

ous visit to their camp, and particularly through the efforts of Mrs. Johnston, mother of Geo. Johnston, and daughter of the Great Chief of Lake Superior—who passed the whole of that fearful night with the hostile chiefs in unremitting efforts to dissuade them from their blood-thirsty resolution. From a very interesting daily journal of that remarkable canoe expedition along the hunting grounds of untameable savages, kept by Mr. Trowbridge, we copy an entry made on the morning after the expected attack. In speaking of the friendly interference of Mrs. Johnston, the diary says:

“This influence, and the courage that never knew fear on the part of our chief, have saved probably hundreds of lives, and given us peaceable entrance to a country whose territory skirts an inland sea, co-extensive with the Baltic, and which must ere long be added by cession to the millions upon millions of acres already composing Uncle Sam’s farm.”

We should have before mentioned, that, in the following afternoon another council was held, the *amende honorable* made, and the treaty signed.

---

In writing to Mr. Trowbridge recently, and asking him to refresh his memory with reference to Hole-in-the-Day having been present, and taken a prominent part in the affair at Sault St. Marie in 1820, as mentioned by Rev. Dr. Brunson, in his sketch of that chief, he kindly responded as follows, which we give entire, though in many respects covering the same ground as given in the preceding statement, yet furnishing additional details in others:

“Dr. Brunson’s sketch is, in respect to Hole-in-the-Day, only one more proof that it is dangerous to trust tradition. Hole-in-the-Day no doubt told the Doctor, or his informant, that in the little affair at Sault St. Marie, in 1820, between Gov. Cass and the Chippewas, he came to the Governor’s aid. But there is an *alibi*—Hole-in-the-Day was not there. I recollect the circumstances as well as if they occurred but yesterday, and my journal of the events is now before me. The account in the Toledo paper, to which you refer, I have not seen since it was published, but it was correctly stated. Without