WEEKLY SENTINEL.

MONDAY........ .... MARCH 3

The Union it must be preserved.
—*Jackson.*

Democratic Union State Ticket.

FOR SECRETARY OF STATE,
JAMES S. ATHON,
Of Marion County.

FOR AUDITOR OF STATE,
JOSEPH RISTINE,
Of Fountain County.

FOR TREASURER OF STATE,
MATTHEW L. BRETT,
Of Daviess County.

FOR ATTORNEY GENERAL,
OSCAR B. HORD,
Of Decatur County.

FOR SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
MILTON B. HOPKINS,
Of Clinton County.

Well Put.

A cotemporary, in reply to the charge that he had said nothing against the rebels, remarks: "We have habitually compared them to Abolitionists, and are at a loss to know what harder thing we could say against them."

Emancipation Laws.

It is stated that the House Judiciary Committee will report against the enactment of any emancipation laws for the disloyal States, upon the ground that the power to interfere with slavery rests with the President as Commander-in-Chief of the army.

Prisoners of War.

We call attention to the general order of Gen. HALLECK in reference to the treatment of prisoners of war, which will be found in the telegraphic columns. The instructions of Gen. HALLECK are not only just and humane, but, if complied with both in letter and in spirit, will be worthy a Christian and magnanimous people. The effect of such treatment upon prisoners will be most salutary, and will go far to convince them that the war is conducted with no vindictive spirit on our part, but solely to maintain the integrity of the Government.

The Right Name.

The Chicago *Times* says: So far as we are concerned, the time has come when we propose to call that which is treason, treason. ABOLITIONISM IS TREASON. Where is the Abolitionist who will not answer that he "loves liberty better than the Union?" and by liberty he means the abolition of slavery. He is not to be found. The Abolitionist is not to be found who is for the restoration of the Union with slavery. And the Union can not be restored without slavery. The abolition of slavery by the Federal Government is revolution the same as the Southern rebellion would have been revolution had it been successful.

The Union can be restored with slavery. This war will inevitably thus restore it if it shall be continued as it has been carried on thus far. Every attempt to divert the course of the war then is TREASON.

When the war shall be closed and all the States shall have resumed their natural and constitutional position in the Union, each State, for itself, will possess, as each State has hitherto possessed, the exclusive control of slavery within its limits; and any intermeddling with it by other States will be, as it has been hitherto, impertinent and unconstitutional. That some of the States which are now slave will adopt systems of manumission is very likely. This was their tendency forty years ago, and but for the rise of Abolitionism there would have been no interruption of this tendency.

What Constitutes Specie Payments!

The stockholders of the Bank of the State have a valuable charter or special privileges. The consideration or compensation, therefore, they claim to be the furnishing to the people of Indiana a sound circulating medium convertible at the will of the holder into gold or silver. This is all the benefit, if benefit it be, that the people of the State receive, or are promised, for the extraordinary privileges it has conferred upon this corporation. The charter states that "the said bank shall not at any time suspend or refuse payment, in *gold* or *silver*, of any of its notes, bills or obligations due or payable, nor of any moneys received upon deposit," and it provides that if any branch fails thus to meet its engagements, it may be closed, as in case of insolvency. A short time ago, in anticipation of the present extraordinary condition of our public and monetary affairs the officers of the Bank published an official pronunciamento that it "would not suspend specie payments under any conceivable circumstances." Notwithstanding these restrictions in the charter of the Bank and the declaration of its officers that it would, at all hazards, redeem its promises to pay in gold and silver, we understand that the Branch in this city, and likewise Branches elsewhere, have refused to pay coin for their issues and will only redeem their circulation in United States Treasury notes. The contract of the bank is with the State, and not the Federal Goeernment, so that it cannot be effected by or take advantage of the legislation of the latter. In all cases where there is an express agreement or obligation to pay indebtedness in gold or silver, Treasury notes, even if made a legal tender by act of Congress, cannot be substituted for or made equivalent to coin. The contract with the State is that "the said bank shall not at any time suspend or refuse payment, in gold or silver, of any of its notes, bills or obligations due or payable." There can be no doubt or room for equivocation as to the meaning and intent of this clause in the charter. The Constitution also provides that all bank notes shall be redeemable in specie. It says:

"All bills or notes issued as money, shall be, at all times, redeemable in gold or silver; and no law shall be passed sanctioning, directly or indirectly, the suspension, by any bank or banking company, of specie payments."

Such is the bond. And we do not conceive that any one will claim that Treasury notes, or paper promises to pay of any description are "gold or silver."

The statements published by the bank represent it to be in a sound condition and abundantly able to meet its liabilities in the manner provided by the charter. And it has not only boasted of its ability to maintain the redemption of its issues in gold or silver, but it has officially announced it "won't suspend specie payments under any conceivable circumstances." But it appears that some of the branches are either weak at the knees, or else they regard profit more than honor, and for one reason or the other are seeking a subterfuge to avoid both their charter obligations and voluntary pledges to the public. This action of some of the branches is not to be wondered at when the history of the institution is remembered. A distinguished financier and moralist of our city said that the people of Indiana could not expect much good from an institution that was born in corruption. And although that gentleman has since become a large stockholder in one of the branches, we are inclined to believe that his judgment was not at fault in the opinion which he first expressed and that even the salt which he brought into the institution will not save it from its original taint.

We think now, as we have expressed ourselves heretofore, from the double motive of interest and State pride, the bank should be sustained in the determination it expressed to maintain specie payments in good faith, but if it lowers its own standard it can not expect much if any sympathy from the people. If we have a home currency that is sound, and redeemable at the will of the holder in gold or silver, it is infinitely preferable to the eastern trash which now forms our circulating medium. And if the Bank of the State furnishes us such a currency, the business community should drive all other from circulation.

A Lesson of Wisdom.

In our foreign intercourse, says a contemporary, we need the lesson Washington has left us—never act from passion. In his expressive words, "The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is, in some degree, *a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection*, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest." We have lately witnessed an illustration of this truth in the Trent affair. "Animosity" beclouded the intellect of our best jurists, and maddened the people into a passionate desire for war with England. Yet our "interests" would not permit us to fight her, and so if, during our unhappy domestic troubles, she endeavors again to force a war upon us, we shall be her "slave," if we permit our "animosity" to urge us into a contest for which we are unprepared. We shall fight her sometime, *but we* must *choose* the time not her.

