THE INDIANA STATE SENTINEL.

VOL. XXI, NO. 43. INDIANAPOLIS, IND., MONDAY, MARCH 17, 1862. WHOLE NO. 1,184.

WEEKLY STATE SENTINEL.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY MONDAY AT THE

NEW SENTINEL OFFICE,

NO. 2 SOUTH MERIDIAN STREET,

OPPOSITE THE POSTOFFICE.

ELDER, HARKNESS & BINGHAM,

Proprietors.

TERMS OF WEEKLY SENTINEL.

One copy one year	$1 00
Ten copies to one address, and one to the maker of the club	10 00
Twenty copies to one address, and two to the maker of the club	20 00
Thirty copies to one address, and one copy of the WEEKLY and one of the DAILY, to the maker of the club	30 00
Fifty copies to one address, and two copies of the WEEKLY and two of the DAILY	50 00

Additions can be made to Clubs at any time at the above rates. Where the paper is addressed to each subscriber separately, the extra copies will not be sent.

POSTAGE.

The postage on the *Weekly State Sentinel*, and mailed for one year, is as follows:

Within the County	Free.
Within the State	13 cents.
Within the United States	25 cents.

Advertising.

One square, one insertion	$0 75
" two "	1 00
" four "	2 00
For each subsequent insertion, and for each insertion of each additional square	33⅓

Advertisements published in both the Daily and the Weekly Sentinel, will be charged the full Daily rates, with one-half the Weekly rates added.

Announcing deaths with funeral notice attached, $1; without notice free.

Marriage Notices 50 cents.

Notices of Festivals, Picnics and Excursions, gotten up by individuals or associations, or by churches, at the regular prices.

Advertisements leaded and placed under the head of Special Notices, if ten lines or over, will be charged double the usual rates.

Yearly advertisers to pay quarterly.

Announcing candidates for offices of every description to be charged at the rate of $1 50 for each name in the Daily, and $2 in the Daily and Weekly, the same to be, in all cases, paid in advance.

Legal advertisement inserted at the expense of the attorneys ordering, and not delayable for the legal proceedings, but collectable at our usual time. Publishers not accountable for the accuracy of legal advertisements beyond the amount charged for their publication.

ELDER, HARKNESS & BINGHAM,
Proprietors Indiana State Sentinel.
J. M. TILFORD,
President Indianapolis Journal Company.

THE DAILY SENTINEL

Will be sent by mail or express to subscribers at any point for fifty cents a month, or six dollars a year.

All subscriptions invariably in advance. Address

ELDER, HARKNESS & BINGHAM, Ind'pls.

Selected Miscellany.

An Inside View.

The published defense of Gen. FREMONT contains the following letters from "M. BLAIR," Postmaster General, and "A. LINCOLN," President, which give an exceedingly interesting and piquant view of public men and public affairs. They show that great men entertain the same ideas and have the same amount of thought that common men do. "Distance lends enchantment to the view," and if we did not look at our high public functionaries through the wrong end of the telescope their intellectual altitude would not appear greater than ordinary mortals. Read:

BLAIR TO FREMONT.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 24, 1861.

DEAR GENERAL: Don't suppose that I don attend to your matters, and do all that I can to forward them, because I do not write frequently. I am to be interrupted if I take up a pen, by people that have the run of my office or house, and so I keep out of both, and go after your business in person, and effect it if I can.

I write now, to-day, in reply to your letter about Meigs, that you must not suppose that he intended by his telegram to Turnley to reflect upon you. Far from it. I happened in his office when he opened Turnley's requisition, and re marked to me, substantially, that he telegraphed to Turnley. But he did not know that Turnley had any instructions from you to get horses of any superior quality.

* * * * * * *

The trouble is elsewhere. Chase has more horror of seeing Treasury notes below par than of seeing soldiers killed, and therefore has held back too much, I think. I don't believe at all in that style of managing the Treasury. It depends on the war, and it is better to get ready and beat the enemy by selling stocks at fifty per cent. discount than wait to negotiate and lose a battle. I have got you a splendid officer for your Navy Department, and guns. He will be en route for you in a day or two, when he will be posted up and call for what you want. You will have credit at the Navy Department when you get him under you.

I showed the President Billings's letter, and read him yours about Adams. He said that you were right in saying that Adams was devoted to his money bags.

Schuyler had already gone to Europe about arms when I wrote and telegraphed you, and your letter in reply was handed to Mr. Seward to be forwarded to him. I suppose it would put him in relation with Billings, which would bring about your wishes. If I had known when you were here what you communicated to my father, I think from my knowledge of Meigs, with your indorsement, I could have turned the whole matter over to him. At the same time you must not expect too much of me in the Cabinet. I have, as you know, very little influence, and even now, when the policy I have advocated from the first is being inaugurated, it does not seem to bring me any great power over the Administration. This, I can see, is partly my own fault. I have been too obstreperous, perhaps, in my opposition, and men do not like those who have exposed their mistakes beforehand and taunt them with them afterward. The main difficulty is, however, with Lincoln himself. He is of the Whig school, and that brings him naturally not only to incline to the feeble policy of Whigs, but to give his confidence to such advisers. It costs me a great deal of labor to get anything done because of the inclination of mind on the part of the President or leading members of the Cabinet, including Chase, who never voted a Democratic ticket in his life. But you have the people at your back, and I am doing all I can to cut red tape and get things done. I will be more civil and patient than heretofore, and see if that won't work.

