

HON. HESTER CUYLER, of Berks Co.

GEN. GRANT having reported that all our white volunteers are anxious to be mustered out...

Radical journals of the Freedmen's Bureau strike always ready to exact the negro above the white man...

Not so the negro. No patriotic impulse, no thought of his country, ever caused him to draw on the uniform.

Counted, rations and better clothing than he was able to buy for himself, combined with a wholesome dread of punishment and compelled to go with out the bounty, alone carried him into the ranks.

Encountering few of the hardships that fell to the lot of the white troops, and doing little or none of the fighting, the negro soldier managed to have a very good time...

It was not war going on, and peace had been proclaimed, but he was in a negro regiment.

He camped, or took the sun on the south side of a barrack wall, with the grease of his liberal pork ration trickling out of every pore of his shining skin.

Accustomed to the sun and the heat of his part for a change, it was the least of his desires to be released from such duty.

Little cares he whether the mechanical and agricultural operations of the country go ahead or come to a dead halt, so long as he can draw clothing, rations and monthly pay from the Government.

The facts above mentioned by Gen. Grant, and from which the extreme Radical journals are endeavoring to make capital for the negro, are, in our judgment, highly creditable to the men who volunteered.

It shows that they are men of spirit, energy and independence, and animated by feelings, sentiments and aspirations becoming citizens and defenders of the Great Republic.

THE TRIBUNE'S Washington correspondent says: "The reports in circulation here that the money of prominent and wealthy Rebels of Baltimore, Washington and other cities South, was used in the New Jersey Legislature to send the reelection of Stockton, and that from this money a fund had been supplied to purchase enough votes to defeat Gen. Ferry, Union candidate for Senator in Connecticut, are very generally accredited."

What a virtuous and loyal set of men the iron-clad Radicals of New Jersey and Connecticut must be. They carried both of those States at the last election, and they have a majority in each branch of the Legislature of each State; and yet they have been unable to elect the "Union candidate for Senator" in either because their representatives have not virtue enough, with all their loyalty, to vote for the man who has been so worthily rebuffed by the Southern and other cities South."

These Radical papers are making out a good case against their own party. Their thinking men must soon conclude that it is worse than useless to vote with a party which sell the fruits of its victories for honest money.

HON. LEWIS D. CAMPBELL, Minister to the Republic of Mexico, has arrived in Washington on Monday, and has received instructions. He was prominent Whig member of Congress ten or twelve years ago. His fellow-citizens of Hamilton, Ohio, where he resides, serenaded him by their confirmation by the Senate and he made them a speech. After discussing the unfriendly course of England and France against the West, and our duties to the struggling Republic of Mexico, he spoke of our own want of domestic harmony as a reason why the great Powers required the gravest consideration. He defined the conflict between the President and Congress, and without indulging in many harsh remarks in regard to Congress, argued that the President was consistent and right, and steadfast to the policy inaugurated by Mr. Lincoln. He contended that sympathy for sister republics was of little consequence if the people merely sympathize with Congress and Congress with the President's Bureau Bill, Civil Rights Bill, &c., which tended to absorb the reserved powers of the States in the Federal hand, thus destroying the republican feature of our system.

THE HARRISBURG TELEGRAPH, whose owner's tongue has been unloosed by the loosening of his head as Postmaster, says "There is no longer any room to doubt" that President Johnson is not an enemy of the corrupting influence of his patronage, to defeat the election of every man who dares to differ with him in opinion. "Well, what is there about that to astonish anybody? Didn't President Lincoln use the corrupting influence of his patronage to defeat men who differed from his opinion, and didn't the Telegraph help him as well as it could? What brazen-faced impudence it is for such proscriptive journals as the Telegraph, which cried out for the crucifixion of every prominent Democrat in the country who differed from Lincoln in opinion, to first flout with Johnson, and then using his patronage to sustain his own administration."

Maryland Politics.

The Annapolis Gazette and the Somerset Herald, two Union journals, are out against the President's message. The Gazette opposes colored suffrage, and favors a modification of the registry law, and adds:

"Further we have a strong faith in the honesty and patriotism of President Johnson, and in his efforts to reconstruct the Union, and believe that the abuse so freely lavished upon him by a certain class of politicians is unbecomingly unchristian."

