R. K. Hammond

THE INDIANA STATE SENTINEL.

VOL. XXI, NO. 51. INDIANAPOLIS, IND., MONDAY, MAY 12, 1862. WHOLE NO. 1,192.

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	15 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 Widekly 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 headed 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'plis.

Selected Miscellany.

CONFISCATION AND EMANCIPATION

An Exposition by a Republican Senator of the Dangers of Radical Measures—Speech of Hon. Jacob Collamer, of Vermont, in the U. S. Senate, April 24, 1862.

REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENT ON TRIAL.

Mr. President, our nation is in a stage and condition of its national existence where undoubtedly it attracts more than it ever did before the notice of the nations of the world, not merely in relation to the skill which is shown in our new projectiles or improved ordnance or invulnerable ships, or even in our battles, but the attention of the world is attracted to what is to be the result on this great occasion of this national experiment of ours. They say, "Your experiment of a republican form of government succeeds well enough in time of peace, when there is no occasion to try it, when there is nothing to test it;" but they have looked forward to some time which might bring periods of trial and convulsion; and the question before the world is, is our system competent to that occasion? does it possess strength and elements of power sufficient to meet the shock of such a contingency? If it will not do that, they say it is not what we have claimed it to be before the world—the great and successful experiment in popular government. "Now," say the world, "we shall see whether you can succeed with what appears to us a feebly formed Government in a period of trial." That we may be enabled to sustain the integrity of the nation—I mean its entirety, not its sense of justice—by the physical force of the nation is but one step in it. That is not the point. The great question before the world to be now settled by us is, can we sustain the integrity of our Government, and perpetuate our institutions, and do it according to the limitations and provisions of the Constitution? That is what is to show that our Constitution is competent to the trial, and nothing short of that. If, when this occasion arises, we are compelled to resort to means which, in effect, are the means used by stronger Governments, our experiment is a failure. If we are constrained to call up, invoke, and put in exercise in any one department of the Government—it is immaterial in what department of the Government—more of power, more of force, than the Constitution provides, or than is limited by that Constitution—the moment we do that, or are constrained from our supposed necessities to do it, we acknowledge before the world that our institutions are insufficiently founded, and that we are after all compelled, in the period of trial, to resort to the force which, they say, is necessary to the existence of a nation, and our experiment is a failure. We should, therefore, particularly in a period like this, carefully study and sacredly regard all the limitations and provisions of the Constitution. It is vain and idle in us to war against a part of our people because they have made war upon this Government, if we at the same time have to sap the foundations of the Government by stabbing through the vitals of the Constitution.

STATE GOVERNMENTS MUST BE RESPECTED.

Mr. President, it is quite obvious that State legislation, local legislation and government, is as essential a feature of this Government as the General Government. The system cannot exist any more without the one than the other. It is a failure utterly unless both exist. Then, in restoring Government, it implies that we must restore the State Governments, put them again into operation, or we fail in our system altogether. In relation to this last branch of duty, I can conceive that there may be legislation even at this period which may possibly tend, if well administered, in some measure to secure that great end. But the first thing to be observed is, that, however legislation may take place, nothing can be practically done on that point until the insurrection as an armed insurrection is put down, suppressed, for then alone is it that your law can really operate. The plans which different gentlemen have presented all look to that. None of them in any of their essential and leading purposes can be carried into effect in any way until we possess the country. They are not means to that end—the end of suppressing the armed rebellion; they are only to take effect after the armed rebellion is suppressed, for that must be done in order to put such a law into operation; and the question is, can we legislate now wisely, discreetly, advisedly, in such manner that our law may be put in operation at that time with success to the end which I have stated? I confess for myself I have some misgivings about that.

WE HAVE NOT FULFILLED OUR CONSTITUTIONAL OBLIGATIONS TO THE PEOPLE OF THE REBEL STATES.