Yours, truly, M. BLAIR.

THE PRESIDENT'S FIRST LETTER TO GEN. FREMONT, ASKING HIM TO MODIFY HIS PROCLAMATION.

[Private.] WASHINGTON, D.C. Sept. 2, 1861.

To Major Gen. Fremont:

MY DEAR SIR: Two points in your proclamation of August 30 give me some anxiety.

First: Should you shoot a man according to the proclamation, the Confederates would very certainly shoot our best men in their hands, in retaliation; and so, man for man, indefinitely. It is, therefore, my order that you allow no man to be shot, under the proclamation, without my approbation or consent.

Second: I think there is a great danger that the closing paragraph, in relation to the confiscation of property, and the liberating slaves of traitorous owners, will alarm our Southern Union friends, and turn them against us—perhaps ruin our rather fair prospect for Kentucky. Allow me, therefore, to ask that you will, as of your own motion, modify that paragraph so as to conform to the *first* and *fourth* sections of the Act of Congress, entitled, "An act to confiscate property used for Insurrectionary purposes," approved August 6, 1861, and a copy of which act I herewith send you. This letter is written in a spirit of caution, and not of censure. I send it by a special messenger, in order that it may certainly and speedily reach you.

Yours very truly, A. LINCOLN.

Interesting Synopsis of the Tax Bill—The Old Treasury Notes as Legal Tender.

WASHINGTON, March 8.

Additional items of the tax bill.

Is licenses tobacconists, stationers, confectioners, horse dealers, where gross receipts are over $1,000 annually, $10 each; manufacturers of tallow candles, half a cent per pound; sperm, stearine and adamantine, one cent; vinegar, other than cider or wine, five cents a gallon; ground coffee and spices, one cent a pound; refined sugar and candy, two mills a pound; saleratus, five mills; corn starch, four mills; common gunpowder, one cent; rifle powder, five cents; white lead, twenty-five cents a hundred pounds; paints, five per cent.; inks, all kinds, three per cent. *ad valorem;* hats and caps, twenty five cents to one dollar and fifty cents per dozen, according to value; hoop skirts, two dollars to four dollars per dozen, according to value; clocks, twenty-five to fifty cents each; umbrellas and parasols, five to twenty five cents each; railroad iron, $1 50 per ton; writing paper, two cents; wrapping paper, three mills a pound; common woolen, flax, hemp, India rubber, wood, iron and other metals manufactured, three per cent. *ad valorem;* all patented articles, five per cent.; auction sales, the tenth of one per cent. on the gross amount; piano fortes, four dollars; forty ounces silver spoons or plate silver, exempt from duty; dividends insurance companies, three per cent.; publishers official advertisements may add tax to price fixed by law; incomes of citizens, resident abroad, five per cent.; stamp duties, agreements or contracts, five cents; bills of exchange, from two to twenty-five cents; bills of lading, from five to ten cents; express bundles, three to ten cents; bonds, twenty-five to fifty cents; certificates of stock, profits or damage, twenty-five cents; certificates of deposits, two to five cents; other certificates, ten cents; charter parties, three to ten dollars; contracts, ten cents; conveyances, one dollar; telgraphic dispatches, three cents; custom house and warehousing entries, fifty cents to one dollar; policies of insurance, fifty cents to two dollars and fifty cents; lease, fifty cents to one dollar; manifests of cargo, twenty five cents to five dollars; mortgages, one dollar; notarial acts, twenty five cents; passenger tickets abroad, fifty cents to one dollar; powers of attorney, ten cents to one dollar; probate will, fifty cents to twenty dollars; warehouse receipts, twenty five cents; legal documents, fifty cents; medicines, three to ten cents a bottle.

Five hundred thousand dollars are appropriated for salaries and expenses.

It is doubtful whether the section of the House bill, passed yesterday, making Treasury notes of the old issue legal tender, will get through the Senate. Leading Senators say that, the notes being already above par, don't need this legislation.

From the New York Evening Post (Republican.)

The Disfranchisement of States.