Referring to Gov. Swann's letter, the Gazette remarks:

"We ask for it an attentive perusal by our readers, and we believe that Maryland fully agrees with the Governor in the main."

White Soldiers vs. Negroes!

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Why is it that Congress has so far refused to give bounties to the white soldiers who enlisted in the first two years of the war?

Hon. Howell Cobb.

A correspondent of the New York Times, writing from Macon, Georgia, under date of May 14th, says he was present the previous day at an interesting and impressive ceremony, which deserves special notice as illustrative of the feeling of the white to the black race, and of the sincere desire of the former to promote the temporal and spiritual welfare of the hitherto dependent bondsmen.

The occasion was the ordination of three colored men as Presbyterians ministers, to take pastoral charge of colored congregations who had petitioned for separate organization under their own ministers.

One of the candidates for orders was a negro man named Robert, born a slave in the family of Hon. Howell Cobb, and although nominally an independent servant, in fact as he has lived as he now, living early learned the trade of a wheelwright and carriage-maker, and for many years one of the best and most skillful of his trade in that city, protected and encouraged by his late master on all occasions. Among the most interesting features of the proceeding was the presence of Gov. Cobb, who, after the ceremony, was the first to take Robert by the hand, and congratulate him on his elevation, and to grant him the ministerial office which the new minister felt and expressed at the presence and good will of his former owner.

Numbers of gentlemen of position and influence were present, and one of the presbytery, an eminent lawyer, advanced in life and in very feeble health, traveled over a hundred miles across the country in his buggy to take part in the ordination.

The correspondent of the Times says: "These are the true signs of the times. These are the real indications of the feelings of the two races for each other. No Civil Rights Bill required this action; no political advantage could have been derived from it; no compulsory process could have enforced it; no Freedmen's Bureau had anything to do with it, and there cannot be a more positive proof of the confidence of the colored people in the justice and good will of the whites, and of the readiness of the latter to help and encourage the colored people to improve their condition."

The correspondent of the Times says: "These are the true signs of the times. These are the real indications of the feelings of the two races for each other. No Civil Rights Bill required this action; no political advantage could have been derived from it; no compulsory process could have enforced it; no Freedmen's Bureau had anything to do with it, and there cannot be a more positive proof of the confidence of the colored people in the justice and good will of the whites, and of the readiness of the latter to help and encourage the colored people to improve their condition."

The correspondent of the Times says: "These are the true signs of the times. These are the real indications of the feelings of the two races for each other. No Civil Rights Bill required this action; no political advantage could have been derived from it; no compulsory process could have enforced it; no Freedmen's Bureau had anything to do with it, and there cannot be a more positive proof of the confidence of the colored people in the justice and good will of the whites, and of the readiness of the latter to help and encourage the colored people to improve their condition."

The correspondent of the Times says: "These are the true signs of the times. These are the real indications of the feelings of the two races for each other. No Civil Rights Bill required this action; no political advantage could have been derived from it; no compulsory process could have enforced it; no Freedmen's Bureau had anything to do with it, and there cannot be a more positive proof of the confidence of the colored people in the justice and good will of the whites, and of the readiness of the latter to help and encourage the colored people to improve their condition."

The correspondent of the Times says: "These are the true signs of the times. These are the real indications of the feelings of the two races for each other. No Civil Rights Bill required this action; no political advantage could have been derived from it; no compulsory process could have enforced it; no Freedmen's Bureau had anything to do with it, and there cannot be a more positive proof of the confidence of the colored people in the justice and good will of the whites, and of the readiness of the latter to help and encourage the colored people to improve their condition."

The correspondent of the Times says: "These are the true signs of the times. These are the real indications of the feelings of the two races for each other. No Civil Rights Bill required this action; no political advantage could have been derived from it; no compulsory process could have enforced it; no Freedmen's Bureau had anything to do with it, and there cannot be a more positive proof of the confidence of the colored people in the justice and good will of the whites, and of the readiness of the latter to help and encourage the colored people to improve their condition."

The correspondent of the Times says: "These are the true signs of the times. These are the real indications of the feelings of the two races for each other. No Civil Rights Bill required this action; no political advantage could have been derived from it; no compulsory process could have enforced it; no Freedmen's Bureau had anything to do with it, and there cannot be a more positive proof of the confidence of the colored people in the justice and good will of the whites, and of the readiness of the latter to help and encourage the colored people to improve their condition."