The duties of protection by the Government and allegiance and loyalty by the people are reciprocal terms and duties. Neither of them can be enacted by the other unless that part due by itself is performed. This is as true now as it was when it was said and elaborated by Judge Parsons. Now, sir, the men who have ridden over the people in the Southern States have established Governments *de facto*; they are operative on that people, however much they may have originated in usurpation. How are we to look at such a people? What is our duty to them as a nation? What is their duty to us as citizens? It is the duty of the Government of the United States, under the Constitution, to suppress insurrection. That is our duty, clearly expressed in the Constitution, to put down insurrection everywhere in the United States. An insurrection is essentially injurious to that section in which it arises, and the duty to have it suppressed is most owing to those that are most injured by it. Mr. President, have we put down that insurrection? Have we relieved that people from the incubus which is upon them? Have we dispersed the insurgents who ride rough-shod over them? We have not done it. You may say, "Our duty of protection is to people that are loyal, and we will protect them." Sir, if the people are all the while loyal they do not need any protection; they stand in peace, of course. If we have any obligations to the people of the State as members of this Republic, is is to protect them from violence. When we guaranty them a republican form of Government in each State it implies that we have the exercise of power over them, at least to secure to the body of that people the opportunity to have, not a nominal and usurped, but an actual Government within the Constitution of the United States. That is what we owe them.

THE REBEL GOVERNMENT A DE FACTO GOVERNMENT, AND THE PEOPLE COMPELLED TO OBEY IT.

I will remark another thing. These men have established a *de facto* Government over that people. If a man finds himself in a *de facto* Government which he cannot resist and has no power to control, what are the limits and measures of his obligations? It requires a brave man to say that he will war upon it because he thinks it is a usurpation. It would be a bold man who should say now, "The United States made a rebellion against England, and all the present power you have, national and State, is itself but a usurpation; I do not owe it any obedience, and I will not obey it." How idle it would be for an individual, a weak man, to talk in that way! Just so it is with the people in these States. However loyal their feelings, a Government *de facto* is over them; they cannot get away; they have nowhere to go; they have nothing to go with. What would you have a man there to do? What has this nation a right to demand of him? What right have we to demand of these people loyalty, allegiance, and obedience to this Government, and to war on the Government *de facto* which is established over them, when we do not relieve them, furnish them with arms, disperse the armies that are there, or disarm the men who are their usurpers, but leave them in that condition?

Mr. President, when I look at things in this light, it seems to me it is a very questionable policy, and still more questionable ethics, for us to sit here day after day, before relieving that people, and while they are thus trodden on, making laws by which we declare that they have taken their States out of the Union and annihilated them, that whatever charters they hold under laws are gone, to unhouse them, strip them, and confiscate their property, taking advantage of their absence when they are not represented here, and have no power to do otherwise. It may suit the notions of equity and right of some, but to my mind it looks more like taking counsel from our resentments than from our judgments.

But it is said, "Men have actually taken offices there under that Government; they have had the audacity to do that since that Government has been established over them." I do not profess to be very highly versed in the ethics of politics, but I am fond of looking to examples that are bright and high. At the time of the rebellion under Cromwell, which had established a Government *de facto* over the people of England, and had put down the existing Government, application was made to Chief Justice Hale—a man whose character stands as high, perhaps, as any in the annals of Christian judges—to take the place of Chief Justice, he being opposed to that gentleman. Justice Hale consulted with a couple of his friends (bishops,) and after a full deliberation came to this conclusion: "Justice must be administered; the rights between man and man must be adjudged upon; somebody must hold courts; I can consider it no sin to take an office under a *de facto* Government, though it is a usurpation." He took it; and that man was not adjudged guilty of treason upon the restoration of Charles II. He continued in position ever afterwards.

In all the troubles between the house of York and the house of Lancaster, in the wars of the Roses, when revolutions were constant and frequent, one day a man of this family upon the throne, and the next day one of the other, as early as the period of Henry VII a statute was passed which has abided in England through all the revolutions afterwards, that no man should be adjudged guilty of treason because he was obedient to the reigning King, no matter if his was a usurpation. Such, sir, is the respect paid by the world, and especially that part of the world from which we sprung, to a *de facto* Government; and the nations of the earth deal with them as Governments, no matter what the usurpation.