With this deep sense of the enormity of treason, however, we cannot yet persuade ourselves of the justice or policy of the scheme which proposes to disfranchise the seceding States until such time as they shall be of better mind. It proceeds, if we understand it, upon the ground that those States, by the very act of secession, have abrogated their functions as States and reverted to the condition of Territories, in which condition they are to be held and treated until again admitted as States. But that is certainly not the theory on which we have thus far conducted the war. In the President's proclamation and in all the subsequent acts of the Government secession has been regarded as the rebellious outbreak of unlawful combinations of men, and not as a deed having the least legal validity or force. Every act or ordinance of secession, being inconsistent with the fundamental law of the land, is null and void from the first. No State convention, no legislative body, no popular assemblage of any kind has authority to overthrow the general Constitution of the nation. The relations of the States to each other and to the Federal Government are created by that instrument, and until that is destroyed, those relations remain the same, whatever course any single State may see fit to pursue. If a State could, by an act of its own, annul its own existence, then the doctrine of secession is right, and we of the North have been warring against a correct principle.

But the position of the North, we repeat, has always been that every law promulgating disunion was treasonable, rendering the individuals concerned in it liable to prosecution for treason, but invalid in its effects upon the existing political *status*. For that reason, our Government has uniformly treated rebel agents, whether official or otherwise, as insurgents against its authority, and nothing more. The State Governments which have confirmed the rebellion are held to be in suspense, but not annulled. As organizations they have been perverted from their purposes, but not annihilated. They still exist *de jure*. As soon as enough people loyal to the Federal Constitution are gathered to put their machinery in operation, they will be revived. They are as much factors of the Union now as they ever were, because the Constitution which creates and defines them is in full vigor, although their own local constitutions are for a time paralyzed.

It would be a departure then, from sound theory, to treat those States as territories; it would be doing by legislation precisely what their people wish to by arms, but which we would not suffer them to do; and it disfranchises abruptly all their loyal inhabitants because of offenses committed by the disloyal. In either phase the scheme is likely to awaken hostility, not at the South alone, but at the North. Our present unanimous prosecution of the war against rebellion would be complicated with an intricate and doubtful political question, which would eventually lead to serious party divisions, and greatly embarrass the energetic action of the Government. All the zealous adherents of the doctrine of State Rights, ourselves among them, would feel compelled to oppose the new doctrine, or any other which involves the legal dismemberment of the nation. We are not, as our readers are aware, superstitious worshippers of any instrument, however venerable, even the Constitution of the United States—but the principles of national Union and local independence which underlie it are, to our minds, the finest results that political wisdom has yet attained.

The President's Emancipation Scheme.

We deeply regret that the President should have considered it his duty to send to Congress the special message which was published in our columns yesterday. It was, in our opinion, ill-timed and out of place, calculated to create divisions among the loyal men of the free States and to alarm the loyal men of the slaveholding States. Yet it is perhaps, in one sense, the most terrible blow which the President could give to the ultra Abolitionists, because in it he directly takes issue with them on the assumed power of the Federal Government to deal with the question of slavery in the States. The President recognizes the right of the *States* exclusively to adjudicate the question of slavery, leaving it to Congress, if that body sees proper, to encourage an emancipation policy by appropriating money to indemnify slaveholders for the loss of their property. Taking this view of the great question at issue between the Conservatives and Abolitionists, we regard it as certain that the President would consider it his solemn duty to veto any such measure as that proposing to make free Territories out of the revolted States, or in any manner to interfere with the question of slavery without the consent and against the wishes of the States themselves. We are rejoiced that the President has taken this position.

We can not but fear, however, that the President's message will be liable to misapprehension in one quarter and to misrepresentation in another. Loyal men in the border States will be apt to regard it as the entering wedge to Executive and Congressional dictation, demanding of them to take measures for the extinguishment of slavery in their respective States, while in the more Southern States it will be represented by the rebel leaders as an out and out Abolition pronunciamento. In this light we regard the message as most unfortunate and calculated to work great mischief to the cause which we have so much at heart. Nor would the passage of the joint resolution proposed by the President be of any binding effect. It would be merely an expression of the views of those members of the present Congress who voted for it, subject to be repudiated by any future Congress. Our own opinion is that were this question made an issue in the election of members of Congress, but few in favor of taxing the people to buy up the negroes of the South would be chosen. The voters would reasonably conclude that if the institution of slavery had become so burdensome as to warrant its abolishment, the States so desiring to abolish it would be the proper ones to bear the burden.

But of all others, the present is the most inopportune time to inaugurate a discussion on the subject of slavery, either at the North or at the South. Long before Missouri or Kentucky could decide upon so momentous a question as the abolition of slavery, we hope to see the Union entirely restored, and the last hopes of the cotton State traitors extinguished. If the war should be protracted till the people of the border States should decide to abolish slavery, we fear peace would be a long way off.—*N. A. Ledger.*

Insolence.

It is now as habitual for a certain class of papers to accuse Democrats of being "secessionists" as it was when the war first broke out. The utter foolishness of the accusation is all that protects its authors from such rebuke as would not soon be forgotten. If it was true, what would be the fate of the country? What resistance could be made to rebellion if the North was divided? The great Democratic party, true to all its traditions, is now the chief pillar in the temple of the Union. Its members and organs are the only reliable support which the President and General McClellan have in the conduct of the war. Let that support be taken away and the war cannot be carried on an hour.

