UNITED STATES AND GEORGIA.

House of Representatives of the U. States, March 1, 1827.

[Report concluded.]

In pursuance of the proclamation of the Governor, the Legislature of Georgia assembled, and on the 9th of June, passed an act "to dispose of and distribute the lands lately acquired by the United States, of the Creek nation of Indians." By this act, the whole of the ceded territory within the limits of Georgia, was made subject to the Legislative and criminal jurisdiction of the State: the land was divided into sections, districts, and lots of two hundred and two and a half acres each; one hundred district surveyors, and ten surveyors of district, reserve, and sectional lines, were appointed to be chosen, and a land lottery organized, by which the said lots should be disposed of to the citizens of Georgia.

The Treaty of the Indian Springs had guaranteed to the Indians the undisturbed possession of the land, till September, 1826. This guaranty, with the course which events had taken among the Indians, and the serious and fatal consequences likely to flow from the immediate introduction on the lands of so large a body of surveyors, and their necessary attendants, had led the President of the United States, through the Secretary of War, to make known to the Governor of Georgia the expectation that the survey would be suspended till the decision of Congress was known on the subject; and this course was adopted by the Governor.

On repairing to the Creek nation, Gen. Gaines held Councils, both with the McIntosh party, and the Chiefs of the nation opposed to the treaty. The former were assured of the protection of the United States against further violence.—The latter were urged, with the greatest earnestness, to accede to the terms of the Treaty of the Indian Springs. To this proposition, no importunity could induce them to listen; and while they uniformly professed an intention to submit to the power of the United States, if called into action against them, they as uniformly protested that they would accept no compensation for the lands that might be thus wrested from them, in a compulsory execution of that Treaty.

Unable to procure from the Creeks an acquiescence in the Treaty of the Indian Springs, Gen. Gaines received from them, in open Council of the nation, a written instrument, whereby a certain number of Chiefs deputed to Washington for that purpose, were authorised to negotiate a treaty for a further cession of land. The deputation arrived at Washington, and a negociation was opened by the Secretary of War. It immediately appeared, however, that a misapprehension existed, as to the extent of their powers in regard to a cession. In his conferences with them at the Broken Arrow, Gen. Gaines had first proposed to them to enter into a treaty on the basis of a cession of all their lands in Georgia. This proposition they rejected. General Gaines then, of his own accord, and without instructions (as he informed them at the time) proposed a treaty on the basis of a cession of their lands East of the Chattahouchie. They declined acceding to this on the ground that a part of their delegation was already gone to Washington. The written instrument just alluded to, was, however, drawn up, setting forth the authority given to their deputation, to accede to "the last proposition of the President, made by Gen. Gaines." By this "last proposition," the delegation declared that they understood the unauthorised one, which made the Chattahouchi the boundary. General Gaines had understood his authorized proposition to be meant, viz: that which proposed a cession of all the lands within the limits of Georgia. It appears, however, from the documents, that such was not the case.

This misapprehension of the powers of the Creek deputation, formed a serious obstacle in the outset, to the progress of the negotiations. It was in this posture of affairs, that the meeting of Congress took place, and it appears from the opening message of the President, that he still anticipated the necessity of making the transactions, in relation to the treaty of the Indian Springs, the subject of a special message. Fortunately, however, the Indian deputation was at last brought to consent to a treaty, by which all the land east of the Chattahouchie was ceded, and a portion also West of it. To this Treaty, after an interval of some weeks, a supplemental article was added, by which the cession was extended to a new line, which, as it was supposed, by many persons qualified to judge, would include all the lands within the limits of Georgia.

The negotiations by which this treaty was effected, was carried on during almost the whole of the session of Congress, and rendered it of course inexpedient to agitate the subject of the transactions in relation to the treaty of the Indian Springs. The happy termination of an affair, which had assumed an alarming aspect, was matter of general congratulation. The mass of papers and documents herewith submitted, and not of later date, was communicated to a Committee of the Senate, while the treaty was before that body. But the ratification of the treaty, and the sanction given it by the appropriations made to carry it into effect, superseded, in the opinion of Congress, the necessity of inquiring into the subject of the treaty, which was now declared "to be cancelled."