The Work Before Us.

It must not be thought—remarks a cotemporary—that all is done when our triumphant columns shall have dispersed the insurrectionary bands which so long impeded their march. Victory is not always synonymous with peace. We must remember that after we shall have drawn back the misguided Southerners into the Union folds, we shall have to live with them as brothers and equals, and that in some sense their allegiance must be voluntary in order that the connection may be mutually beneficial. The aim ought to be to conciliate rather than destroy—to show that whilst resistance to the authority of the Government will be vain and suicidal, the Government is not a tyrant, as designing men have said, but a political organization to protect all rights. Let it be shown that the objects of the loyal people have been slandered by the disunion leaders—that we never intended, never wished, to oppose the inhabitants of any section, or render their citizenship burdensome or distasteful. Above all should it be demonstrated that the Unionists are not a gang of slave robbers or Abolition incendiaries. So will the erring soon see their error, and brotherly cordiality, fraternal harmony, seal the permanence of the re-united States.

Giving Aid and Comfort to the Enemy.

There is no paper in Indiana or in the West, according to its ability and influence, that has done and is doing more to give aid and comfort to the secessionists, than the Indianapolis *Journal*. Immediately after the Presidential election in 1860 it advocated disunion—a peaceful separation from all the States that desired to withdraw from the Union. It pronounced civil war worse than the loss of a dozen States, and, in advance of its installation into power, it condemned in the harshest terms any act of the Administration which should invite or precipitate such a conflict upon the nation. In July last, after the war upon a gigantic scale had been inaugurated, the *Journal* stated that it entertained the opinions it had previously expressed in favor of a dissolution of the Union, and would willingly let the States that desired to separate, or withdraw, go in peace upon the single condition that the citizens of those States should lay down their arms. There is no doubt but the *Journal* is as much in favor of a dissolution of the Union as the rankest secessionist in the rebel States. Day after day its columns furnish evidence of its disunion proclivities. And we desire to call especial attention to the peculiar manner, under the false guise of loyalty, it has of illustrating its sympathy with those who are seeking to destroy the Union and strengthening the hands of those who are in arms against the Government. In its editorials, and through correspondents working to the same end, day after day, as it has month after month, it strives to convey the impression to the people of the Southern States that there is a large and powerful party in the North in favor of secession and which sympathize with the traitors who are putting forth Herculean efforts to divide the Union—to make two Governments where one only can exist in peace and prosperity. It knows that such statements are gross misrepresentations; that they have no foundation whatever in truth, and that they are the coinage of a wicked heart for the basest of purposes. The *Journal* also knows that the Democracy are the constitutional and conservative party of the country and that they are in favor of maintaining the Union at all hazards under the Constitution. The Republican organ is well aware there is no disunion sentiment in Indiana, or elsewhere in the Northwest, except what it represents. There is no other. There never has been any other. And we confidently express the opinion that there never will be any other. But the acknowledgment of this state of public sentiment would not suit the *Journal*, as it would deprive it of its power to do mischief and to help its traitorous allies. We ask every sensible and conservative man to reflect upon the course of the *Journal* in its persistent misrepresentations as to there being a strong secession sentiment in Indiana and throughout the Northern States, and whether it can have any other motive in so doing but to put weapons in the hands of the disunionists of the South to aid them in carrying out their wicked designs. These men can not have, they have not had, a more efficient co-worker than the *Journal*. Could a Southern man receive any other impression after reading that print, than that the Northern people are divided in sentiment in regard to the value of the Union and their desire for its maintenance? The Indianapolis *Journal*, the New York *Tribune* and *Independent*, and the Boston *Liberator* have openly and earnestly advocated a division of the Union, a separation from all the States that desired to sever their connection with the Government, and since the commencement of the war by a willful and wicked misrepresentation of the condition of public sentiment in the North they have been efficient allies of the Secessionists in strengthening the rebellion and procrastinating the terrible conflict, with all its evils, which has called nearly a million of men from the peaceful and productive pursuits of life to scenes of mortal strife, carnage, waste and destruction. The *Journal* has assumed a fearful responsibility in misrepresenting the position and sentiment of the conservative people of the North, who have no affiliation with Abolitionism, and ere long those whom it has thus attempted to deceive and delude will appreciate its true character and visit it with a just condemnation.

☞ The Louisville *Journal* pronounces the effort of Mr. VOORHEES, in the House of Representatives on the 20th of February, "a most scathing and eloquent speech against Abolitionism," and that it "fully sustains his brilliant reputation as an orator."

THE RALLYING CRY.—The Washington correspondent of the Cincinnati *Enquirer* thus defines the issues before the country:

The old Union, the Constitution as our fathers bequeathed it, and annihilation for Abolitionism and rebellion now and forever, must be the rallying cry of the Democracy. Thus alone can the great *constructive* party of the country vanquish the monster party of *destruction* which now threatens its existence.

From the Washington National Intelligencer.

How Far the United States are One People—The Defense of Local Institutions not Rebellion—A War upon Them is a War upon the Principles of the Constitution—It is Revolution North as well as South—Its Fatal Effects at Home and Abroad.

LETTER II.

To Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States:

RESPECTED SIR: In my first letter I endeavored to show that the only legitimate object of the pending war is the integrity of the nation as constituted by the Constitution of the United States. I shall now attempt to point out some of the consequences to be apprehended from making it a war on the fundamental principles of the Constitution.