THE SAFEGUARDS OF THE CONSTITUTION.

Mr. President, I have already remarked that in whatever we do we must keep fairly within the limitations of the Constitution. It will not do to say that because we need to do this thing, because it is necessary in our judgment, we will do it for that reason. The limitations and prohibitions of power in the Constitution were put there on purpose to prevent our doing such things when we wanted to do them. They were not put in to prevent our doing things we never wanted to do. When it provided, for instance, that you should not pass any attainder bill, that you should not take away any man's property without due process of law, that no man should be punished unless it was on conviction by a jury, that no man should be twice punished for the same offense—prohibitions of this kind are prohibitions to everybody, and they were put in to prevent Congress doing such things when they wanted to do them. They were put in there on purpose to prevent us doing these things when we thought they were necessary. They were not put in to prevent us doing these things when we did not want to do them, and when they were not necessary at all in our judgment.

Now, the question is, after we shall have possessed that country by force of arms, can we do anything consistently with the provisions of the Constitution that will tend to bring back those people to their allegiance. If we can, and if we are clear that our measures will tend to produce a good effect in that way, very well; but if we can not do it pursuant to and within the provisions of the Constitution, let us not, at this particular period of our trial, acknowledge in the face of the world that our Constitution and institutions are insufficient to sustain us.

THE WAR POWER.

Judge COLLAMER here combatted at length, in a legal argument of great power, the proposed plan of proceeding against the rebels by confiscating their property by act of Congress, without jury trial, as a violation of the Constitution. The passage of such a law would be an assumption of power by Congress it does not possess. He says:

If we make laws by our power under the Constitution we must regard the prohibitions of the Constitution, else we are lawless. And it makes very little difference to what department of the Government all this usurpation goes. If it is true that the Congress of the United States, on an occasion like a war of this kind, can take to itself and exercise all power, regardless of the prohibitions of the Constitution; and, further, can make itself Commander-in-Chief of the army and conduct the particulars and details of the war in all respects, I do not know that there was any usurpation by the House of Commons in the time of Cromwell. They said they represented the people, and they took command of the Generals of the army; they overrode the other departments of the Government and broke down the Government itself. Suppose we choose to take control of the army and all its command, and of its Commander in-Chief, and direct all its details as we please, and send our Committee on the Conduct of the War out into the camps to inspect the proceedings of the Generals and direct them in their duty, as was done under Cromwell, I do not see that it would be anything more or anything less than a usurpation and tyranny; and its being in this body, or in these two bodies constituting the Congress, does not relieve it of the difficulty in the least.

It is said, however, that we are at war, and that we have become elevated to the privileges and are entitled to exercise the rights of a belligerent; that this power of confiscation is a sort of war power over our own citizens that we have a right to exercise in the capacity of a belligerent. I have given what little reflection my limited powers would allow to this branch of the subject. I at first thought it was tolerably plausible that, to some extent, such a power might be used; but the more I reflect on it the more I perceive that the whole of that doctrine about the relative rights and privileges of belligerents to each other is utterly inapplicable to the present condition of things between us and the seceded States and their people. Undoubtedly, so far as regards the conducting of the war, it should be conducted according to the laws of nations, and, if you please, according to the usages of nations in these times of civilization; but when we come to the rights of belligerents, can we apply them? When we conquer a country with which we are at war, we own the public property there. Now, we have conquered Tennessee, if you please. Do we own the capitol at Nashville to-day? Do we own any of the universities and colleges and public property of the State of Tennessee to-day? If they are treated as belligerents, then, when you conquer the country, the property in the land remains in the individuals who have owned it before, and the nation acquires no title to it by conquest. Here is an attempt to get possession of all that property of individuals which have been concerned in this rebellion. And how? As a belligerent. According to the laws of nations a belligerent does not get it. I know that the Constitution provides that Congress may issue letters of marque and reprisal, and make regulations in relation to captures or seizures by sea and land. That looks to a state of war, undoubtedly. What is a seizure or capture? What is the meaning of the term? Something that you take, make prize of, carry away. Can you carry away the farms of an enemy? Are they subject to capture? Not at all.