The quantity of land occupied by the Indians in the State of Georgia, and ceded by this treaty for the benefit of that State, amounted, by computation, to about 4,760,000 acres. The cession was procured, at an expense to the United States of $800,000, including the worth of the annuity of $20,000 per annum, which formed a part of the price.

By the first article of this treaty, the treaty of the Indian Springs was "declared to be null and void to every intent and purpose whatsoever;" and every right and claim arising from the same, "was cancelled and annulled" by the new treaty.

This new treaty received the sanction of the Senate, by a very large majority of the votes of that body, and the appropriations necessary to carry it into effect, passed unanimously in the House of Representatives, with the exception of nine dissenting voices, being those of the Alabama delegation, and the greater part of that of Georgia.

In the whole course and progress of this affair, in the perseverance and assiduity of the Executive in pursuing the negociations, and in the ample provisions made by Congress to carry them into effect, the Committee perceive strong indications on the part of every branch of the legislative authority of the United States, of a desire to redeem the pledge of the compact of 1802, to promote the interests, and gratify the wishes of Georgia.

In pursuance of the provisions of the treaty, the western line fixed by it was duly run. Before, however, it could be ascertained whether by this line, any part of the land within the chartered limits of Georgia were left out, it was necessary that the boundary line between Georgia and Alabama should also be established. Commissioners on the part of these two States were appointed. That, the circumstance that a direct line to Nickajack, from the first bend of the Chattahouchie, above Uchee Creek, would intersect that river, induced the Commissioners to depart from the letter of the compact of 1802, and to propose some other point more accordant with its spirit, which it was supposed, did not admit of carrying the line East of the Chattahouchi. In endeavoring to settle on some other point, the Commissioners of Georgia and Alabama disagreed, and the former ran an *ex parte* line, on the authority, and at the expense of Georgia alone.

Between the Georgia line, and the line ascertained by the treaty of Washington, it appears by computation, that there remain unceded about one hundred and ninety-eight thousand six hundred and thirty-two acres of Creek lands. How much this quantity may be reduced, on the final settlement of the line between Georgia and Alabama, the Committee have no documents which enable them to decide.

It is in respect to this small tract of barren land, that the existing controversy has arisen. The Surveyors of Georgia, in the month of January last, having passed the line of the Treaty of Washington, were interrupted by a party of Indians, acting under the orders of the Head Chief of the Creek Nation, who remonstrated with them, in a letter written at their request by the Agent; and they have since appealed to the Government of the United States, for protection against encroachment on those lands which were guaranteed to them by the Treaty. The Surveyors of Georgia applied to the Governor for the support of a military force. The Governor of Georgia has addressed a remonstrance to the President of the United States, apparently representing these interruptions as an invasion of the territorial rights of Georgia, which may end in bloodshed. It has been stated in the public prints, that a military force has been called out in Georgia to support the Surveyors.

The President has promised to the Creek nation, to maintain the faith of the country pledged by the Treaty of Washington; and the Government of Georgia has also been made acquainted that the President will feel it his duty to carry that duty into effect. Orders have, accordingly, been given to the District Attorney and Marshal of the District of Georgia, to arrest and prosecute those, who, contrary to the Treaty of 1826, and the law regulating the intercourse with the Indians, have been engaged in surveying the lands not ceded.

The right to regulate trade and intercourse with the Indians, was one of the first Federal rights exercised after the commencement of the Revolution. On the 12th July, 1775, it was resolved by the Continental Congress, "that Commissioners be appointed by this Congress to superintend Indian Affairs on behalf of these colonies," and the Indians were divided by the same resolution into Northern, Middle and Southern Departments. In the latter department the Creek Indians were included.