Let it never be forgotten that we are one people and one nation *only so far as the Constitution makes us one.* Outside of that bond we are thirty-four peoples and thirty-four nations, none of which have any more right to interfere with the local laws and institutions of the rest than with the laws and institutions of China and Brazil. The people of the States have a right, under the Constitution, to defend their local laws and institutions by arms, if necessary, and it is the duty of the United States to uphold and aid them in the attempt. A war confined to such an object would not be rebellion, even though the United States were the aggressor. Just so far, therefore, as the pending war may be waged against Southern institutions, the Southerners in arms will cease to be rebels, and the Northerners in arms will become in truth what they are now falsely charged with being—the wanton assailants of Southern rights. Let me not be misunderstood. Thus far the war has been confined to an enforcement of the Constitution and the laws of the United States, and, in their armed resistance, the Southerners are unqualified and unmitigated rebels. But let the United States abandon this firm and safe platform; let them announce that the war is hereafter to be waged against the constitutional laws and institutions of the Southern States, and they will measurably relieve the traitors from the odium of causeless rebellion, will give to their cause a color of right, and will nerve their arms for a more desperate resistance. Then, indeed, would the war become one of subjugation—prosecuted, not for the purpose of maintaining the Constitution, but in subversion of its fundamental principles.

Such a position would be attended with mischievous, not fatal, consequences, both at home and abroad. It would paralyze many a Northern patriot, who would give his life for the Union, not because he loves Southern institutions, but because he holds sacred the principles of the Constitution, and deems their preservation essential to the maintenance of order and law, as well in the North as the South.

All intelligent men know that a republic as extensive as the United States, embracing such a variety of climates, productions, institutions, opinions and interests can not exist under one consolidated Government and at the same time allow the highest practicable degree of liberty to all its parts. Hence it is that every true friend of liberty revolts from the idea of an attack on that fundamental principle of the Constitution which leaves every State free to govern itself in all things which pertain to its local affairs. In the subversion of that principle he sees nothing in prospect but a cluster of hostile republics, like those of Greece, wasting each other in continual wars; or a great empire like that of Rome, in which liberty shall be crushed under the iron rule of an artistocratic Senate or an usurping Cæsar. With such a prospect before him, how can any true friend of liberty sustain, with confident hope and unflagging enthusiasm, the prosecution of this war?

But the paralysis which an abandonment of the Constitution would produce in many a Northern arm would not be its only effect. It would, in an equal degree, nerve many a Southern arm and array in active hostility many a Southern friend of the Union. It would enable the rebels to say that the North is attempting to subvert the constitutional rights which the South is fighting to maintain. It would, in the eyes of the world, mitigate the crime of rebellion by enabling the rebels to assert, with some plausibility, that there was a conspiracy in the North against their constitutional rights. It would enable them to say to Great Britain and France that the North as well as the South had abandoned the Constitution which made them one people, and become equally revolutionary—that the one was as much entitled to be considered and acknowledged a separate and independent people as the other.

But it is said that slavery is the cause of the rebellion, and, therefore, it should be exterminated. The assertion is but remotely and partially true, and, as far as it is true, by no means justifies the conclusion. If the mere existence of slavery were sufficient to produce rebellion, the Constitution would never have been formed; or, having been formed, it would not have lived to three score years and ten. If slavery were of itself sufficient to make men rebels, then all slaveholders would be rebels. So far is this from the truth that the most considerate among them look upon the Constitution and the Union as the only outside protection which that institution has. In their view, and in that of all disinterested men in other States, that feature of the Constitution which guarantees the return of fugitives from labor, commends it to the cordial and persevering support of all masters who have no object in view beyond security in their lawful rights. No such international regulation exists elsewhere in the civilized world, and its maintenance ought, upon every principle of sound reasoning, to have made slaveholders the last to give up the Constitution. In this view slavery was a bond of union, so far as the masters were concerned, rather than an element of dissolution. And it is in this view that certain men in the North have denounced the Constitution as "a league with hell."

In another letter I will endeavor to point out the true causes of the rebellion, and how far slavery has fostered them. I shall also attempt to show that the warmest friends of emancipation ought to be satisfied with the progress their principles are making through the madness of slave owners and the growing necessities of the pending conflict.

AMOS KENDALL.

February 15, 1862.

Sumner's Resolutions.

Senator Sumner has recently introduced a series of resolutions into the Senate of the United States, setting forth that the States in revolt against the General Government have committed suicide, and consequently have forfeited all their rights, not only to property, but to their longer existence as States.

His whole argument is, we think, based on a false assumption, to wit: That a State has a right, under the Constitution, to secede from the Union. Gen. Jackson denied that such right exists, and declared most emphatically in his celebrated proclamation, that it ought not to be acknowledged. And all the great statesmen from that day to this have adopted this view of the subject. Does Mr. Sumner mean to admit the constitutionality of all the secession ordinances that have been enacted through the machinations of a few bold and wicked conspirators, contrary to the wishes of a large majority of the Union loving and law-abiding citizens of the rebellious States? Does he know that in the ratification of these ordinances, wherever the farce of ratification was held, that the fear of the bayonet was more potential than the voice of the people? And will he not admit, that these same oppressed and down-trodden people—at this very hour, if they were released from the galling yoke of despotism, which has been imposed upon them by such men as Davis, Yancey & Co., would assert their devotion and allegiance to the Union? Has Mr. Sumner failed to discover, in all his reading and study of the Constitution, that while this unrivalled instrument made provision, or opened a door for the admission of new States—that it furnished no outlet or door for their exit after they were once admitted? Why, then, should these loyal people be held responsible for the acts of their oppressors and doomed to a state of vassalage and reduced to the condition of serfs! Away with such ideas! Once a State, always a State, is the foundation rock upon which the temple of liberty was built; and palsied be the arm or the tongue of the man who for the sake of maintaining a cherished theory of Government would attempt to undermine or destroy it! "The present deplorable civil war has been forced upon us by the disunionists of the Southern States now in revolt against the constitutional Government, and is not waged on our part in any spirit of oppression nor for any purpose of conquest or subjugation nor purpose of overthrowing or interfering with the rights or established institutions of the States; but to defend and maintain the supremacy of the Constitution with all the dignity, equality and rights of the several States unimpaired; and that as soon as these objects are accomplished the war ought to cease." In the spirit of this resolution the war must be waged, if waged successfully. And when again we are one people, with one Government, and one Constitution, with the flag of the Union emblazoned with the trophies which have been collected from every battle-field, waving, in triumph, over the whole land—then will be the appropriate time, if ever, to attempt fundamental changes in our political organization. We advise Mr. Sumner, therefore, to withdraw his resolutions, take up this apple of discord, and employ his great talents in aiding his Government to put down this wicked rebellion, preserve the Constitution, and execute the laws. Under a Government, controlled by the voice of the people through the ballot-box, he may live to see all the bright anticipations of his favorite theory realized; but under a Government controlled by the voice of a military despot, sustained by the bayonet and cartridge box, never!—*Salem Union Advocate.*

The Salt by Which We Shall Be Saved.