But, Mr. President, when, after a war with another nation, you make peace with it, all matters are ended, depending on the form of your articles of peace. It may be the *status ante bellum*, it may be *uti possidetes*, depending on the terms of your treaty; but all matters are then ended. Now when we have conquered these people, taken military possession of the country, can we not punish the men who have been in rebellion? can we not render it legitimate to hang them? Certainly. Could you do so with enemies with whom you have made war and peace? No; but in such cases, when peace was declared, the past would be wiped out.

Again, to treat with them, and treat about them, as being belligerents, is to acknowledge them, so far as this war is concerned, as a coequal power. We have complained that any foreign nation acknowledged and recognized them as in a state of belligerency. We thought it was pretty hard usage to us. I do not see it in that light exactly; but at any rate, especially after what has been said to the other nations of the world by our functionary and correspondent of the State Department, it ill becomes us to take measures founded on the ground that they are co-equals and belligerents, and that we may make laws accordingly. This legislating for that people as bound by the laws that we here make, and at the same time legislating for them as enemies and belligerents not bound by the laws we make, is, to my mind, utterly inconsistent, utterly irreconcilable, and I shall not, therefore, make any further remarks in relation to what might, by possibility, be done by us as belligerents.

THE PLEA OF MILITARY NECESSITY.

A favorite argument with the ultra Republicans, in justification of the radical legislation they propose, is that of "military necessity;" and upon it they base many of the schemes they seek to enact into laws. Military necessity with them overrides the Constitution, and is made to sanction every form of tyranny. On this point, Judge COLLAMER said:

* * * But I insist that the Executive, his Generals, the military power, are the sole judges of what is military necessity. It is not possible that we can, by legislation, provide for the prosecution of the war in all respects, and enact the laws by which, in all cases, it shall be governed. War, even in its most modified form, is in a great measure the law of retaliation. You do what is necessary to meet the enemy's acts; you retaliate on him, and go sometimes to great extremity, laying waste his country, spreading over it utter desolation. It may be a military necessity to do that; but to undertake to sit here and make laws directing the Executive and the Generals as to what they may, and what they may not, consider as military necessities, is utterly idle, because they are constantly changing with the changing circumstances; and, as I have before said on another occasion, when you undertake to make the laws to regulate what they may do, you necessarily imply that they must not do any thing but what you have regulated. It was said by the Hon. Senator from Ohio (Mr. Sherman) yesterday, that the Executive, through his officers, may take ships and burn them. Did we make any law for that? No. Do we complain of its being done wrongfully? No. It did not need any law then to do it. It does not need any law to stop it. It is said that this confiscation is a military proceeding, a military necessity. If it is—I do not decide that point—we know where to go; we know who is to decide whether it is or is not; and, if we do anything that takes away from the Executive and his Generals the deciding upon what is military necessity, we usurp their rights, we usurp their powers.

WHAT LEGISLATION IS CALLED FOR.