But Democrats have their way of suppressing the rebellion; a way, too, in which they are sustained by thousands of men who do not belong to their organization. They point to the Constitution as the authority by which, and as the end for which the war shall be carried on. They live up to the "bond" as it was made by the fathers of the Republic. They simply insist that the struggle shall not be made *political*. Have they not a right to do this? Is it not their duty to do this?

We sincerely regret the factious spirit which cause the class of papers referred to to indulge these malicious imputations. We fear that all men will not view them with the indifference we do. They are undoubtedly designed to inaugurate civil war at the North. This, at least, be their natural tendency, if Democrats regarded them as entitled to consideration.—*Detroit Free Press.*

The Ericsson Battery.

The Ericsson floating battery, just completed and known as the Monitor, in shape and machinery, is an ordinary propeller, 173 feet in length, 41 feet beam and 11 feet depth of hold. A revolving fort, which contains two 11 inch Dahlgren guns, is placed upon the deck near the center of the vessel. This fort or bomb-proof is 20 feet diameter inside, 10 feet in hight, and 8 feet in thickness. The hull is built of iron, and to protect the sides, the vessel is covered with one layer of oak 16 inches in thickness, another layer of oak 15 inches in thickness and the whole plated with six plates of one inch iron. The whole thickness of the sides is therefore three feet of solid wood and iron, exclusive of any ribs or braces in the interior. There are no bulwarks upon the deck, which is covered with heavy plates of iron, sufficient to resist any glancing shot or shell which may be thrown upon it. The smoke pipe is made with telescopic joints, which can be lowered into the hold during an engagement. The guns in the interior of the fort are loaded from the inside, and are free from exposure to the enemy's fire. She is propelled by steam engines.

The Monitor was constructed at the Continental Iron Works, Greenpoint, under the superintendence of Thomas F. Howland, of Brooklyn.

She was launched a short time since, and retained for a period at the place of launching, after which steam was got up and the vessel ran down to the navy yard in Brooklyn, where her guns were put aboard. It was afterwards contemplated to have made a trial trip at sea on Saturday last, but this was delayed; and meanwhile, late on Sunday night, intelligence was received from Washington of the ordering of the Monitor at once to Fortress Monroe.

The vessel was built under an act of Congress, making an appropriation of $1,500,000 for building iron clad vessels for the navy, and Captain Ericsson presented the plan for the Monitor. He stipulated to launch his battery one hundred working days from the date of the contract, October, 1861, and to test its impregnability and efficiency before the battery of an enemy at the shortest ranges of the guns. In this trial of efficiency the Government is to supply officers and men, guns and ammunition. The day of the launch was the 101st working day from the time the contract was made.

The previous description indicates one hull to the vessel, but there are in effect two hulls. The lower one, which is entirely under water, is sharp at both ends, flat bottomed, built lightly and about six feet deep, with sides inclining at an angle of fifty-one degrees to the vertical line. The second or upper hull, which comprises the defensive portion, has straight sides, is longer and broader than the under one, is five feet deep, sinks into the water three feet and is covered with the heavy iron armor above described. It has no bottom except what is required to enable it to fit exactly on the top line of the lower hull, both of course forming the consecutive side of the vessel.

The construction of the two hulls is such that the upper one, the sides of which are straight, project over the lower one, which is nearly flat-bottomed; to the extent of nearly four feet on the sides, and twenty-five feet at the bow and stern. The upper hull being iron plated, and submerged three feet and three inches, thus fully protects the bottom part of the vessel from injury, and receives against its invulnerable sides all shots which can possibly cause damage.

The turret has two port holes for the guns. Its plates of iron completely overlap and are riveted to each other, so that but one joint of one inch thickness of iron exists at any one spot. A shell-proof flat roof of perforated plate iron, planted on forged beams inserted six inches down the cylinder, covers the top.

Several sliding hatches in this cover, which give access to the top of the turret, are perforated an inch in diameter to give light, and are useful for musketry fire, in case the battery is boarded. A spur wheel, 6½ inches in diameter, 11 inches full, moved by a double cylinder engine, turns the turret around and also the guns; a rod, connecting with the running gear of the engine, enables the gunner to control the aim. The two port holes of the turret are within three feet from the deck. The guns move in forged iron slides, across the turret, the carriages being made to fit them accurately.

The battery being sharp is incidentally one of the most powerful steam rams ever built in the known world. The battery was commanded by Lieut. J. S. Worden, U. S. N.