By the articles of Confederation, Congress had the exclusive power of making treaties at that time, & it is believed, at all times, the only mode, in time of peace, in which the relations with Indian tribes have been conducted by the United States. Congress had also the power of "regulating trade, and managing all affairs with the Indians, not members of any of the States: Provided, that the legislative right of any State, within its limits, be not infringed or violated." This express proviso, and the proviso implied in the words "not members of any State," were the the sources of much embarrassment under the old Confederation. Georgia, particularly, claimed the right to treat with the Creek Indians concerning peace, lands, and the other objects that usually form the matters of Indian treaties; and in order to establish her right to do so, she, by the treaty of Galphinton, in 1785, stipulated that the Indians of the Creek nation were "members of the State" of Georgia. In what sense they could have been "members of the State," this Committee does not understand; and the right of a State to enter into treaties with the Indians, was strenuously resisted by Congress.

At length the Constitution was adopted. The treaty making power was again vested in the United States. A treaty duly ratified became the supreme law of the land, "any thing in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." By the Confederation, the powers of the Congress for regulating trade, and managing affairs with the Indians, were limited (as has just been observed,) by the proviso "that the Legislative right of any State, within its own limits, should not be infringed or violated." No such limitation is found in the Constitution of the United States. This omission was not undesignedly made. It was one of the changes expressly introduced, to prevent the continued collision of Federal and State powers, which had so long existed, to the injury of the public. The grant of unqualified power to regulate commerce with the Indians, the exclusive right of repelling by force, their hostile encroachments, & the exclusive power of treating, were necessarily so many infringements upon the jurisdiction of the individual States, and upon the power of the State Legislatures. If any authority be wanted to confirm these principles, it may be found in 42d number of the Federalist, a paper written by Mr. Madison. Comparing the powers granted to Congress by the present Constitution, with those of the Confederation, he says, "The regulation of commerce with the Indian tribes, is very properly unfettered from those limitations in the Articles of Confederation, which render the provision obscure and contradictory. The power is there restrained to Indians, not members of any State, and is not to violate or infringe the legislative right of any State, within its limits. What description of Indians are to be deemed members of a State, is not yet settled; and has been a subject of frequent perplexity and contention in the Federal Councils. And how the trade with the Indians, not members of a State, yet residing within its legislative jurisdiction, can be regulated by an external authority, without so far intruding on the internal right of legislation, is absolutely incomprehensible. This is not the only case in which the Articles of Confederation have inconsiderately endeavored to accomplish impossibilities, to reconcile a partial sovereignty in the Union, with a complete sovereignty in the States; to subvert a mathematical axiom by taking away a part and letting the whole remain."

To the Constitution of the United States, thus designedly framed on these points, Georgia became a party, and thereby relinquished, if she previously possessed it, all power to treat with the Indians, and all right to exclusive jurisdiction over them.

The powers conferred on the General Government, in reference to the Indians, are to be viewed, not more as conferring authority, than as implying and imposing burdens. With their exclusive rights in relation to the Indians, devolved on the United States the great duty of protecting the States from Savage violence. In the discharge of this duty is laid the foundation of the Military Establishment of the United States—The first armies raised after the adoption of the Constitution, were for defence against the Indians. And in this way, the older States of the Union, who struggled in their infancy alone and unaided, against numerous and powerful tribes of savages, have been charged with perhaps the greatest single item of public expenditure, in the fulfilment of the trust and duty of carrying on the relations of the Union with the Indians. But the power and the burden must be reciprocal, and the State which claims the right, by uncontrolled legislation, of causing an Indian war, cannot reasonably call on the Union to sustain the burden of carrying it on.