Mr. President, the legislation which is called for at the hands of legislative bodies depends in a great measure upon the exigencies of circumstances, and ought to be addressed to them, fitted to them. The old law of the mischief and the remedy, lawyers well understand. We should look to what is the present law, and see what is needed, and what shape the law should take to effect the desired end. When the Executive, through its Generals and its armies, shall have put down the armed rebellion—and nothing of great importance here can be done until that it is effected—what is wanted, what is needed? Nothing can now be offered by the President to these people but that, if they will return to their allegiance and be obedient, they shall not be hanged. We all perfectly well know that the idea of hanging a hundred thousand men, or ten thousand men, or anything of that kind, is idle. Nobody apprehends it; nobody has any fears of it; and I trust nobody has any hopes of it. Then that will not enable the President to hold out any inducement at all, because they have no apprehensions on that subject. All rebellions that are unsuccessful, that are suppressed, among any civilized people, end in a bill of amnesty, from which some are reserved and executed for punishment. The great body of the people are pardoned. I recollect among a civilized people of but one rebellion that was ever attempted to be treated in any other way, and that was the Monmouth rebellion, under the Duke of Monmouth, in England, in the time of James II.—a very foolish rebellion and one which was readily suppressed. King James sent Jeffries, and he hung two hundred and odd people, including females; it was called "Jeffreys' western campaign." Though the people of England disliked the man for his bigotry, they disliked that rebellion; but when that experiment was tried on the British people, when it shocked the humanity of the British nation, it produced the culmination of the public disgust with that same James II., and in less than six months from that time Jeffreys was in the Tower and his master was fleeing from the throne of England. That was an attempt to deal in another way with a rebellion.

I look to no such result in this country. I know our people are exceedingly exasperated, and I participate in that feeling myself as an individual. But revenge, exasperation, feelings of vengeance should not be entertained by nations, nor by bodies representing nations. Rebels must be treated with severity to extremity; a proper number of those who are needed for example, for its wholesome influence afterwards, should be brought to condign punishment; but the great mass must have an amnesty.

HOW EXTREME MEASURES WILL WORK.

A short time since Mr. Cave Johnson was at Clarksville, and he informed Commodore Foote that the rebel army had gone away from Clarksville, and he had better come there and take the town and take care of it. These people had all been engaged in the army pretty much, but Commodore Foote came and took possession. The people were in great consternation, not knowing what would happen; and he published a card informing them that if they remained in their houses, and attended to their ordinary business and behaved themselves, they should be protected. When General Buell got to Nashville he published a proclamation to the same effect. Now, suppose you pass this bill in this shape, and another city which has been possessed by the enemy is abandoned or their soldiers are driven out of it. The people of that city have been almost entirely concerned with the rebels, and they come to our General and say, "We are satisfied that we cannot continue this rebellion any more; we are willing to submit; we want to know whether you will protect us from wrong and violence." "What do you want to be protected in?" "In our property, in our families, in our houses, our residences." "You have got no houses, you have got no homes; you want to be protected in your property; you have not got any property; the whole of it was confiscated by Congress last week; and we are here to sell it, dispose of it, and put the purchasers into possession; you are all of you in that condition." "Is that all that is left to us if we become obedient to the laws?" "Yes, all except to be shot; I do not know that there is anything else; if you resist and go on, I do not know how you will come out; but if you submit to us, subject yourselves to our laws, that will be your fate; and your slaves will be set at liberty; and your six or eight millions of people unhoused, have nothing, and have nothing to buy it with." [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. President, it is beyond my comprehension how the road to peace lies in such a path. I am unable to see how peace can be attained by any means of that kind. Oh, but it is said we must have some money, our people are burdened with taxes and debts and expenses, and we must have something to repay them. I should like to ask a man who talks in that way how much he thinks can be got out of it. What would you give for a farm down in Tennessee or Georgia, with the people swarming around you unhoused, people believing themselves to be owners, who were outlawed and deprived of their property by you? Why, sir, it would require two regiments to take care of every plantation. [Laughter.] No man would give a dollar for such a title. The idea of realizing money in that way is to me as idle as the idea of realizing peace in that way.

NO INTERFERENCE WITH SLAVERY.

Judge COLLAMER referred at some length, in considering the provisions of the confiscation bills freeing slaves, to the plighted faith of the Republican party not to interfere with slavery in the States. He said:

If we make a law, intending it to be operative, by which we declare that the slaves of all engaged in this rebellion, or of all the officers and classes mentioned in the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, are free, and all right over them abolished, do you believe, does any man of common sense believe, that you can make the world understand that we have not interfered with slavery in the States, and not to a very limited extent either, but to about the whole extent to which it exists? All remarks, however ingenious, and all sophistry, however remarkable, which can make this look any otherwise, is but a delusion. It can not be seen in any other light. This is not put on the ground that it is a military operation, not on the ground of proceedings *in rem*, not that it deprives a man of his property and yet leaves him to be hung, not upon any conviction, not upon any process of law whatever, except this law which we now make.