The President's Emancipation Policy

The Springfield *Register*, in reviewing the recent message of the President in favor of granting pecuniary aid by the General Government to the States that may adopt a system of gradual emancipation, remarks:

The President's policy of emancipation is perfectly absurd. The slave States do not desire it and the North will not have it on the terms proposed. The North has voted money and declared its willingness to pay taxes to a limitless extent to carry on the war to put down the rebellion, but they have not voted a cent to buy negroes with, and they will not. The Abolitionists will not submit to such taxation, because they believe in robbing the slave owners by abolishment without remuneration; and the Democrats of the North will oppose it because slavery is a constitutional institution with which they wish to have nothing to do. We do not wish to buy their slaves, and the South do not wish to sell them by any such mode as the President proposes. It is unmanly to insult them, in their present situation, by such proposition.

Among the various humorous ideas in the message not the least striking is that of the "inconvenience" for which the Southerners are to receive compensation. It would puzzle "any member of Congress" to find out how much of a bill that would run up. The President does not tell us how the money is to be paid out in making the purchases—how good faith is to be secured, &c.

The message is a palpable failure. It will enrage the Abolitionists, disgust the Democrats, excite the derision of Southern Unionists and provoke the ridicule of all the outside world.

BANK OF THE STATE.—We hear of one of the branches of the Bank of the State of Indiana that has refused to pay coin for its bills, tendering demand treasury notes instead. The bank takes the ground that these notes are a legal tender, grounding its conclusion upon the construction given to the law by the Secretary of the Treasury. The fact, however, that there is now a bill before Congress, making the old issue legal tender, is evidence that the law authorizing the new issue did not impress this feauture upon the notes created under the act of July, 1861. Banks, therefore, that undertake to test the redemption question, on their right to use the United States paper now in circulation as a legal tender will be very apt to go to the wall, or they will at least be at the mercy of parties who may protest in default of payment in coin.—*Cin. Gaz.*

—The monthly returns show that the army of the Potomac is in excellent and improving health.

Is the Democratic Party Pro-Slavery

For many years it has been the constant practice of the opponents of the Democratic party to assail it with the cry that it was pro slavery, and from the fact that, latterly, the Southern States voted for Democratic candidates for President, many honest, fair minded men were made to believe that there was some ground for the assertion; whereas, the truth is that the abstract question of slavery was never introduced into any Democratic convention, and no opinion was ever expressed upon the subject. Every one was left free to form his own opinions and views upon this question, without let or hindrance from any one. How, then, has the opinion gained such footing as to mislead some men of real intelligence? We can only answer this question by referring to the action of the party, and thus show the utter falsity of the charge. The first resolution adopted upon the subject of slavery was at the Democratic National Convention held at Baltimore on the 5th of May, 1840, and was in the following words:

"*Resolved*, That Congress has no power, under the Constitution, to interfere with, or control, the domestic institutions of the several States; and that such States are the sole and proper judges of everything pertaining to their own affairs, not prohibited by the Constitution; that all efforts by abolitionists or others, made to induce Congress to interfere with questions of slavery, or to take incipient steps in relation thereto, are calculated to lead to the most alarming and dangerous consequences, and that all such efforts have an inevitable tendency to diminish the happiness of the people, and endanger the stability and permanency of the Union, and ought not to be countenanced by any friend to our political institutions."

The stand taken in this resolution was always maintained from that day forward. The party planted itself upon the Constitution, and what ever interfered with States or individuals, contrary to the Constitution, was opposed. The leaders of the party did not pretend to pass judgment upon the institution of slavery, because it had already been decided by the highest tribunal in the land that it was a local or domestic institution over which the United States had no control. There were doubtless many Democrats who thought and believed that if the negro race was to remain in our country in any considerable numbers, they must for a long period, if not permanently, remain in servitude; that, under these circumstances, slavery was not an evil; while others believed very differently. It was a singular fact that that portion of the party the farthest removed from actual contact with the negro race, the least acquainted with it, and knowing the least of its capacities for civilization and freedom, were those who were imbued with the strongest anti-slavery opinions.

The Convention of 1844 re-adopted the resolution of 1840, leaving the party to stand precisely as it had before. No new principle was adopted—no new proposition was even made to the Convention. In 1848 the same resolution was re adopted without change or alteration. In 1852, at the time Mr. Pierce was nominated, the same resolution was re affirmed, and the following additional resolutions were adopted:

Resolved, That the foregoing proposition covers, and is intended to embrace, the whole subject of slavery agitation in Congress; and, therefore, the Democratic party of the Union, standing on this national platform, will abide by, and adhere to, a faithful execution of the acts known as the compromise measures, settled by the last Congress, the act for reclaiming fugitive slaves included; which act being designed to carry out an express provision of the Constitution, cannot, with fidelity thereto, be repealed, nor so changed as to destroy or impair its efficiency.

Resolved, That the Democratic party will resist all attempts at renewing, in Congress or out of it, the agitation of the slavery question, under whatever shape or color the attempt may be made.