Confessedly all the energy and all the statesmanship in the Cabinet at Washington are in the War Office. Seward is a failure, Welles is a lamentable failure, and the names of the heads of the other Departments are so unfamiliar to the public ear that not many people can readily speak them. And Cameron was the worst failure of all. He was venal, corrupt and incompetent. Had he continued in office, the army never would have moved. There is good reason for believing that he designed it should not move. It is believed by well-informed gentlemen of the highest character and loyalty at Washington, that he was under the influence of a party whose policy was to prolong inactive war until both sections should become exhausted, and then to negotiate, through foreign intervention, an inglorious peace by which separation should be recognized. Either these conjectures are true, or Cameron was one of the most inefficient high public officers of which history furnishes any account. His embarrassment of Gen. McClellan was constant and fatal. The General-in Chief's requisitions were never answered, or the answer came so tardily that months were employed in matters which should have been accomplished in as many weeks. There are honest men in Congress and out of it who think the ex-Secretary should be hung for treason instead of commissioned as Minister to Russia. His incompetency was a capital crime. His Abolitionism was moral treason, and his attempt to commit the Administration to the policy of abolitionism was an overt act of moral treason.

It was by his expulsion that all the energy and statesmanship to be found in the Cabinet were brought into it. And the embodiment of this energy and statesmanship is a Democrat. Here is a great and important fact. The Republican Administration was a failure, and it has only been saved from utter demoralization and dissolution by Democratic salt, and the country will be saved only by this same salt.

It is a fact for the contemplation of honest, thinking men of whatever partisan affinities hitherto. It is a lesson which must not be lost upon the American people. It teaches what must be hereafter if we hope for preservation as a nation. In less than one year after the Republican Administration came into power it stretched out its hands to the Democratic party for help in the simple duty of government, and without which help the country would have drifted to perdition.—*Chicago Times.*

The Tergiversations of Abolitionism.

We have hitherto shown that the doctrine of the right of a State to secede from the Union is of New England origin. Up to about the time of Southern secession this doctrine was held by Northern Abolitionism. Eight years ago there was a visible disunion party in the North, outside of the Garrison Abolitionists, whose representative paper was the New York *Tribune*. It was at about that time that that paper published a series of editorial articles seeking to show, by statistics, that the North would be the gainer, in dollars and cents, by separation from the South. As late as the middle of December, 1861, the language of Abolitionism, uttered through the New York *Tribune*, was: "Whenever a considerable section of the Union shall deliberately resolve to go out, we shall resist all coercive measures designed to keep it in. We hope never to live in a Republic whereof one section is pinned to another by bayonets." Again: "If the cotton States unitedly and earnestly wish to withdraw peacefully from the Union, we think they should and would be allowed to do so." And again: "If the Declaration of Independence justified the secession from the British Empire of three millions of colonists in 1776, we do not see why it would not justify the secession of five millions of Southrons from the Union in 1861."

This, we say, was where Abolitionism stood up to the time of Southern secession. And why had Abolitionism stood thus? Because, by dissolution, the free States would be released from their constitutional obligations concerning slavery and could thereafter make war upon slavery without hindrance. It was a sudden desertion by abolitionism from this attitude after "a considerable section of the Union" *had* "deliberately resolved to go out." From a peaceful dissolution party it abruptly became a coercion Union party. It became the vehement advocate of the doctrine that no State had a right to secede and that the Federal Government had no right to permit a State to secede—that the relations of the States to the Union were fixed by the Constitution, and that those relations could not be changed except by amendment of the Constitution. It was by this doctrine that Abolitionism justified the war and insisted that it must be fought through. We do not of course give Abolitionism credit for genuineness of conversion to the true doctrine of the Constitution. We shall presently show that there was no genuineness about it. Abolitionism became a convert to the war because in the war it thought it saw a successful crusade against slavery. It thought it could better carry on this crusade under a coercive policy to keep the South in the Union than under any prabable policy after the South had gone peacefully out of the Union. That this was its animating motive the sequel has proved.

We have said that when Southern secession had occurred Abolitionism suddenly became the vehement advocate of the doctrine that the relation of the States to the Union were fixed by the Constitution, and that these relations could not be changed except by amendment of the Constitution. Let us now test the sincerity of this advocacy. What is the present doctrine of Abolitionism? It is that the rebellious States have committed *felo de se*—that they are suicides,—and that the lands of which they formerly consisted shall be organized into Territories without regard to former State lines. The reader sees how contrary a doctrine this is to that suddenly embraced by Abolitionism at the breaking out of the rebellion. He sees how unconstitutional it is if the other doctrine is the true doctrine of the Constitution.

Abolitionism is consistent in but one thing, and that is in its hatred to slavery. In every other thing it is inconsistent. In its pursuit of slavery it makes everything bend to that one object. It will embrace one policy to-day, and another and a directly opposite policy to morrow, as the one or the other will better, for the time, subserve its single purpose. It is for the Union or against it, as Union or dissolution will enable it to strike the hardest blow at slavery.

If this be a party which should be permitted to live in the country, then why should not the party of the other antipode be permitted to live also? Is the one better than the other? Do degrees of latitude determine the degree of guilt of traitors? Is he more a traitor who would destroy the Union in the interest of slavery than he who would destroy it in the interest of abolition? Is the question of the existence or demolition of slavery paramount to the question of the existence or demolition of the Union?—*Chicago Times.*

English Neutrality.