It seems to me, obtuse as I am, perhaps, in my perceptions, that that is directly interfering with this plighted faith; and it seems to me, further, that it is in direct violation of the provisions, prohibitions and securities which the Constitution enacts. I, for one, will not do it. I do not regard myself as needing any apology for not doing it. I do not think my people wish me to contribute to breaking any provision of the Constitution, and they know I would not do if they did wish it; nor do they need any apologies from me for regarding the oath I have taken.

But, sir, if we had this power, allow me to make a single remark as to the policy of it in aiding to put down the rebellion. You propose to say to the officers, "Your property is confiscated," and to the soldiers, "You may proceed with impunity; if you do not succeed you shall not be punished." Is it not saying, "Now, you officers, fight on to save yourselves; and soldiers, you may follow your officers as far as you can, for, after all, if you do not succeed, you are not going to lose anything." Really that does not seem to be very good policy. The same treatment is proposed in regard to slaves. The slaves are now in the possession and control of their masters, except so far as our army goes. If they try to get away, especially if they are at any considerable distance from our armies, their masters will not allow them to do it. Of course, the masters are not going to let them get away to join us to shoot them; they will stop them, perhaps kill them in the attempt. If we knew people were going from us to join the enemy and fight us we should not let them go. Neither do they. Now, by this bill, we say to these slaves, if they are ever to learn what we do at all—and if they do not, it can have no effect—"You need not run any risk about offending your master; perhaps your master will succeed in the rebellion, and you will suffer pretty hard if you undertake to run away and he catches you; you may remain quietly with your master, and not incur the hazard of his displeasure or punishment; but if, after all, your master does not succeed, you shall be free, whether you help or not." Is that good policy? That is the bill. It does not seem to me to be a very wise means to the end, if such an end is had in view, as I suppose.

JUDGE COLLAMER'S EXPLANATION OF THE BILL HE SUBMITS.

I will now call the attention of the Senate to the bill which I have submitted as an amendment. It is printed, but I have made some little alterations in the copy left on the table. In the first place, in order to enable the President to have in his hands an opportunity to offer some objects and advantages and purposes to that people, I have taken this course: In the first section of my bill I provide that the punishment for treason upon conviction may be death, or, in the discretion of the court, it may be fine and imprisonment. That fine is limited to be not less than $10,000, and the imprisonment to be not less than five years. The maximum I have left to the discretion of the court. I intended that the fine in the power of the court to lay should be such as was adapted to the man's means, and I would put the fine large enough to strip any man who was incorrigible.

I further provide that the effect of the conviction shall be that he shall be incapable of holding any office under the Government, and that his slaves shall be free, and that this fine shall be levied and collected out of any property he possessed at the time the act was committed. I am free to acknowledge one purpose that I had in this provision. Much has been said about the subject of the forfeiture of a man's estate beyond his life. I do not choose to discuss that; I do not desire that we should be involved in it. What is forfeiture? It is the taking of some specific thing, as all the visible property a man now possesses—his farm, his horse, his ship. That is a visible, material identity that is forfeited. A fine has no such quality. A fine is but a mulcting of the responde.nt in a sum of money. If he pay it, well; if he does not pay it, you may levy and collect it out of his property. I have created no forfeiture by my bill. The act creates none, but it enables the courts to levy and collect the fine out of the convicted traitor's property. I involve no question as to whether you can create a forfeiture of anything beyond his life or during his life. It is no forfeiture whatever. I avoid that question altogether.

It is next provided in my bill that, in order to meet this, the President shall have power to take possession of the property of a person thus engaged, wherever situated in the United States, real and personal, to sequester it to meet this fine, to be holden until the man is tried, sooner or later.