The first law regulating the intercourse with the Indians, passed after the adoption of the Constitution, was approved July, 1790. After prohibiting the Indian trade to all but licensed persons, it gave the President the power to make such order respecting the tribes surrounded in the settlements by the citizens of the U. States, as to secure an intercourse without license, if he deem proper; and the same law declared that no sale of Indian lands to an individual or a State, whether having the right of pre-emption or not, should be valid, unless made and executed at a public treaty, held under the authority of the United States. The duration of this act was limited to two years, and another law was passed, approved 1st March, 1793, by which the surveying of lands belonging to any Indian tribe, by marking trees, or otherwise, was prohibited. All purchases and grants of land, or claims and titles to land "not made by a Treaty or Convention, entered into pursuant to the Constitution," were declared to "be without validity or equity in law." This act, limited to two years, was supplied by that of May 19, 1796, by the first article of which, the Indian boundary line was declared and defined from the mouth of the Cayahoga river, on the Lake Erie, to the St. Mary's. At this time the Oconnee formed the boundary line between Georgia and the Creeks. By this law, the prohibition of surveys is specifically re-enacted, and all right, title and claim, of whatsoever nature or kind, of persons settling or surveying lands secured to Indians, by a treaty, is vested in the United States on conviction of the offender. This law was limited to three years, and its provisions were substantially re-enacted by that of 3d March, 1799. By the law of 30th March, 1802, the previous legislation on this subject was re-enacted without limitation of time, and has remained until the present day, and still exists unrepealed.

It is not known to the Committee that until recently, either Georgia or any other State, has, since the adoption of the Constitution, exercised or claimed the right to treat with independent tribes of Indians, except by authority and consent of the United States, or has exercised any act of legislation over them, or has claimed to do any act or thing forbidden by the law of 1802. The Committee believe, that the State of Georgia has not only acquiesced, until lately, in the validity of this course of legislation, but that her intelligent and prominent citizens have given it their entire sanction. In the talk of Messrs. Campbell and Merriwether to the Cherokees, in 1823, the gentlemen say, "The sovereignty of the country which you occupy, (a considerable portion of which is in the State of Georgia) is in the United States alone: no State or Foreign Power can enter into a treaty or compact with you. These privileges have passed away, and your intercourse is restricted to the United States. In a letter dated March 10, 1824, addressed by the Georgia delegation of Senators and Representatives to the Secretary of War, the Committee understand the delegation to say, that the Cherokees are to be viewed as other Indians, as persons suffered to reside within the Territorial limits of the United States, and *subject to every restraint which the policy and power of the General Government require to be imposed on them*, for the interest of the Union, the interest of a particular State, and their own preservation."

From these considerations the Committee are brought to the conclusion that the property in, and jurisdiction over the lands occupied by the Creeks within the State of Georgia, are not exclusively possessed by that State, but are subject to the rights guaranteed to the Creeks, or reserved to the United States by the compact of 1802, by the provisions of law, or by treaty.

It remains only to ask, whether the occupancy of the small portion of lands now in controversy is reserved to the Creek nation, & on what right Georgia claims to survey it.

Georgia claims the right to survey it, under the treaty of the Indian Springs, but the Committee are of opinion that no right nor title could vest under that treaty, for the following reasons, in brief:

First. That treaty was negotiated not only contrary to instructions, but on a basis expressly forbidden by the Executive, when previously submitted for his sanction.

Secondly. The treaty at the Indian Springs was concluded by a party of the Creek nation, not authorised by the Creek nation to treat for the cession of any lands.

Thirdly. The treaty was concluded by a minority, not merely of the principal Chiefs of the nation, but by a minority of the Chiefs present, and without regard to the protest of the Head Chiefs, made by their representative, both before and at the moment of executing the treaty.

Fourthly. Supposing the Commissioners authorised, and the Chiefs empowered to treat, such authority and power could, in no circumstances, extend beyond a cession of the lands occupied by the Chiefs treating, and those who empowered them; whereas, by the treaty of the Indian Springs, a small party assumed to themselves the right to cede away nearly all the lands occupied by the nation.

Fifthly. If the Creek nation was a party to the treaty of the Indian Springs, then it has been declared null and void by the two parties to it, viz: the United States and the Creek nation: if the Creek nation was not a party to it, then it is no treaty at all, for it purports on its face to be negotiated with the Creek nation.

For these reasons, on which the committee are prevented for want of time from enlarging, they are of opinion that, by a treaty like that of the Indian Springs, the Creek nation could not be divested of its right of occupancy, nor Georgia vested with a right of possession, and that the lands west of the new treaty line having never been ceded away, are reserved to the Creek Indians by the treaty of Washington, and that the survey of them is contrary to law.