Reluctantly we are compelled to the conclusion that, under the guise of neutrality, the English government are aiding, as far as in their power without an open declaration of war, the cause of the Confederates in the Southern States. The recent order issued in regard to the ships of war of the United States visiting the ports of Nassau and the Bahama Islands, or from making use of any port or roadstead in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, or the Channel Islands, or in any part of her Majesty's colonies or foreign possessions or dependencies, or of any water subject to the territorial jurisdiction of the British Crown, as a station or place of resort for any warlike purpose, or for the purpose of obtaining any facilities of warlike equipments, is such an order as cannot well pass without notice from our Government. Following close upon this, the refusal to allow the gunboat Tuscarora to leave the harbor of Southampton until twenty-four hours after the departure of the Nashville, thus giving that steam privateer on opportunity to intercept our merchant ships sailing from London, is such an act of hostility as will arouse the feelings of the American people to the highest pitch of indignation.

We are aware that this new order in council may be considered, by some, as act of strict neutrality on the part of the English government, but we do not view it in such a light, and we shall be much mistaken if it is not met on our part by such orders as will widen the breach between the countries. So far from being desirous of bringing back the era of good feeling which once existed, it would seem to be the effort of the English government to increase the ill feelings to that point when war will be inevitable. The day is rapidly drawing near when the voice of the American people will be for war, if England desires it, and such a war as will have no parallel in history.—*Detroit Free Press.*

Special correspondence of the Chicago Times.

From Washington.

The Position of the Democratic Members of the House—The Great Struggle Initiated—The Restoration of the Union on One Side—Abolitionism and Emancipation on the Other.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 21.

As the time has arrived for the Democracy of the United States to clearly define their position in reference to the war, its objects and the results to be fought for, it may not be uninteresting to the readers of the *Times* to peruse a few lines relative to the position of the Democratic members of the House of Representatives in Congress.

All Democrats in that body, every one of them, are in favor of the prosecution of the war for the suppression of rebellion and for the restoration of the Constitution and the Union.

They more than any other men have been educated to respect, obey and defend the integrity of the one and the preservation of the other. The Democracy always guarded with sleepless vigilance the every line, precept and letter of our American *Magna Charta*, and to-day they are, where they were in all past time, planted upon the immutable principles of that instrument, and struggling for its maintainence. Our armies were raised, avowedly, for this purpose, and for no other. The war must be prosecuted for this purpose, and no other, unless admit that the troops were raised and the war begun under false pretenses.

The Democracy committed a great sin though, in the estimation of Lovejoy, Sumner, Chandler & Co., by declaring that voting first for an honorable compromise of our difficulties and difference with the South in preference to crying for "blood-letting" and slave insurrection as Chandler, Wilkinson and other malignant and small-minded Republicans did. For this Democrats have never been forgiven, but a venal and truckling press has been constantly employed to villify and defame all prominent and active Democrats as sympathizers with the rebellion, secessionists at heart and therefore unworthy of public confidence and esteem. The objects of such attacks have been many, but a prominent advantage hoped to be gained by it was to attract attention from the patent treason that Abolitionism had preached for years, and the fruits of which are now ripened in the practice of war by Jeff. Davis & Co. They preached that the Union could not exist part free and part slave. He, *their* convert, illustrates the experimental religion of Abolitionism by a rebellion. Lovejoy knows this to be true; Sumner, Wilson, Wade, Greeley, Hickman, *et id omne genus*, looking out from the national Capitol, beholding devastation, ruin and death upon every hand, must and do hear "the still, small voice" whisper in their souls, "*These are thy works.*"

As the long-tried strategy of thieves is to cry louder than all other men "stop thief," so these primal and original disunionists and traitors, looking and pointing at the Democracy, now cry out "traitors," "disunionists," "secessionists." For a while this deceived the mass of the people, but the day of illusion for the masses has passed. And these fathers in the church of disunion and Abolitionism are being dragged from their coverts and branded as they should be.

Yesterday, in this House, a most unwarrantable and cowardly assault was made upon Mr. Vallandigham by Hickman, the notorious, of Pennsylvania.

It was too much to endure, and was met, as it should have been promptly and well by the accused, and not only by him, but by gallant "Old Dick" of Illinois, who, rushing into the fight, struck out fearfully and deposited a sockdolager upon the black and sooty phiz of Abolitionism that will not soon be forgotten. The fight has already begun. Democracy is the army and the restoration of the Union is the battle-cry upon one side; emancipation and Abolitionism are upon the other, and disunion forever is the tocsin of the ebony cohort.

Continuation of the Attacks on General McClellan—What is to be done with the Southern States;—The Abolitionists have Determined that the Southern States shall never again enter the Union as States—The Campaign in Tennessee, &c., &c., &c.

WASHINGTON, February 25.

Everybody here is of course jubilant over the recent glorious victories at Fort Henry and Fort Donelson, and everybody willingly admits that the glory of the affair belongs to the Western soldiers.

The enemies of the General-in-Chief of the army, although they have been rather more quiet of late, do not at all relax their efforts to undermine the foundations of his usefulness and drag him down from that exalted pedestal on which he so worthily stands. They dare not openly deny that the recent victories are the results of his orders and of his plans. The facts on this head are too well known to be disputed. They swallow their chagrin, therefore, with a very ill grace, and bide the time when they can again open their batteries on the object of their wrath. They have not yet given up the hope of turning Fremont to account, and still indulge the dream of seeing him elected a Lieutenant General. But although the Abolition element is pretty strong in both Houses of Congress, it is not strong enough to accomplish that piece of supreme folly.