Having done this, I propose, in the next section, that the President shall be authorized to issue his proclamation offering indemnity and pardon to the people, with such exceptions and upon such conditions and at such times as he shall point out. Suppose we take possession of a State, and the people remain; the President issues a proclamation to the people, saying to them, "I have appointed officers; and now if you will within sixty days, all of you, except Jefferson Davis, Robert Toombs," or their Generals—what exceptions he thinks the public safety requires should be condignly punished—"with these exceptions, if you will come in to the officers I have appointed, and take your oath of allegiance, I will give you amnesty and pardon." He has something to offer then.

Pass such a bill, and they see by it that they are subject to be fined and stripped, as well as imprisoned, and, to save themselves and families from that, they would do what they would not do to escape hanging, which they know will never be administered. You can hold out to them some purpose, some object, some advantage, and in my opinion the great body of the people not excepted would at once avail themselves of the offer. If you take off the pressure of their armies from them, if you relieve them of those armies that are riding over them, of the incubus that is resting down on them, and give them the opportunity of loyalty and allegiance, you will have it, I have no doubt; but I propose to have the punishment remain in force, capable of being executed on all those who are so bad as to be excepted out of the proclamation of amnesty, or so obstinate that they will not submit. That it seems to me will be the practical effect. It will have to be carried into execution after possession is had of the country, after the proper discriminations can be made, after our authorities have looked around amongst the people and seen who it is that needs to be punished, and who are those whom the safety of the public would permit to be admitted to their loyalty and allegiance. You cannot make that distinction by classes now and here before the thing happens, as is attempted to be done by the honorable Senator from Ohio. He says by his amendment that the President may extend an amnesty, if he pleases, to any of the classes named. Why, sir, that is not what is wanted. You cannot make the discrimination now. There may be men as good as Matthew Hale who have actually taken and hold offices under that *de facto* Government, and who the gentleman from Ohio would have no more desire to hang or strip than Charles II. had to hang Chief Justice Hale. These discriminations can only be made when the means and opportunity for information exist.

For the Daily State Sentinel.

The Proposed "Union Party."

INDIANAPOLIS, May 5th, 1862.

EDITOR SENTINEL.—DEAR SIR: I have noticed in the Republican papers a call for a Convention in June to organize a party on a platform for the vigorous prosecution of the war for the Union, and to put candidates in the field on that platform. I was struck with the call, and have been wondering what could be its object. I knew that there was already one ticket of good men in the field in the State on just the platform proposed, and I could not see why it was necessary to divide up the people of the State by getting up an opposition, if *principle* was all that was involved. The tenth resolution of the 8th of January Convention, held on that day in honor of old Hickory, who said, "The Union, it must and shall be preserved," read as follows:

10. That we will sustain, with all our energies, a war for the maintenance of the Constitution, and of the integrity of the Union *under the Constitution*; but we are opposed to a war for the emancipation of the negroes, or the subjugation of the Southern States.

So much for the platform. Again; I asked, what will be the need of a new special war platform, the last of June next? Why, by that time the war will be over so that there will be none to prosecute. Has not the Administration already discontinued recruiting for volunteers because it has got soldiers enough?

Again; I said to myself, is not the war in the hands of Mr. Lincoln, and the Generals; and have they not got over half a million of men enlisted for the period of its continuance; and can they not, therefore, independent of all parties continue it as long as they please? And is there any danger that they will stop it too soon? I came, therefore, to the conclusion, that the ostensible purpose of the Convention was not its real purpose—that the Convention must, of consequence, have a fraudulent purpose, and that it has, is plain enough to me; and I have my mind made up, as to what that purpose is, viz: *to keep abolitionists in power—sectional men in office*; the same men who have involved the nation in its present troubles. Of this there is no doubt. Proofs:

1. The Indiana *Journal* is the organ and advocate of the call. The proprietors of that paper belonged to the old Abolition or Freesoil party, and supported the Buffalo Abolition nominees. Who were the old Abolition electors for President in this State and county in successive elections? The *Journal* men are gentlemen, no doubt, but they are political anti-slavery men, and I presume will not deny it.