The correspondent of the Times says: "These are the true signs of the times. These are the real indications of the feelings of the two races for each other. No Civil Rights Bill required this action; no political advantage could have been derived from it; no compulsory process could have enforced it; no Freedmen's Bureau had anything to do with it, and there cannot be a more positive proof of the confidence of the colored people in the justice and good will of the whites, and of the readiness of the latter to help and encourage the colored people to improve their condition."

The correspondent of the Times says: "These are the true signs of the times. These are the real indications of the feelings of the two races for each other. No Civil Rights Bill required this action; no political advantage could have been derived from it; no compulsory process could have enforced it; no Freedmen's Bureau had anything to do with it, and there cannot be a more positive proof of the confidence of the colored people in the justice and good will of the whites, and of the readiness of the latter to help and encourage the colored people to improve their condition."

The correspondent of the Times says: "These are the true signs of the times. These are the real indications of the feelings of the two races for each other. No Civil Rights Bill required this action; no political advantage could have been derived from it; no compulsory process could have enforced it; no Freedmen's Bureau had anything to do with it, and there cannot be a more positive proof of the confidence of the colored people in the justice and good will of the whites, and of the readiness of the latter to help and encourage the colored people to improve their condition."

The correspondent of the Times says: "These are the true signs of the times. These are the real indications of the feelings of the two races for each other. No Civil Rights Bill required this action; no political advantage could have been derived from it; no compulsory process could have enforced it; no Freedmen's Bureau had anything to do with it, and there cannot be a more positive proof of the confidence of the colored people in the justice and good will of the whites, and of the readiness of the latter to help and encourage the colored people to improve their condition."

The correspondent of the Times says: "These are the true signs of the times. These are the real indications of the feelings of the two races for each other. No Civil Rights Bill required this action; no political advantage could have been derived from it; no compulsory process could have enforced it; no Freedmen's Bureau had anything to do with it, and there cannot be a more positive proof of the confidence of the colored people in the justice and good will of the whites, and of the readiness of the latter to help and encourage the colored people to improve their condition."

The correspondent of the Times says: "These are the true signs of the times. These are the real indications of the feelings of the two races for each other. No Civil Rights Bill required this action; no political advantage could have been derived from it; no compulsory process could have enforced it; no Freedmen's Bureau had anything to do with it, and there cannot be a more positive proof of the confidence of the colored people in the justice and good will of the whites, and of the readiness of the latter to help and encourage the colored people to improve their condition."

The correspondent of the Times says: "These are the true signs of the times. These are the real indications of the feelings of the two races for each other. No Civil Rights Bill required this action; no political advantage could have been derived from it; no compulsory process could have enforced it; no Freedmen's Bureau had anything to do with it, and there cannot be a more positive proof of the confidence of the colored people in the justice and good will of the whites, and of the readiness of the latter to help and encourage the colored people to improve their condition."

The correspondent of the Times says: "These are the true signs of the times. These are the real indications of the feelings of the two races for each other. No Civil Rights Bill required this action; no political advantage could have been derived from it; no compulsory process could have enforced it; no Freedmen's Bureau had anything to do with it, and there cannot be a more positive proof of the confidence of the colored people in the justice and good will of the whites, and of the readiness of the latter to help and encourage the colored people to improve their condition."

The correspondent of the Times says: "These are the true signs of the times. These are the real indications of the feelings of the two races for each other. No Civil Rights Bill required this action; no political advantage could have been derived from it; no compulsory process could have enforced it; no Freedmen's Bureau had anything to do with it, and there cannot be a more positive proof of the confidence of the colored people in the justice and good will of the whites, and of the readiness of the latter to help and encourage the colored people to improve their condition."

The correspondent of the Times says: "These are the true signs of the times. These are the real indications of the feelings of the two races for each other. No Civil Rights Bill required this action; no political advantage could have been derived from it; no compulsory process could have enforced it; no Freedmen's Bureau had anything to do with it, and there cannot be a more positive proof of the confidence of the colored people in the justice and good will of the whites, and of the readiness of the latter to help and encourage the colored people to improve their condition."