The question of providing provisional governments for some of the Southern States may possibly come up sooner than was expected, as a matter of actual necessity. It is not probable that the infamous scheme of Sumner, of blotting out all traces of the Southern States as States, will find much favor in the House, or will pass the Senate. Sumner and his coterie, however, declare their determination to call it up at an early day, to discuss it at length, and to press it to a vote. I am satisfied, from what I have heard these crazy fanatics say, that every one of the radical Republicans in the Senate will vote for Sumner's bill. But this will not give it a majority of votes. It is only in case some of the more moderate Republicans give it their support, which is improbable, that it will pass. The language of Sumner, Chandler, Wade, Lovejoy, and Stevens, as reported in their speeches, fails to convey an idea of the intense bitterness with which they hate the South and everything Southern, and which they express in conversation with other members of Congress. They have determined that the Southern States shall never again enter the Union. That, after all, is the key to their whole conduct. If this object can be attained by the subjugation and conquest of the South, and by the extermination of all the white people, they will willingly see every Southern city in flames, every plantation made a blackened desert, and every rivulet in the South running red with the blood of murdered white women and children. They do not hesitate to say that this war must not terminate until slavery is wiped out, even though it is wiped out in the blood of all the white people in the Southern States. They boast that there are officers who will do the work, even if those now in command are too squeamish to undertake it; and they will soon demand that Gen. McClellan and every other General who happens to be a Democrat shall be removed, and their places filled by men who have not "been educated to worship the Constitution." And they mention Fremont, and Phelps of Ship Island notoriety, and Banks, as such men.

The idea of any kind of an amnesty, or act of oblivion, is particularly distasteful to them. They argue that the whole of the Southern people, by taking up arms against the Government, are traitors, and should only receive a traitor's doom; that it would be weakness to spare them, now that we have them in power; that the true policy of the Government consists in pushing forward our armies, taking possession of Nashville, Knoxville, Memphis and Richmond, and in treating the country as the country of an enemy. They scoff at the idea of carrying on the war as General Dix did in Eastern Virginia, and insist that it shall be conducted on entirely different principles. And they demand that no peace shall be made with the rebels until the terms of that peace shall be dictated to them in their own cities by their conquerors. They would much rather wage the war until the entire white race at the South is exterminated,—whether in battle, or by dagger and torch, it makes no difference with them. But if they can not do that they will never consent to peace until the South gives up all its peculiar institutions and rights, and accepts submissively from the Abolitionists whatever terms the latter see fit to impose.

The members of Congress now here from Tennessee believe that Nashville either has been or will be surrendered to the Union forces without resistance; that Knoxville is in the power of the Union forces whenever they choose to march through the Cumberland Gap; that Memphis is untenable and must be abandoned; and that the Confederates will not attempt to hold Columbus now that the reason for holding it no longer exists. They think that, with the Southern armies, the last vestiges of secession will disappear from Tennessee, and that that State will very soon, of its own free will and accord, resume its place in the old Union. The information that I have from other sources, however, indicates that the defence of Knoxville enters into Beauregard's plans. If, however, the Confederate armies are defeated and compelled to evacuate the State, there is no doubt that the Union sentiment will prevail there, and will predominate in Tennessee as it does in Kentucky. In that case, the conservative and the more moderate republican members of Congress will be for giving Tennessee her old place in the Union without imposing any disabilities on her citizens. But this or any similar plan will be strongly resisted by the radicals, whose vindictiveness cannot be appeased by any such proceeding.

I had the pleasure of meeting, yesterday, Col. Lee, Col. Coggswell, and Col. Wood, on their arrival from Richmond, which city they left on Saturday evening after the inauguration of the rebel President. I also conversed with some of the released prisoners, 340 in all, who left Richmond at the same time, and some of whom attended the inauguration. The ceremonies were simple, much like those observed at Washington on similar occasions. The inaugural address took the ground that the late reverses to the South, although serious, were not irreparable injuries, and urged still greater unanimity on the part of the Southern people, and the exercise of patience and endurance.

A Slander Upon the Indiana Democracy.

We are astonished at the persistency with which the Louisville *Democrat* insists upon misrepresenting the sentiments and feelings of the Indiana Democracy, and in mis-stating the predominant element of the 8th of January Convention. That paper, in a notice of the appointment as Wright as Senator, takes occasion to say:

"In the Convention, held at Indianapolis on the 8th of January, by courtesy styled a 'Democratic Convention,' the Bright element was rampant. Indeed, the Convention consisted principally of Bright and Breckinridge men, and the whole affair was 'cut and dried' and made to order."

This statement is wickedly slanderous. The Convention was *not* gotten up by the "Bright element," nor were any of its proceedings, so far as the members of the Convention knew or cared, in accordance with Mr. Bright's feelings or views.

The Convention was called, in accordance with a time-honored usage of the party, for the 8th of January—called in the regular way and by the usual formalities. It was attended by the true members of the party from all parts of the State, without regard to their private differences in the last canvass. Out of the large delegation from this county—some eighteen or twenty—every man, with perhaps one or two exceptions, voted for Douglas in November last—and every one of the delegates heartily and cordially indorsed the Convention's action.

During the progress of the Convention, we beg to remark, in reply to the *Democrat's* charge, the only opposition to its action and platform was made by what that paper styles Breckinridge Democrats.

In the formation of the committee on resolutions, a large majority were men who supported Douglas—the formation of the State Central Committee will show the same facts; the principal speakers were "Douglas Democrats"—and the chairman of the Convention, Hon. Thomas A. Hendricks, as the Democratic candidate for Governor last October, was a warm and decided supporter of Douglas for the Presidency—he was at the head of the ticket, which, as the *Democrat* asserted at the time, Mr. Bright used all his efforts to defeat, and which was so highly lauded by our Louisville cotemporary.

The nominees of the Convention, so far as we know, all voted against Breckinridge, and were opposed to Bright's action in the late canvass. They are all good and tried Democrats—loyal and Constitution loving men—placed upon a platform which all true Union Democrats will support heartily. It is vile injustice to intimate that the members of the Convention did not act in accordance with their own views of right—in accordance with what become them as freemen, without fear or favor, and regardless of whether such action would be acceptable to this or that man or set of men. The only "element" uppermost was a love of country, and a desire to take such action as would most surely tend to re-establish the Union, and the supremacy of the Constitution. Their action, we sincerely believe, will be ratified and endorsed by the people in October next.—*Vincennes Sun.*

Is the Country Betrayed!

