

**Indian Sovereignty.**—We give the correspondence between Mr. Wirt and Governor Gilmer, of Georgia, in relation to the retainer of the services of the former gentleman, by the Cherokee tribe of Indians, in their contemplated efforts to erect a foreign government in the heart of the United States, and to take for that purpose a large portion of the State of Georgia. We admire the sarcastic coolness of the Governor's reply to some of the gracious intimations of Mr. Adams' Ex-Attorney General. We agree with him in believing Mr. Wirt's protection unnecessary for the safety of that State, however polite the offer and philanthropic intention.

How Mr. Wirt and his clients can bring their cause into the Supreme Court, we cannot see; nor is Georgia likely to allow the question to be tried with her consent, or to meet this tribe of savages on equal terms to debate their right to dismember her territory, and to erect a foreign government within her limits, thus abrogating her constitution at will, and partitioning her soil. The agitators of this controversy, those who have labored to defeat all the beneficent intentions and peaceful measures of the Federal Government in this matter, by encouraging the Indians to make such extravagant assumptions, and counselling them to disobey the laws of the State, must meet the question without blinking the consequences, and be prepared to sustain them to their full extent, to the assertion by the general government, of supreme unlimited power over State laws, and indeed over the existence of state government.

In what manner the decrees of the general government, for dismembering and partitioning the State of Georgia, are to be carried into effect, and how far the safety of the Union will be compromised, are also matters of serious reflection for those who are making up the dreadful issue.

We believe the claims of the Indians to sovereignty within a State, to be untenable, and we look upon the relations between them and Georgia, in that particular, as purely municipal concerns, in which the United States have no more right to interfere than in any other domestic relation. We can conceive no case in which Federal Government has a right to abrogate state laws, not *individually* repugnant to the U. States' Constitution. There is nothing in any law of Georgia on this subject unconstitutional, *per se*. It is the right to legislate in any case which is contested and denied by the party, of which Mr. Wirt is the legal adviser, and this denial on the other, form the substance of the controversy, with which the question of the Indian removal has no substantial connection. It is a discussion of vital importance, a constitutional question, involving cardinal interests, the maintenance or subversion of state authorities, the extent of Federal power, the whole policy of Indian legislation, and the nature of the treaty-making power, as vested in the general government, and exercised with the Indians. All of these, we are convinced, are repugnant to the opposition doctrine on the subject.

It is strange that there should exist any difference of opinion on this subject. We have not been surprised by any thing that the opposition orators and editors have said in regard to it; but that any gentleman having reputation as a lawyer, should not perceive the gross absurdity of testing the jurisdiction of Georgia, or the pretensions of the adventurers of sovereignty in the Cherokee country, in the Supreme Court of the United States, is to us utterly inexplicable.

Let the sovereignty of these 20 or 30 white adventurers and half breeds (though the idea is ridiculous enough) be admitted for the sake of illustration. As an independent nation, can they become a party in the Supreme Court of the United States? Certainly not. The idea of one sovereign nation bringing suit against another sovereign nation, in its own court of law, is preposterous to the last degree.

On the other hand—if within the jurisdiction of Georgia, how can individual Cherokees become parties in the Supreme Court?

It is a dilemma. The opposition may take either horn of it.—*U. S. Telegraph.*