The Committee, however, are happy to add, that the inconvenience resulting from this circumstance is much less than was apprehended.

In a letter of Governor Troup, to Messrs. Cobb and Berrien, dated 4th May, 1826, it is stated that, "unless all the sources of information here shall prove erroneous and deceptive, the State (if the validity of the new treaty be admitted) has been defrauded of one million of acres of her best lands." But if the Western boundary of Georgia were run, according to a rigorous construction of the compact of 1802, it would pass in some points east of the Chattahouchie, and thus give her a boundary which she might consider less advantageous than the line drawn by the treaty of Washington. If the western boundary line be run according to the interpretation put upon the compact by the Commissioners of Alabama, it would leave Georgia less than she now claims. But granting the *ex parte* line, run by the Georgia Commissioners, to be the true Western boundary of the State, the quantity of unceded land, by the only computation the committee has seen, is 198,632 acres, and that of a poor quality, being about one ninety-eighth part of the lands, the Indian title to which, the United States, in 1802, covenanted to extinguish for Georgia, as soon as it could be done reasonably and peaceably.

The small quantity of land in controversy, and its trifling value, render it probable, that the Indians will agree to cede it. Inasmuch as the quantity depends on the direction which the line between Alabama and Georgia may take, it were to be wished that this line should be first run.—It appears, however, that the Executive, from an earnest desire to meet the wishes of Georgia, has instructed the agent to urge the Creeks to a cession of all the land east of the line, which Georgia has established for herself. The preliminary steps for this cession require no appropriation: and the committee deem it inexpedient, by now making an appropriation for the final purchase, either to fix on an inadequate, or an unnecessarily large sum. It is the result of the best view which the committee have been able to take of the subject, that no legislation is at this time necessary.

In conclusion, the Committee beg leave to observe, that they have given to this important subject all the time and attention they could command at this advanced stage of the session. They have felt how many great interests are concerned in the subject. The powers of the Union, and the manner in which they have been exercised; the rights and interests of a sovereign State, and the protection due from the strong and the prosperous, to the feeble remnant of a once formidable race. Notwithstanding the collisions of opinion, which can rarely be avoided where such interests are involved, the committee think it may with justice be averred, that, in the general result, while the constitutional powers of the United States have been asserted, the great objects desired by Georgia have been attained, and the public sentiment of the world has not been disregarded, which requires a tenderness and moderation, in disposing of the rights of those whom Providence has placed, without the means of resistance, at our discretion.

Such are the views which the committee had prepared themselves to submit to the House.—By the message and accompanying documents yesterday referred to the committee, it appears (if the Governor of Georgia correctly represents the other authorities and people of the State) that the prospect of a prompt and amicable termination of existing difficulties, is less flattering than had been hoped. To the letter of the Secretary of War, informing the Governor that the President, in consequence of the remonstrance and appeal of the Indians, would feel himself compelled, if necessary, to employ all the means under his control to maintain the faith of the nation, by carrying the treaty of Washington into effect, the Governor has returned a direct defiance. Instead of submitting the decision of the question to the tribunal provided by the constitution, he has issued orders to the Attorney and Solicitor General of the State, to take all necessary and legal measures to effect the liberation of the Surveyors, who may be arrested under the authority of the Government of the U. States; and has directed them to bring to justice, by indictment or otherwise, the officers of the United States, or others concerned in arresting the surveyors, as violators of the peace of Georgia.—He has ordered the Major Generals of two divisions of militia to hold the regiments and battalions witin their respective commands, in readiness to repel any hostile invasion of the territory of Georgia; and he has declared, in substance, that he shall regard the attempt of the U. States to sustain the Indians by force (which it will become their sacred duty to do, should all other means fail) in the occupation of the lands reserved to them by the treaty of Washington, as an attack upon the Territory, the People, and the sovereignty of Georgia.