The fact that General McClellan is not an Abolitionist, and that he will not sanction the employment of the army in a war to emancipate slaves; that is, he will not make the emancipation of slaves the object of the war. General Halleck in his address to the army entering Tennessee and Arkansas, bid them to observe the property of the people, and in no way to disturb it; to exclude all slaves who might seek the Federal lines, and have nothing to do with fugitive slaves. Slavery, he said, was a question between the slave and his owner, and one with which the army had nothing to do—but was a question belonging exclusively to the civil courts to decide. The army should not interfere in any manner with the institution. General Sherman, when he landed upon the shores of South Carolina, gave to the people of that State an assurance that the Federal army would not in any way interfere with their property or their institutions. General Phelps when he landed on the gulf, told the people of the States of Mississippi and Louisana that slavery was wrong, and would be cleaned out by this war, but Major General Butler, General Phelp's superior officer, took prompt occasion to repudiate the proclamation, and poor Phelps has ever since been set down as a lunatic. Fremont undertook to issue deeds of emancipation, and Fremont's official head was cut off. Secretary Cameron thought the slaves should be emancipated by our armies, and then armed, and Mr. Lincoln suddenly remarked that at dinner one day, many months previously, Secretary Cameron had expressed a desire to leave the war office, and forthwith acted on that wish by asking for his immediate resignation.

And now comes the last evidence. General Burnside at the head of a legend of New England troops, with Pennsylvanians and New Yorkers swelling his numbers to forty thousand, proclaims to the people of Virginia not like Caius Marius, "freedom to the bondmen," but "to close the desolating war." He invites the people of Virginia, not in the name of universal freedom, and the obliteration of slavery, but "in the name of the Constitution, and in that of virtuous loyalty and civilization," to separate themselves from the rebel leaders. "The Government," says General Burnside, "ask only that its authority may be recognized, and we repeat that in no manner or way does it desire to interfere with your laws, constitutionally established, your institutions of any kind whatever, your property of any sort, or your usages in any respect."

Now the question which we wish to put is, are McClellan, Halleck, Butler, Sherman and Burnside soldiers in the cause of "freedom," or are they soldiers in the cause of the Constitution? If this be a war for the enforcement of the Constitution and the laws, and the preservation of the Union as it was, then these Generals are doing their work nobly and well. But if the Constitution has ceased to exist, if instead of being a war to enforce the Constitution and the laws it be a war to exterminate slavery and establish a perpetual military despotism over the conquered States of the Potomac, then the army is in the wrong hands, and the country is betrayed. Our readers must decide for themselves whether Generals McClellan, Halleck, Burnside, Sherman and Butler understand the real objects of this war; if they do not understand their duty, and are perverting the war for the purposes of continuing slavery and a slave recognizing Constitution, then let our readers unite with the Chicago *Tribune* in denouncing them as traitors and betrayers of their country. If the war, as waged by Burnside, Halleck and McClellan be successful, then slavery will not be abolished, but the world will have the knowledge that the American people, even under strong temptation and provocation, suppressed the most formidable rebellion of modern days without violating one letter of their Constitution, and without doing violence to one private right.—*Chicago Post.*

The Governmental Policy.

There can be no doubt in the mind of thinking men, that the true policy of the Government is to cultivate and foster the Union sentiment in the seceded States with the most assiduous care. On the strength and influence of that sentiment, depends, in a great measure the solution of the question of a reunion of the States. The people who make up the voters and legislators of those States, are to make laws hereafter. They are to supersede those traitors who have deceived and led them astray. If this Union sentiment is strong enough to sustain State Governments, we may still have the good old times of a powerful and prosperous Union. If it is not, the result of this war may be perpetual disunion.

Under these circumstances it becomes a matter of prime necessity that the right of Union men under the Constitution should be most scrupulously respected—that no cause for dissatisfaction should be given them—that they should be encouraged in every legitimate way in their devotion to the Union, and made to feel that in it they are safe alike from oppression and misrule.

—Thurlow Weed was at the recent grand ball at the Tuilleries, and he talks eloquently of the supper, which was in fact a dinner with soup and regular courses to dessert. Three thousand of the rank, beauty and fashion were present, and Thurlow says the Empress in gracefulness and beauty is all that she has been described.

Correspondence of the New York Herald.

The Capture of a British Steamer near Matamoras.

SHIP ISLAND, Feb. 18.

About the first of this month the sloop-of-war Portsmouth was cruising off the mouth of the Rio Grande; when she saw a large steamer at anchor in the river, off Matamoras, and a small secession steamer evidently engaged in bringing a cargo of cotton to her. The Portsmouth hoisted the French flag and ran close in, and then sent an officer in a boat to bring the steamer out. She proved to be the British steamer Lebuan,—a large iron propeller, of 1,200 tons burthen, and had on board about half a cargo of cotton. She had landed a cargo of blankets and ordinance stores at Matamoros. The captain is a prisoner on the Portsmouth, and the steamer is at Ship Island. She will be sent North for adjudication, and the trial will possibly result in the delivery of the ship to the English authorities, and a round bill of costs for our Government to pay.

The Captain claims that he was in Mexican waters, and, consequently, beyond the limits of our blockade. Captain Swartwout, of the Portsmouth, has the reputation of being a very prudent man, and his friends think he will be able to prove that he did not act ignorantly in this matter.

Since writing the above I learn by the arrival of Flag Officer McKean, that the British Consul at Havana has made affidavit that the Labuan was bound in good faith from Havana to Matamoras with a cargo for the latter port, and that she was freighting from that port. Her ship's papers were all deposited in the office of the British Consul at Matamoras. She will be sent North just as she is; the Commodore will not allow anything to be placed in her.

The capture of the Labuan was so clearly the result of the most unfortunate mistake that the delivery of the vessel to the English authorities, and the payment of a heavy bill of costs by our Government, are regarded here as almost certain.

DECEASED SOLDIERS.—The following Indiana soldiers died in the general hospital at Louisville during the week ending Friday evening, Feb. 28, 1862:

Feb. 22—E. Parrott, Co. E, 47th Indiana; W. Jones, Co. C, 49th Indiana; Thos. Stevenson, Co. B, 36th Indiana.

Feb. 23—Philip Lyons, Co. A, 50th Indiana.

Feb. 24—John Starkey, Co. D, 9th Indiana; Rob't Hullibarger, Co. C, 34th Indiana; Thos. Powell, Co. B, 47th Indiana; J. W. Teach, Co. K, 34th Indiana.

