Milburn Giles, late of Meigs County, deceased. W. B. GILES, Adm'r. Dated at Rutland, this 28th of February, 1860. 2-37.

John Mason McKintzie's Estate. NOTICE is hereby given that the subscriber has been appointed and qualified as Administrator on the estate of John Mason McKintzie, late of Meigs County, dec'd. Dated at Basban, this 25th day of February, 1860.—347. JOHN GAREN, Adm'r.

Sheriff's Sale. Joseph Patton and Aaron Stout vs. George Silvers, Ohio, being parties to the following case: BY virtue of two executions to me directed, from the Court of Common Pleas of Meigs County, I will offer for sale, at the "Old Mill," on Lot No. 229, containing 140 acres of land, cash. On the 12th day of March, 1860. Feb. 23, 1860.—9-2. J. J. WHITE, S. M. C.

Sheriff's Sale. Wm. B. Shepherd vs. Moses Rutherford. BY virtue of a (four) executions to me directed from the Court of Common Pleas of Meigs County, I will offer for sale at the door of the Court House in Pomeroy, at 11 o'clock A. M. On the 31st day of March, 1860. Feb. 23, 1860.—9-2. J. J. WHITE, S. M. C.

Following described lands and tenements, to-wit: being in Columbia township, Meigs County, Ohio, beginning at the southeast corner of section 36; running thence east 98 rods; thence south to the center line of said section 36; thence north to the place of beginning, in town 9 and range 10, Ohio Co. containing 100 acres, more or less, and supposed to contain 100 acres, more or less, and sold as the property of Aaron Rutherford, at the suit of Wm. B. Shepherd, et al. Appraised at \$3,000.00. Terms of sale, cash. Feb. 23, 1860.—9-2. J. J. WHITE, S. M. C.

Notice. THE following described lands and tenements, to-wit: being in Columbia township, Meigs County, Ohio, beginning at the southeast corner of section 36; running thence east 98 rods; thence south to the center line of said section 36; thence north to the place of beginning, in town 9 and range 10, Ohio Co. containing 100 acres, more or less, and supposed to contain 100 acres, more or less, and sold as the property of Aaron Rutherford, at the suit of Wm. B. Shepherd, et al. Appraised at \$3,000.00. Terms of sale, cash. Feb. 23, 1860.—9-2. J. J. WHITE, S. M. C.

Notice. THE following described lands and tenements, to-wit: being in Columbia township, Meigs County, Ohio, beginning at the southeast corner of section 36; running thence east 98 rods; thence south to the center line of said section 36; thence north to the place of beginning, in town 9 and range 10, Ohio Co. containing 100 acres, more or less, and supposed to contain 100 acres, more or less, and sold as the property of Aaron Rutherford, at the suit of Wm. B. Shepherd, et al. Appraised at \$3,000.00. Terms of sale, cash. Feb. 23, 1860.—9-2. J. J. WHITE, S. M. C.

Notice. THE following described lands and tenements, to-wit: being in Columbia township, Meigs County, Ohio, beginning at the southeast corner of section 36; running thence east 98 rods; thence south to the center line of said section 36; thence north to the place of beginning, in town 9 and range 10, Ohio Co. containing 100 acres, more or less, and supposed to contain 100 acres, more or less, and sold as the property of Aaron Rutherford, at the suit of Wm. B. Shepherd, et al. Appraised at \$3,000.00. Terms of sale, cash. Feb. 23, 1860.—9-2. J. J. WHITE, S. M. C.

Notice. THE following described lands and tenements, to-wit: being in Columbia township, Meigs County, Ohio, beginning at the southeast corner of section 36; running thence east 98 rods; thence south to the center line of said section 36; thence north to the place of beginning, in town 9 and range 10, Ohio Co. containing 100 acres, more or less, and supposed to contain 100 acres, more or less, and sold as the property of Aaron Rutherford, at the suit of Wm. B. Shepherd, et al. Appraised at \$3,000.00. Terms of sale, cash. Feb. 23, 1860.—9-2. J. J. WHITE, S. M. C.