Surely, up to this time, no grounds of complaint could be made against the Democratic party that it was pro-slavery. It adhered in its resolves closely to the Constitution. By that instrument it stood. If that can be called pro slavery, then the Democratic party might be called so also. If not, then how can any such complaint be made? When we have finished with this review of the platform of the Democratic party, we will bestow such attention as may be necessary to show how the Republican party veered around towards the Abolitionists, as that party was ascertained to hold the balance of power between the two. We think we shall be able to show to the satisfaction of every candid man, that while there is no reason for calling the Democratic party pro-slavery, there are good grounds for calling the Republicans *quasi* Abolitionists.

We have already referred to the action of the Democratic National Conventions in 1840, 1844, 1848 and 1852, upon the question of slavery, and found nothing from which even an inference could be drawn that the party, as such, ever held any opinions upon the subject. All the Conventions ever undertook to declare was, simply, that Congress had no power to "interfere with, or control, the domestic institutions of the several States." This was the Constitution, and by that the Conventions not only resolved to stand firmly, but it was made the duty of every man who was a member of that party to stand by the Constitution and obey it, and obey the laws of the land.

During the administration of General Pierce, the question of the *status* of slavery in the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska had been raised, and excited much angry feeling. At the meeting of the Democratic National Convention in 1856, at Cincinnati, much anxiety was felt by the leading men of the North, as well as the South, to lay down a platform which would prove such a clear expression of the Constitution, and, consequently, of the party, that all would be satisfactory therewith. After much deliberation, the Convention adopted the resolutions which had received the sanction of the convention in 1840, and had been reaffirmed successively in 1844, 1848 and 1852, with the additional resolutions adopted in the latter year. But the danger of a sectional party had vastly increased, and as the question of slavery in the Territories acquired from Mexico had to be met and disposed of, the following resolutions were added:

"And that we may more distinctly meet the issue on which a sectional party, *subsisting exclusively on slavery agitation, now relies*, to test the fidelity of the people of the North and South to the Constitution and the Union:

"*Resolved*, That, claiming fellowship with, and desiring the co-operation of, all who regard the preservation of the Union under the Constitution as the paramount issue, and repudiating all sectional parties and platforms concerning domestic slavery which seek to embroil the States and incite treason and armed resistance to law in the Territories, and whose avowed purpose, if consummated, must end in civil war and disunion, the American Democracy recognize and adopt the principles contained in the organic laws establishing the Territories of Nebraska and Kansas, as embodying the only sound and safe solution of the slavery question upon which the great national idea of the people of this whole country can repose in its determined conservation of the Union, and non-interference of Congress with slavery in the Territories or in the District of Columbia.

"*Resolved*, That this was the basis of the compromise of 1850, confirmed by both the Democratic and Whig parties in national conventions, ratified by the people in the election of 1852, and rightly applied to the organization of the Territories in 1854.

"*Resolved*, That by the uniform application of the Democratic principle to the organization of Territories, and the admission of new States with or without domestic slavery, as they may elect, the equal rights of all the States will be preserved intact, *the original compacts of the Constitution maintained inviolate*, and the perpetuity and expansion of the Union, insured to its utmost capacity of embracing, in peace and harmony, every future American State that they may be constituted or annexed with a republican form of government.

Resolved, That we recognize the right of the people of all the Territories, including Kansas and Nebraska, acting through the legally and fairly expressed will of the majority of the actual residents, and whenever the number of their inhabitants justifies it, to form a Constitution with or without domestic slavery, and be admitted into the Union upon terms of perfect equality with the other States.

It will be seen from a careful perusal of these additional resolutions, that the party simply resolved to stand by the Constitution still, as they had for years before. For the purpose of effectually excluding the whole subject of slavery from the halls of Congress, the right of the Territories, so far as the Constitution permitted, was declared to have the complete disposition of the subject within their respective limits. This was the celebrated popular sovereignty doctrine of Mr. Douglas, which was then acquiesced in, not only by the party assembled in convention, but afterwards by almost every leading man of the party, either in Congress or in the campaign which followed. Will any man say, who has any regard for the truth of history, that there is any ground in these resolutions for the charge that the Democratic party was pro-slavery? We think not. At different periods from 1840 to 1856, almost all the Northern States which had ever been Democratic, formed Constitutions, and into every one of them was inserted an article forbidding slavery or involuntary servitude. In these constitutions will be found the judgment and opinions of the leading Democratic statesmen of the North upon the abstract question of slavery when applied to their own respective State Governments. But they did not undertake to prescribe a rule of action for the statesmen of the South, whether they belonged to the Democratic or Whig parties. They conceded to them as full and perfect a right, under the Constitution of the United States, to regulate the domestic institutions of their respective States as they themselves claimed and exercised at home. And more, they held it but right and proper, when any State had made its election, it should be treated kindly and courteously, for the Constitution declared that, "the citizens of each State *were entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States.*" The comity of nations, nay, more than that, the intimate relations existing between States forming such a Government as ours, demanded of each State the utmost circumspection and prudence in expressing an opinion as to the institutions of another State entitled to equal rights and equal privileges. This was all the Democratic party demanded, and this the Constitution required.