The Committee will take upon themselves to express any opinion on the subject of counsels, so much to be deplored. They have no apprehension that the people of Georgia will engage in violent collision with the Union, for the purpose of sustaining a title to a small strip of barren land, acquired under an instrument, which by a very large majority of the other House of Congress, sanctioned by an almost unanimous vote of this House, has been declared null and void. If, however, it is necessary to contemplate so disastrous an event, the Committee trust the law of the land will be maintained, and its faith preserved inviolate. The Committee recommend the adoption of the following resolutions:

Resolved, That it is expedient to procure a cession of the Indian lands in the State of Georgia.

Resolved, That until such a cession is procured, the law of the land, as set forth in the treaty of Washington, ought to be maintained by all necessary Constitutional and legal means.

FROM THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

From what we have before had occasion to say under this head, our readers will have understood how we were struck with surprise at the organization of a party in the Senate of the United States, developed in all its strength, for the first time, on the vote for printer to that body, which took place on the 1st day of the present month. Our surprise was not much lessened by the result having been foretold to us. It was a day or two before that trial of strength, that we were informed that Mr. Green, in other words *The Telegraph*, would certainly receive twenty-two votes in the Senate. It seems that they knew their strength. He received exactly that number, and Mr. VAN BUREN came very near "improving the condition of the press," according to his estimate of the duties and functions of the press, if he did not succeed in it: for the Telegraph, in fact, claimed the election, and boasted the very next day, of the "improvement" it had undergone. We shall be pardoned for introducing here a few lines from the paper of that date, inasmuch as, taken in connexion with the speech of the honorable Senator on the preceding day, and the rally of strength by which it was supported, they are certainly not the least equivocal of the incidents which belong to the political history of the day.

From the U. S. Telegraph of Friday, March 3.

"It will be seen, by a reference to the Congressional proceedings of the Senate, that the editor of this paper claims to have been elected printer for that body. It would be difficult for us to express the feelings excited by this occasion. *Justice* to those who have given this flattering testimonial of their confidence, *forbids us to place it to the account of personal consideration.* We believe it was the result of a desire *to put the press in this District in a situation* to render that important service which its position and the exigencies of the time requires."

Personal considerations, it is here admitted, had no influence in producing this result; nor, it is obvious, had the best manner of doing the printing; but the object was to "put the press in this District in a situation to render," &c. &c. which means, freely translated, to be the supple instrument of an organized party, which is what "the exigences of the times" are supposed to have "required."

We recur to the article in the Telegraph, which bears throughout the impress of the same mind as dictated the above:

"The situation of parties is now changed. In the next Congress, the Republican party will have a majority in the Senate, if not in both Houses. It becomes *that majority* to take charge of the interests of the country, and we are aware of the vast responsibility which will devolve upon *us as the organ of its views*, and the means of its defence."

The Republican Party, indeed! A party, the cohesive principle of which is mutual dislike and consequent hostility to an Administration, which is composed altogether of Republicans, and amongst them, of the most eminent and useful men who ever bore the name! The Republican Party! No, no: for, in the first place, this very majority, which they confidently count upon in the Senate, is, if they count aright, made up, in part, of distinguished and leading Federalists; and, in the next place, the Republicans of the United States have not placed their principles or their consciences in the keeping of some dozen persons (however personally respectable and estimable,) who, by sacrificing their predilections and former association, and even their distrust of one another, to a common object, may obtain a majority in the Senate, or even in the House of Representatives—though it remains to be seen, in reference to the composition of both these bodies whether gentlemen have not reckoned without their host. They may secure a majority in both Houses in favor of their views, and yet be a minority in the nation. "That majority," however, is to "take charge of the interests of the country." [The minority in each House, it appears to be thought, will have no business there, but to help to make up a quorum.] And the "condition" of the Telegraph, having been "improved," it is announced as the "organ of its views, and the means of its defence." That is to say, it is to obey orders, and to defend everything, right or wrong, which "that majority" shall resolve upon. This is precisely that sort of party organization which strikes at the root of the Representative principle, by resolving all questions into a single one of numerical strength, and excluding alike the operations of reason and popular feeling—and exactly that "improvement" of the press, which makes it a fit instrument to sustain any usurpations or follies which may result from such a vicious organization of the Representative Bodies.