Feb. 25—Robert Needham, Co. A, 36th Indiana; Geo. W. Cook, 38th Indiana; M S. Vance, 47th Indiana; James Saxton, Co. F, 15th Indiana; John McFarlan, Co. E, 10th Indiana.

Feb. 25—Jesse R. Smith, Co. D, 29th Indiana.

Feb. 26—R. B. Patterson, Co. I, 29th Indiana; R. M. Mortin, Co. H, 57th Indiana; John Cline, Co. B, 34th Indiana.

Feb. 27—J. A. Boyer, Co. C, 30th Indiana; Elijah Brown, 31st Indiana; Mathias Bachdal, Co. K, 9th Indiana; G. W. Jackson, Co. F, 50th Indiana; J. S. Lore, Co. D, 29th Indiana.

Feb. 28—Rousom Lucas, Co. H, 50th Indiana; A. E. Thompson, Co. D, 39th Indiana; R. J. Bowman, Co. I. 17th Indiana.

THE UNION WILL BE SAVED UNDER THE CONSTITUTION.—While our towns and cities are alive with every expression of the general joy of the loyal for the great Union victories, the armies are advancing on to fresh achievements; and soon those twin enemies of this glorious country, the Emancipation and Secession conspirators against the Constitution our fathers set up, will be overwhelmed in a Waterloo defeat. The man who comes forward now to urge that the only way out of the present troubles is by the red pathway of servile insurrection, insults the bravery of the noble soldiers who are saving the country. Thanks to the glorious Commander-in-Chief, thanks to Burnside, Buell and Halleck, to Dupont, Goldsborough and Foote, the Union is to be saved under the Constitution. This, as sure as it is that the sun shines, will reunite the whole land of Washington under one flag.—*Boston Post.*

☞ The brother-in-law and private Secretary of Governor Morton is the author of the special telegraph dispatches from Indianapolis to the Cincinnati *Commercial* and *Gazette*. This accounts for the tremendous puffs Governor Morton receives in these dispatches. The following from the dispatch of the 25th to the *Commercial* is a sample:

"When Senator Wright was through, Governor Morton was called for by the crowd. To say that his speech was excellent, conveys no idea of its excellence. He never made a better. The hold Governor Morton has upon the people of this State is wonderful."

If that is not "piling on the agony" pretty steep, we would like to see an effort to beat it.—*Richmond Jeffersonian.*

WHO ARE THE TRAITORS?—An old and highly respectable farmer, living some twelve or fifteen miles from the city, was here on business a few days ago, and was assailed very roughly by an Abolition Republican of this city because the old farmer did not talk about the war to suit him—"traitor," "sympathizing with secessionists," &c., &c., the usual slang of that class of men, if *men* they should be called, flamed rapidly from the mouth of Old Abolition.

Moral—The Abolitionist has one or two grown sons, *both at home*. The old farmer has two sons *in one of the Ohio regiments!*

Who is the *traitor* and who deserves *the rope?* Let it be put to vote.—*Columbus (O.) Statesman.*

☞ Col. Gross, of Newcastle, who used to be such an Abolitionist that his hair fairly curled, lately made a speech at that place, in which he was quite severe on the Abolitionists. He says they are a greater stumbling block to the restoration of the Union than the secessionists. He ought to have thought of the injury Abolitionists were doing the Union when he was making speeches in this county, in 1860, and saying the South could not be kicked out of the Union. It is just such Abolitionists as he has been that have brought on the difficulty.—*Anderson Standard.*

☞ An old friend from Sprinfield, lately called to see the President. After the usual greetings, &c., "Lincoln, (said he,) when you turned out Cameron, why didn't you turn out all the rest of your Cabinet?" "That, said the President, makes me think of something that took place near home, in Illinois. An old farmer had been pestered with a whole colony of skunks, that depredated nightly on his poultry. He determined to be rid of them, and finally succeeded in getting them all into one hole, where he could kill them at his pleasure, He drew one forth by the tail and executed him, but (said he telling the story,) this caused such an infernal stench that I was glad to let the rest run."

INDIANAPOLIS DAILY SENTINEL.—For a reliable Democratic journal from the capital of our State, we can confidently recommend the *Sentinel* as a newspaper which will meet the wants of all. As to news, it contains the latest and most reliable telegraphic dispatches, together with a great deal embodied in special correspondence. The current items of interest in the State are also carefully gleaned for its columns. As a party organ, which has adhered to the interests of the Democracy of the State, and is known to be reliable, it deserves a cordial support.

The *Weekly Sentinel* is a large and handsome paper, and will supply the fireside circle with a large amount of interesting and valuable reading matter. The terms for daily and weekly will be found in an advertisement of this journal in another column. We have commenced a club, and those wishing to subscribe can do so by calling at our office, where specimen copies can be seen.—*Newtown Chronotype.*

COTTON GROWING.—We are indebted to Major John McIntire of this place, who has resided here since 1816, for the following information in regard to cotton raising in Southern Indiana:

In 1818, cotton was cultivated by almost every farmer in Pike county and continued to be successfully raised until 1823–4. During 1818, Jas. McClure erected a cotton gin in Pike county about one mile from Petersburgh, which continued in operation some five years. It proved a good investment, and brought a handsome income as long as cotton continued to be raised. Since 1824 but little cotton has been raised in the county for the reason that farmers thought that other products would pay them better.—*Petersburg Reporter.*

THE NEW JAIL.—This costly edifice is completed, and the dwelling part occupied by Sheriff Ferris. In external appearance it is perhaps all the architect designed that it should be—an ornament to our town. As regards the internal arrangements, we cannot speak with certainty, but have heard some intimations that they are not what they should be. The cost of the building alone is $28,500. The cost of lot and the necessary outdoor improvements yet to be made will swell the aggregate cost to at least $30,000.—*South Bend Forum.*

WHAT'S UP.—No Louisville paper was received here last night. We are informed that the military authorities prohibited the express or mail from carrying any of the Louisville papers out of the city yesterday.—*Lafayette Journal, 27th.*