We have thus traced the principles of that party, as declared by the only body having any authority to speak upon the subject, from the day it was first introduced until the year 1856. In all this time there was not a word which indicated that the party was pro slavery, but on the contrary, its whole action clearly and distinctly proclaimed that upon this subject it only adhered to the compromises of the Constitution.

The political contest of 1860 is too recent, has been impressed upon the minds of the people too firmly by the appalling events which have followed in quick succession, until the country is convulsed by civil wars, to need much comment. We all remember the action of the Democratic party, and know that it was neither justly charged with the taint of Abolitionism by the South or pro slaveryism by the North. But to make the record complete, we give the resolutions adopted at Charleston and Baltimore. Those at Charleston were as follows:

Resolved, That we, the Democracy of the Union, in convention assembled, hereby declare our affirmance of the resolutions unanimously adopted and declared as a platform of our principles by the Democratic Convention at Cincinnati in the year 1856, believing that Democratic principles are unchangable in their nature when applied to the same subject matters; and we recommend as the only further resolutions the following:

Resolved, That it is the duty of the United States to afford ample and complete protection to all its citizens, whether at home or abroad, and whether native or foreign.

Resolved, That the enactments of State Legislatures to defeat the faithful execution of the fugitive slave law, *are hostile in character, subversive of the Constitution, and revolutionary in their effect.*

At Baltimore the following additional resolution was adopted, with only two dissenting votes:

Resolved, That in its accordance with the interpretation of the Cincinnati platform, that during the existence of the Territorial governments; the measure of restriction, whatever it may be, imposed by the Federal Constitution on the power of the Territorial Legislature over the subject of the domestic relations, as the same has been, or shall hereafter be finally determined by the Supreme Court of the United States, should be respected by all good citizens, and enforced with promptness and fidelity by every branch of the Government.

Here ends the record of the principles laid down by the Democratic party upon the subject of slavery. There is not a sentence, a word, a syllable, even, to indicate or show that the party, as such, is now, or ever has been, pro-slavery, no more than there is to show it is favor of abolition. At all times, at all places, and under all circumstances, it has stood boldly up to the Constitution, and declared its readiness and willingness to have that instrument carried out in good faith, and, instead of being called sectional or pro-slavery, it has well earned the name which history will accord to it, as a great constitutional party, which administered the Government with eminent wisdom and success for many years, and at last fell before the fierce attacks of fanatics in the different sections of the Union.—*Detroit Free Press.*

General McClellan.

We are advised by our special Washington correspondent that to-day General McClellan will cease to be General-in-Chief of the Army of the United States, sad that an order announcing the change will be issued this morning by Secretary Stanton. This will not take any careful reader of the *Gazette* by surprise. It has been known to us, that soon after the inauguration of Mr. Stanton, he lost the confidence not only of the Secretary of War, but of the whole Cabinet, and also of the President. It was fully determined some weeks ago that he must either bring forth fruits worthy of the fine army he controlled, or retire. Of this decision, we understand, he was advised, when he asked for an opportunity to lead his army against Manassas. This was granted. The movement took place, and the result is known. The rebel army had departed. The place was there, and nothing else. And now it appears that this great army, which menaced for so many months the capital of the nation, and blockaded the Potomac, did not exceed forty thousand men. The dismissal was fairly deserved. It could not have been avoided. Gen. McClellan has no right to complain. Never did a man, occupying such a position, and holding for many months within his control the destinies of a great nation, enjoy such advantages for distinction as he has enjoyed. Elevated by the President, with the unanimous approval of the Senate, and the cordial assent of the people, he entered upon what promised to be a brilliant career. In all his movements he was sustained by the resources of the nation in men and money, meeting no opposition from any quarter; and encountering no interference, the President, even, having surrendered everything into his hands, until it became evident that he was not equal as a chief commander to the emergency. Then, and not before, did a patient people begin to express dissatisfaction. It is not our purpose here to recount the failures of General McClellan. Indeed this is not necessary to a full justification of the course of the President. The events of the last twenty-four hours make it evident that he was not removed an hour too soon. The country is in peril, and no man can be allowed to endanger it by retarding the great undertaking the nation has in hand. The task was a delicate one, and we are sure no one regrets the necessity for the step that has been taken more than Mr. Lincoln; but the country will feel strengthened and encouraged to find that energy and resolution now preside at the helm. For this let the people rejoice while they sympathise with the General whose failure has led to the change in the command of the army.—*Cincinnati Gazette.*

ISLAND NO. 10.—This island is situated in the corner of that bend of the Mississippi river which touches the border of Tennessee, a few miles farther up the river than New Madrid, although nearly southwest of that point. It is located about two hundred and thirty miles from St. Louis, and nine hundred and fifty miles from New Orleans. The elevation of the river at this point is about two hundred feet above the level of the delta, or its mouth. The average depth of the water at this point is from ninety to one hundred and twenty feet, and the breadth of the stream from mainland to mainland about nine hundred yards. The current runs by the island at a moderately fast rate, and with the power of the three rivers—Mississippi, Missouri and Ohio—combined. The island is near the southern, or what might be termed the eastern, bank of the river, but that, at this point, the stream varies from its southern course and turns abruptly to the northwest, leaving this Island in the southern angle of the bend. It is about forty five miles, by the course of the river, south of Columbus, and about twenty-six miles from Hickman. It is near Obienville.

