

### The Indian Question.

Practically, the whole question as to the treatment of the Indians is not one of philanthropy, but of political economy. The problem should be studied, not in the rose-colored atmosphere of sentiment, but in the clear, cold light of science and statesmanship. And, looked at in that light, it is evident that the murder of Gen. Canby and Dr. Thomas was the legitimate result of the miserable no-policy which has always characterized our dealings with the Indians. No uniform principle has ever been consistently applied to our Indian relations. The Government has always played fast and loose with them, alternately petting and preying upon them; now caressing and now cursing them; at one time treating them as superior beings, and at another hunting them down as wild beasts. To outwit them in bargains, to rob them of supplies; to steal their lands, to meet their confidence with treachery, and deal with them as though they had no rights white men were bound to respect, have been the only points in our Indian policy persistently adhered to from the first. The Indian has naturally come to look on the government with distrust and the white man as an enemy; and the superior skill and arts of an adversary who exasperated him beyond endurance by treachery, fraud, and robbery, and then called in the soldiery to shoot down "the savage" they had excited to violence, left the Indian at their mercy. Our whole treatment of the Indians has been a disgraceful blunder when not a crime. We have dealt in Modoc morality from the outset, and the tragedy at the Lava Beds is repayment in our own bad coin.

Even allowing that our Indian policy has been uniformly wise and consistently kind, the order of General Sherman would be equally inhuman and unjust. A half dozen savages at the most, demoralized by contact with the meanest whites, and excited by sense of wrong and suspicion of still greater, kill two eminent men in mortally wounding one they looked upon as a foe and robber. Thereupon the commanding general of a great nation issues orders for the extermination of the whole tribe, and the President approves of his act! Are we living in the nineteenth century? Is the panic of the moment to efface all ideas of justice, and turn declared intentions of the Government topsy-turvy? Have the Modocs taken possession of Washington, and seized upon all the Departments? When a burglary or murder is committed in New York, do we set fire to the ward in which the thief resides, or hang the whole family to which the homicide belongs? And why should not Indians be treated like human beings? Why should we disgrace ourselves, and dishonor the nation, and outrage the moral sentiment of the civilized world by punishing the innocent for the deeds of the guilty? Shall we be savages because the Modocs have acted badly? They have only bettered our instructions. The whole Indian Bureau is a gigantic swindle. Almost every man who has ever had anything to do with the Indian Department has made himself rich. Every Indian contract has been a wholesale steal. Every treaty with the Northern and Western tribes has been at their expense. They had good reason for looking on the white man as the Indian's devil. And even in this instance, while carrying on negotiations, General Canby had completely surrounded the tribe, and was slowly contracting his lines. The Indians saw perfidy, which excited perfidy in them. But their cowardly and treacherous murders do not justify the Government in yielding to a paroxysm of revenge which dooms the innocent and guilty alike to one common destruction.

The sober thought of the country will not sustain General Sherman's decree. It demands justice, but not sacrifice. The day for Modoc morality has gone by. The tragedy at the Lava Beds should lead the Government to review and revise its whole policy of dealing with our Indian population. How is it that Brigham Young planted a colony of half-educated whites in the midst of hostile Indian tribes, and for twenty-five years had no trouble with any of them worth speaking of? And here to-day he proposes to establish a new colony in the midst of Indians our settlers can live with only by putting to death. Is the example of William Penn,

who kept the whole colony of Pennsylvania in profound peace for eighty years by his Indian policy, utterly wasted on the authorities at Washington? Is our statesmanship so rudimentary and imbecile that it cannot deal with the few Indians scattered along our frontiers without perpetual broils and bloodsheds? Allow that the Indians must eventually give way before the white race. Grant that they are incapable of a high state of civilization, and must disappear in time. It does not follow that we should disgrace ourselves by treating them like brutes. Perhaps were the Government to deal with them like human beings, holding them individually amenable to the laws and responsible for their conduct like other citizens, and punishing every crime against their persons and property by whomsoever committed, we should have fewer Indian depredations to complain of and less occasion to imitate the ethics of "the noble savage." \* \*

Was Captain Jack the only one who was acting in bad faith? To the careful observer it appears that the soldiers were slowly advancing their lines, and feeling their way to the Indian stronghold, while the Peace Commissioners were talking of an amicable settlement of affairs. Seeing this, and suspecting that they were foully dealt with, the red men sought to kill the leaders of their foes, hoping to gain advantage or escape by the consequent confusion. They made the sad mistake of slaying their best friend. They aroused, also, the worst spirit of our people. No excuse will be listened to when the hour of reprisal comes.