Notice. THE following described lands and tenements, to-wit: being in Columbia township, Meigs County, Ohio, beginning at the southeast corner of section 36; running thence east 98 rods; thence south to the center line of said section 36; thence north to the place of beginning, in town 9 and range 10, Ohio Co. containing 100 acres, more or less, and supposed to contain 100 acres, more or less, and sold as the property of Aaron Rutherford, at the suit of Wm. B. Shepherd, et al. Appraised at \$3,000.00. Terms of sale, cash. Feb. 23, 1860.—9-2. J. J. WHITE, S. M. C.

Notice. THE following described lands and tenements, to-wit: being in Columbia township, Meigs County, Ohio, beginning at the southeast corner of section 36; running thence east 98 rods; thence south to the center line of said section 36; thence north to the place of beginning, in town 9 and range 10, Ohio Co. containing 100 acres, more or less, and supposed to contain 100 acres, more or less, and sold as the property of Aaron Rutherford, at the suit of Wm. B. Shepherd, et al. Appraised at \$3,000.00. Terms of sale, cash. Feb. 23, 1860.—9-2. J. J. WHITE, S. M. C.

Notice. THE following described lands and tenements, to-wit: being in Columbia township, Meigs County, Ohio, beginning at the southeast corner of section 36; running thence east 98 rods; thence south to the center line of said section 36; thence north to the place of beginning, in town 9 and range 10, Ohio Co. containing 100 acres, more or less, and supposed to contain 100 acres, more or less, and sold as the property of Aaron Rutherford, at the suit of Wm. B. Shepherd, et al. Appraised at \$3,000.00. Terms of sale, cash. Feb. 23, 1860.—9-2. J. J. WHITE, S. M. C.

Notice. THE following described lands and tenements, to-wit: being in Columbia township, Meigs County, Ohio, beginning at the southeast corner of section 36; running thence east 98 rods; thence south to the center line of said section 36; thence north to the place of beginning, in town 9 and range 10, Ohio Co. containing 100 acres, more or less, and supposed to contain 100 acres, more or less, and sold as the property of Aaron Rutherford, at the suit of Wm. B. Shepherd, et al. Appraised at \$3,000.00. Terms of sale, cash. Feb. 23, 1860.—9-2. J. J. WHITE, S. M. C.

thing, but, he continued, "I have considered the matter well. You will have no more invasions from Missouri. The poor people of Kansas have suffered enough; my heart bleeds for them. I now see it my duty to draw the scene of excitement to some other part of the country. You may never see me again. Farewell. God bless you," and he departed. To-day the Committee demanded the attendance of Hyatt before them, but he sent a letter declining. This will be considered a case of contempt, and will bring Hyatt before the Senate.

(Special dispatch to the Cincinnati Gazette.) Washington, Feb. 24. There is no change in the Printer question. Probably the Republican caucus, to-morrow, will determine on a candidate who can be elected, if the party are united. Haskin's Committee to investigate the public expenditures are working vigorously. They start on the Public Printing, and will thoroughly ventilate that case to-day. His contestant, Williamson, replies to-morrow in writing. The Majority Committee hold that Williamson has not made a good case against Sickles.

Stephen Whitney, the millionaire, who died in New York, a few days ago, at the age of 84, began life as a poor Connecticut boy. At his death he left the second, or, according to other accounts, the third richest man in the city in which his fortune was acquired. His wealth is stated in one paper at two, and in another at twelve millions. The difference is quite material, but the true estimate will probably be found between these extremes. Pugh Piled Up! In announcing the fact that Mr. Pugh, of Ohio, has just thirteen months more of Senatorial life allowed him, the Boston Traveller says he will then be "added to the Democracy by the fact that they have set up in their desire to engrat the fetich worship of Africa on the institutions of America."

regular Gallipolis & Parkersburg Packet. (SPECIAL EXPRESS FOR THE TRADE.) The fast-running light-draught Steamer, "J. J. CADOT," S. COX, Master. J. MORROW, Clerk. Will leave Gallipolis every Monday and Thursday at 6 o'clock A. M., and Parkersburg every Wednesday and Saturday at 8 o'clock A. M. Feb.