"And it is our intention," says the Telegraph, "in the further discussion of subjects connected with the contest [for the Presidency] to look to the *high destiny* to which a *free Press*, conducted for the public good, can attain."

The high destiny! The destiny of following submissively, in the wake of the great man, at the peril of a destiny rather *higher* than would be agreeable—even "sky-high." A free Press! Parroting, as it does in this very article, the party Shibboleth, already alluded to, of which, were it to miss a letter, the fate of the Ephraimites of old, would overhang it. Such a destiny we would shun, as we would indelible disgrace, and such freedom we should regard as the most intolerable bondage.

We have (deviating from our usage, in regard to such matters) devoted these passing remarks to the article in the Telegraph, because of the peculiar circumstances under which it very naturally, and even necessarily connects itself with the speech of Mr. Van Buren, in the Senate, on the preceding day, and because it is the connecting link between the incidents of the preceding day, and what is to follow.

We have said we were surprised at the state of the vote in the Senate. And so we were. But we felt a stronger sensation, when, three days afterwards, we received the New-York National Advocate of Friday, March 2, (Ominous coincidence of dates!) containing an article which we have copied entire on the preceding column. [This article is omitted to-day for want of room, but shall appear in our next.—] We recommend to our readers, before they read a line further, an attentive perusal of it—the passage in italic being so printed in the original. We hope they will not miss a word of the whole article; for it is as remarkable for its doctrines, and even for its style, as it is for its disclosures and its insinuations. We do not know that we ever met with a more admirable specimen of what may be called, in composition, the mystifying style. That the article is from the pen of Mr. Van Buren, we would not even insinuate. That it emanated from some devoted friend of his, having sources of information in Washington, if not here present, and was intended to give a direction to the public sentiment, in New-York, where the People are to be disciplined under the new system of tactics compiled here, we have no more doubt than we have of the truth of anything, of which we have not personal knowledge. Of things unseen we can only judge from what we know.

Of this article, so very remarkable from the coincidence of time, and circumstances occuring here, the intelligent reader will need no analysis. There are one or two prominent points in it, however, to which it may save him some trouble to direct his attention.

What we shall first remark is, that the editor of the Advocate, in that article, is evidently not expressing his own views, but obeying the instructions of others. He admits that he is one of the "organized."—He has "no other ambition," as an editor, "than to be *the organ*, &c." It is worth while to see how very remarkable the coincidence of sentiment is, between that print, in New-York, and the Telegraph, published in the City of Washington, on the same day—for which purpose we collate parts of two of their sentences.

THE TELEGRAPH.	THE NAT. ADVOCATE.
We are aware of the vast responsibility which will devolve upon us as the organ of its *views*, & than to be the *organ* of the means of its defence.	As the conductor of a democratic journal, we have no other ambition than to be the *organ* of correct principles and accurate *views*.

Verily, here are a *pair* of "organs."

Not only has the editor of the Advocate no ambition, but he has no opinion of his own: for he is ready to give "*a cordial, warm and honest* support"—to what, or to whom? To any thing that he knows or approves? Not at all—but to something that he cannot know, and, therefore, cannot tell whether he approves or not. This is the very climax and perfection of improvement of condition, that suits the party organization, which a bold attempt is now making to extend, from the sphere of the State of New-York, to the sphere of this Union. The chess-board of a State is not large enough for a game, worthy to employ a skilful tactician—nor, we may add, is the stake large enough.

The next thing we shall advert to is the news from Washington which this article communicates. We had supposed, simply enough it seems, that both Houses of Congress had been deeply engaged in the business of legislation, for which the people sent them here. We believe so still of a large majority of Congress. But others, it now appears, have been very differently employed: and "a concentration of opinion has been formed at Washington" during the late Session. With what secrecy must not these operations have been carried on, when the first suspicion of a combination or organization is produced by a