Col. John A. Hendricks Killed.

The numerous friends of Col. JOHN A. HENDRICKS will receive with sincere regret the intelligence of his untimely end at the battle of Pea Ridge. He was appointed Lieutenant Colonel of the 22d regiment Indiana volunteers upon its organization, and was in command of the regiment in that engagement. Col. HENDRICKS was the oldest son of WILLIAM HENDRICKS, deceased, who was the second Governor of the State and afterwards represented Indiana in the United States Senate. He was a native of Indiana, born in Madison, and about forty years of age. He was a gentleman of ability and education, a lawyer by profession and twice had enlisted in the military service of his country. In the Mexican war he was a Captain of an Indiana regiment, but resigned before its expiration. A husband, a father and a valued citizen is cut off in the prime of life and usefulness—another victim added to the long list who felt it their duty to offer their lives upon the altar of their country in the unnatural strife to maintain the Constitution and preserve the Union. This regiment is ill-fated. Two of its field officers, TANNER and HENDRICKS, have fallen—

A warrior's weapon freed a warrior's soul.

And the recent terrible conflicts at Pea Ridge and Fort Craig are but the precursors of the sad news which will yet reach many a hearthstone and desolate many a household before peace and union again bless the land.

O'er the proud heads of free men our star-banner waves,
Men firm as their mountains and still as their graves,
To-morrow shall pour out their life-blood like rains,—
We come back in triumph, or come not again.

The Tax on Real Estate.

There seems to be an impression that the Government has imposed no direct tax on the real estate of the country. By the law entitled "An act to provide increased revenue from imports, to pay interest on the public debt, and for other purposes," passed on the 5th of August, 1861, it is provided "that a direct tax of twenty millions of dollars be and is hereby annually laid upon the United States, and the same shall be and is hereby apportioned in the manner following:"

Maine	$420,826	Indiana	$904,874
N. Hampshire	218,496	Illinois	1,146,551
Vermont	211,068	Missouri	761,127
Massachusetts	804,581	Kansas	71,743
Rhode Island	116,963	Arkansas	261,886
Connecticut	308,214	Michigan	501,763
New York	2,603,918	Florida	77,522
New Jersey	450,134	Texas	355,106
Pennsylvania	1,946,719	Iowa	452,088
Delaware	74,683	Wisconsin	519,688
Maryland	436,823	California	254,538
Virginia	937,550	Minnesota	108,524
N. Carolina	576,194	Oregon	35,140
S. Carolina	363,570	New Mexico	62,648
Georgia	584,367	Utah	26,982
Alabama	529,313	Washington	7,755
Mississippi	413,084	Nebaska	19,312
Louisiana	385,886	Nevada	4,592
Ohio	1,567,089	Colorado	22,095
Kentucky	713,695	Dacotah	3,241
Tennessee	669,498	Dis. of Col.	19,437

The law further declares that this tax "shall be assessed and laid on the value of all lands and lots of ground, with their improvements and dwelling houses, at the rate each of them is worth in money on the first day of April, 1862." There is a provision, however, in the law which allows the Stetes and Territories to assume the payment of the amount apportioned to them respectively, in which case a deduction of fifteen per cent. is allowed.

The President on Emancipation.

The suggestions of the President in his recent message in favor of the General Government extending pecuniary aid to those States which may adopt the policy of gradual emancipation, to compensate them for the public and private inconvenience attending upon such change of system, are considered by the leading organs of public sentiment from entirely different stand points and with widely different conclusions. The New York *Tribune*, the organ of the radical Republicans, hails it as "The message of freedom. * * One of those few great scriptures that live in history and make an epoch in the lives of nations and races." It thus interprets the suggestions of the President:

He sees that, however often rebellion may be suppressed at the South, it will never be ended so long as slavery has an assured existence. The continuation of slavery as a permanent institution on which no inroad has been made is the continuation of the war, for resistance to the Federal Government must be permanently suppressed, and resistance brings war. Whatever is indispensable to this end must be done, and slavery, therefore, must fall either in one way or the other. Let the slaveholders begin the reform and we will give them our hearty aid; if they will not, then we must do it without them as a necessary step toward the establishment of permanent peace and the supremacy of the Union, for slavery is rebellion. The South has the choice of beginning the work with the help of the whole country, and the system thus to be left to gradually disappear from natural but inevitable causes; or she may refuse and resent the offer and take the consequences of continued resistance. This is clearly Mr. Lincoln's meaning, and his convictions are