It is curious to note that, at the very hour when the extermination of the Modocs is proposed, Brigham Young is making his home among the Apaches, the bravest, bloodiest and most treacherous of the warriors of Arizona. He has no fears for his scalp. In the twenty-six years the Mormons have lived in Utah, they have had no trouble with the Indians. Our people deride their civilization, but their treatment of the red men was humane and enlightened. It might not be amiss to pluck a leaf from their management for our own guidance in border troubles. Other religionists claim that they cannot live in peace with the Indians. The Mormons have shown that they know how to do it.—*New York Daily Graphic.*

### Children of the Period.

EUROPEAN POLITENESS VS. YANKEE SMARTNESS.

Pan's Pippings, in your issue of Saturday last, about children, are true to the letter, so far as my experience goes. If you will allow me I will give you an illustration of the manners of some of the present generation of American children. Being called upon to attend professionally a gentleman in this city, who is cursed (blessed would be a most improper word in this case) with three children, aged eight, ten and twelve years, respectively, during one of my visits the father was lying upon a couch, conversing with me, when the eldest boy, at twelve years, bounced into the room, and, coming up to the head of the couch, addressed his father in these words:

"Say, give me ten cents; I want to buy a whip."

Father to boy—"Go away; do you not see I am talking with the Doctor?"

Boy—"Oh, who cares for Doc! he's nobody. Won't you give us ten cents?"

Father—"No, I will not."

Boy—"Take that, then!"

At the same time this young scamp actually boxed his father's ears. The boy ran from the room. I saw the father's color heightened, and after the boy's departure he said, "Really, I don't know what must be done with these children of mine; they are becoming a perfect curse, and I firmly believe sending them to the public schools makes them much worse than they otherwise would be. When they were younger I had no trouble with them, but now neither their mamma nor myself can keep them within bounds."

I remarked that I frequently noticed that the children of New York were not so obedient or so well behaved as in England and on the Continent.

"So I have heard before, Doctor,

although you must own that our children are very much smarter here than they are in the old country."

I remarked: "If rudeness and vulgarity in speech, cursing, and ill-behavior generally constitute smartness, the American children certainly carry off the palm. But if one of my children had spoken to me in the manner Master Willie did to you, bread and water would have been his diet for twenty-four hours, at the least."

I could give you several instances almost as bad as the above, but your space will not admit of it, and, in conclusion, I would earnestly beg of the god Pan to let the parents of the children and their teachers in school know that there is still in existence a commandment that says: "Honor thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long in the land, &c." Sincerely thanking you for your courtesy and Pan for his pippings.

C. C. C. M.D.

April 15, 1873.

—*N. Y. Graphic.*

### A Noble Hack Driver.

A few evenings ago, an incident occurred in this city, which has about it too much of good to allow it to escape without publicity, containing, as it does, evidence that a man in the humbler walks of life can do deeds as honorable and heroic as the laureled soldier who has faced shotted guns while they grew noisy. The facts as narrated by those who are familiar with them and vouch for their accuracy, are substantially as follows:

Upon the arrival of the evening train from Sioux City, a young woman alighted and applied to a hack-driver named William Harper for conveyance. He enquired about her destination, and was under the impression that her reply included the name of a well-known house of ill-repute, but judging from the modest appearance of his passenger, he concluded that one of his senses had practically deserted him, and that he must have been mistaken. After assisting the girl to her seat, other passengers mounted his hack, and William Harper started off, determined in the meantime to convey the other passengers to their destinations before he ventured a second time to unravel the mystery of his first applicant. The determination was followed strictly, and when alone, Harper again enquired where she wished to go. The reply this time was conclusive, and Harper felt restored confidence in his sense of hearing. The girl seemed innocent, and Harper ventured an inquiry as to the reasons which prompted her to voluntarily choose the life which was suggested in her order. She wept bitterly, and told her history. Thus far she was guiltless of any wrong, but she had been denied peace in her own home and had been ordered away from the shelter of its roof. Her father's name and residence were frankly given. Repeated applications for work had been made, and she weepingly confessed that it seemed at last as if there were no other resource than the one indicated, except to die from starvation in a land teaming with plenty. In her desperate resolve she had decided upon the first alternative. Wm. Harper had lived half a lifetime, and his past experience now enabled him to tell her something which she evidently had not thought of—the dishonor of her youth, the hopelessness of middle age, and the death of an outcast. He believed her story, and a grand sympathy warmed the soul of the honest man. Driving to the door of the establishment indicated, Harper stopped and informed his passenger that she might enter if she insisted upon that course, but she should not do so, if she preferred another and better life, to which he could direct her steps. Said he:

"I will drive you to a hotel, and pay your way until you can obtain work, and an honest and honorable living. You shall not starve, and I can help you!"

The girl joyfully accepted the proposition of her good angel, who had unfolded his Christian nature by the side of a hack. To shorten the story, Harper took her to the hotel and drove home. The girl had informed him that she was brought up in the Catholic faith, and Harper at once laid the story before Rev. John Ireland. Steps for the girl's benefit were immediately taken, and through the good offices of noble Harper and Mr. Ireland the girl has obtained a situation, and now attributes her salvation to the unexpected inspiration of her benefactor and friend, who deserves to be recorded among those who are an honor to their kind.

Harper's employer closed the reference to the act with these words: "That man shall not want employment or a place while I am alive!" and there was a tone of sincere feeling in his voice which showed that he appreciated the nobility of Harper's grand achievement.—*St. Paul Press, April 13.*

### The Bradwell Case.

THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT DECIDES IT ADVERSELY.

A Washington dispatch says: The following is the opinion in full of Justice Miller, all the court concurring, adverse to the claim of Mrs. Myra Bradwell, of Chicago, that under the Fourteenth Amendment she could not be refused the right to practice before the Illinois bar:

The plaintiff in error, resident in the State of Illinois, made application to the Judge of the Supreme Court of that State for license to practice law. She accompanied her petition with the usual certificate from the inferior court of her good character, and that on examination she had been found to possess the required qualifications. Pending this application she also filed an affidavit to the effect that she was born in the State of Vermont; that she had been a citizen of that State; that she is now a citizen of the United States, and has been for many years past a resident of the city of Chicago, in the State of Illinois; and with this affidavit she also filed a paper claiming that, under the foregoing facts, she was entitled to the license prayed for by virtue of the second section of the fourth article of the Constitution of the United States, and of the Fourteenth amendment of the said instrument. The statute of Illinois on this subject enacts that "No person shall be admitted to practice as attorney or counselor at law, or to commence, conduct, or defend any action or suit to which he is not a party concerned in any court of record within this State, neither by using or subscribing his own name, or the name of any other person, without previously having obtained license for that purpose from some one of the Justices of the Supreme Court, which license shall constitute the person using the same attorney and counselor at law, and shall authorize him to appear in all courts of record within this State, and therein to practice as attorney and counselor at law, according to the laws and customs thereof." The Supreme Court denied the application apparently upon the ground that it was a woman who made it. The record is not very perfect, but it may be fairly taken that the plaintiff asserted her right to license on the ground, among others, that she was a citizen of the United States, and that, having been a citizen of Vermont at one time, she was in the State of Illinois entitled to any right granted to any citizen of the former State. The court having overruled this claim of right founded on the Federal Constitution before referred to, three propositions may be considered properly before this court. As regards the provision of the Constitution that citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the rights and immunities of citizens in the several States, the plaintiff in her affidavit has stated very clearly her case, to which it is inapplicable. The protection designed by that clause, as has been repeatedly held, has no application to a citizen of the State where the laws are complained of. If the plaintiff was a citizen of the State of Illinois, that provision of the Constitution gave her no protection against its courts or its Legislature. The plaintiff seems to have seen this difficulty, and attempts to avoid it by stating that she was born in Vermont. While she remained in Vermont that circumstance made her a citizen of that State, but she states at the same time that she is now a citizen of the United States, and that she is now and has been for many years past a resident of Chicago, in the State of Illinois. The Fourteenth Amendment declares that citizens of the United States are citizens of the State within which they reside; therefore plaintiff was at the time of her applica-