The correspondent of the Times says: "These are the true signs of the times. These are the real indications of the feelings of the two races for each other. No Civil Rights Bill required this action; no political advantage could have been derived from it; no compulsory process could have enforced it; no Freedmen's Bureau had anything to do with it, and there cannot be a more positive proof of the confidence of the colored people in the justice and good will of the whites, and of the readiness of the latter to help and encourage the colored people to improve their condition."

The correspondent of the Times says: "These are the true signs of the times. These are the real indications of the feelings of the two races for each other. No Civil Rights Bill required this action; no political advantage could have been derived from it; no compulsory process could have enforced it; no Freedmen's Bureau had anything to do with it, and there cannot be a more positive proof of the confidence of the colored people in the justice and good will of the whites, and of the readiness of the latter to help and encourage the colored people to improve their condition."

The correspondent of the Times says: "These are the true signs of the times. These are the real indications of the feelings of the two races for each other. No Civil Rights Bill required this action; no political advantage could have been derived from it; no compulsory process could have enforced it; no Freedmen's Bureau had anything to do with it, and there cannot be a more positive proof of the confidence of the colored people in the justice and good will of the whites, and of the readiness of the latter to help and encourage the colored people to improve their condition."

The correspondent of the Times says: "These are the true signs of the times. These are the real indications of the feelings of the two races for each other. No Civil Rights Bill required this action; no political advantage could have been derived from it; no compulsory process could have enforced it; no Freedmen's Bureau had anything to do with it, and there cannot be a more positive proof of the confidence of the colored people in the justice and good will of the whites, and of the readiness of the latter to help and encourage the colored people to improve their condition."

The correspondent of the Times says: "These are the true signs of the times. These are the real indications of the feelings of the two races for each other. No Civil Rights Bill required this action; no political advantage could have been derived from it; no compulsory process could have enforced it; no Freedmen's Bureau had anything to do with it, and there cannot be a more positive proof of the confidence of the colored people in the justice and good will of the whites, and of the readiness of the latter to help and encourage the colored people to improve their condition."

The correspondent of the Times says: "These are the true signs of the times. These are the real indications of the feelings of the two races for each other. No Civil Rights Bill required this action; no political advantage could have been derived from it; no compulsory process could have enforced it; no Freedmen's Bureau had anything to do with it, and there cannot be a more positive proof of the confidence of the colored people in the justice and good will of the whites, and of the readiness of the latter to help and encourage the colored people to improve their condition."

The correspondent of the Times says: "These are the true signs of the times. These are the real indications of the feelings of the two races for each other. No Civil Rights Bill required this action; no political advantage could have been derived from it; no compulsory process could have enforced it; no Freedmen's Bureau had anything to do with it, and there cannot be a more positive proof of the confidence of the colored people in the justice and good will of the whites, and of the readiness of the latter to help and encourage the colored people to improve their condition."

The correspondent of the Times says: "These are the true signs of the times. These are the real indications of the feelings of the two races for each other. No Civil Rights Bill required this action; no political advantage could have been derived from it; no compulsory process could have enforced it; no Freedmen's Bureau had anything to do with it, and there cannot be a more positive proof of the confidence of the colored people in the justice and good will of the whites, and of the readiness of the latter to help and encourage the colored people to improve their condition."

The correspondent of the Times says: "These are the true signs of the times. These are the real indications of the feelings of the two races for each other. No Civil Rights Bill required this action; no political advantage could have been derived from it; no compulsory process could have enforced it; no Freedmen's Bureau had anything to do with it, and there cannot be a more positive proof of the confidence of the colored people in the justice and good will of the whites, and of the readiness of the latter to help and encourage the colored people to improve their condition."

The correspondent of the Times says: "These are the true signs of the times. These are the real indications of the feelings of the two races for each other. No Civil Rights Bill required this action; no political advantage could have been derived from it; no compulsory process could have enforced it; no Freedmen's Bureau had anything to do with it, and there cannot be a more positive proof of the confidence of the colored people in the justice and good will of the whites, and of the readiness of the latter to help and encourage the colored people to improve their condition."

The correspondent of the Times says: "These are the true signs of the times. These are the real indications of the feelings of the two races for each other. No Civil Rights Bill required this action; no political advantage could have been derived from it; no compulsory process could have enforced it; no Freedmen's Bureau had anything to do with it, and there cannot be a more positive proof of the confidence of the colored people in the justice and good will of the whites, and of the readiness of the latter to help and encourage the colored people to improve