tion, a citizen of the United States and a citizen of the State of Illinois. We do not here mean to say that there may not be temporary residence in one State with intent to return to another, which will not create citizenship in the former; but the plaintiff states nothing to take her case out of the definition of citizenship of the State as defined by the first section of the Fourteenth Amendment.

In regard to the Fourteenth Amendment, the counsel for the plaintiff in this case truly says that there are privileges and immunities which belong to a citizen of the United States as such; otherwise it would be nonsense for the Fourteenth Amendment to prohibit a State from abridging them; and he proceeds to argue that admission to the bar of the State of a person who possesses the requisite learning and character is one of those which the State may not deny. In this latter proposition we are not able to concur with the counsel. We agree with him that there are privileges and immunities belonging to citizens of the United States in that relation and character, and that it is these, and these alone, which a State is forbidden to abridge. But the right to admittance to practice law in the court of a State is not one of these. This right in no sense depends on citizenship of the United States. It has not, as far as we know, ever been made in any State, or in any case, to depend upon citizenship at all. Certainly many prominent and distinguished lawyers have been admitted to practice, both in State and Federal courts, who were not citizens of the United States or of any State. But on whatever basis this right may be placed so far as it can have any relation to citizenship at all it would seem that, as to the courts of a State, it would relate to citizenship of a State, and as to the Federal courts, it would relate to citizenship of the United States. The opinion delivered in the slaughter house cases from Louisiana renders an elaborate argument in the present case unnecessary, for unless we are wholly and radically mistaken in the principles on which these cases are decided the right to control and regulate the granting of license to practice law in the courts of a State is one of those powers which are not transferred for its protection to the Federal government, as its exercise is in no manner governed or controlled by citizenship of the United States in the party seeking such license. It is unnecessary to repeat the argument on which the judgment on these cases is founded. It is sufficient to say they are conclusive of the present case. The judgment of the State court is therefore affirmed.—*Chicago Post.*

### EASTERN NOTES.

A lunatic felt called of Providence to convert Henry Ward Beecher on Saturday last. A policeman was called to take him away, and, on *ditto*, he hesitated which was which.—*Ex.*

"Mr. Speaker, you're a brazen liar," he said, and they expelled him. He was an Arkansas Legislator. "That's what he said," remarks the Memphis *Avalanche*, but they didn't expel him. He still represents an admiring constituency.

Colonel E. Barksdale, of Jackson, Miss., desires to "open a correspondence" with J. S. Morris, of the same place, outside the limits of the State, for the purpose of settling a slight misunderstanding. Morris demurs.

A company, with \$200,000 capital, has been started in New York to sell farmer's milk to the inhabitants. The relative value of this article as compared to cow's milk and goat's milk is not stated.

A Lafayette husband having ably discussed the new liquor law in a saloon, came home much discouraged to meet the peculiar arguments of his wife. She caressed his forehead with a stove-lid, and now enters suit against the saloon for the damages he incurred.

Alderman Ottendorfer, of New York, will go down to posterity as the most extraordinary man of his age. He refuses to receive his salary, both as a member of the board of supervisors and alderman, on the ground that the salaries paid are excessive, and that \$2,500 instead of \$6,000, as now paid, would be amply remunerative.