2. The men at the head of the call, and who will control the party action, are old Abolitionists? Will anybody deny that Chase, Seward, Hale, Sumner, Wilson, Lovejoy, &c., are old Abolitionists? Are not these men now controlling the Republican party and the civil administration of the Government? And is it not carrying out the most fanatical Abolition measures? And is not Governor Morton and the Republican party in this State acting with and supporting these men? Was not Gov. Morton, of whom the writer is a personal friend, in 1856 so much of Abolitionist that the Republicans in the southern part of the State were not then sufficiently abolitionized to vote for him? And did they not, for the same reason, refuse, in 1860, to nominate him for Governor? Why do not Democratic editors hunt up the files of the old Abolition papers, that one published in Wayne county and afterwards at Indianapolis, and trace up these men? These men want to remain in power. They are just as much, at heart, Abolitionists now as ever. Personally, they are gentlemen, but it is the rule in free governments that men shall be held accountable to the people for their political deeds and doctrines, and upon no other rule can the permanency of our Union and free institutions be made sure.

The Republican leaders know that the platform of principles upon which they reached power has caused the rupture of this Union, and is calculated to prevent its being healed; they know that the brief period which they have held power has been characterized by the most disgraceful corruption recorded in the world's history. They know that they can not go to the people again upon their old platform and old name, and obtain a re-grant of power. They wish, therefore, to doff the name, put the platform to sleep for awhile, go to the people under a new name, and with a vague generality as to platform, gull in a recruit of Democrats who are green enough to be deceived, or of easy virtue enough to be baited with the hope of place, and thus get power again which they will then use to carry out their real fanatical desires. Who are the Democrats that will swallow such a bait with the hook in it? I will not go into such a union; but there is one that I am willing to go into; one appropriate to the exigencies of the times; one that has something practical in it for the salvation of the country, and our old great and glorious Union. It is this: A union with all men, with Republicans even, upon a platform as to the terms of settlement with the South, conquered—as to the rights which are to be secured to her—the privileges she is to be allowed to enjoy, &c. If the Republicans had come forward with a call for a convention of all the lovers of justice, goodfellowship and fraternal feeling between the North and the South, upon a platform declaring that the latter were not to be robbed of any of their rights; that their slaves should not be taken from them; that their property should not be confiscated, and that guarantees should be given to them to this effect, and that conservative men should be nominated who honestly held these views to carry them out, I would, with alacrity, unite with the Republicans in such a convention.

I close this with an extract from the 1st volume of Scott's Life of Napoleon, p. 115. He says: "It was the will of Providence that the experience of twenty years and upwards should make manifest, that in the hour of victory itself, concessions to the defeated, as far as justice demands them, is the only mode of deriving permanent and secure peace."

*

Suspension of States.

The Albany Union Party have issued an address, accompanied by a series of resolutions, intended to be a platform for the organization, which we published yesterday. It is remarkable that the only allusion to the Union which is contained in the eight sided platform of this Union party is the following brief declaration at the end of the third resolution of the octagon: "And that we are unalterably opposed to any division of the Union, or to any *permanent suspension* of the local sovereignty of the several States which compose it." These words were doubtless well weighed and carefully considered. They mean that the party is not opposed to a temporary suspension of the sovereignty of States. The doctrine of the Sumner resolutions, of the radical newspapers, and of the originators of the Cooper Institute meeting when Mr. Blair called "aiders and abettors of the Southern Confederates" was precisely this, that the States had committed a species of suicide, and were to be treated as Territories until they were educated into loyalty, when they might be readmitted as States in the Union. This we understand to be the doctrine of the above extract from the resolutions of the Albany men. That it is un American and subversive of the Constitution no one can doubt. It goes on the avowed principle that constitutions are paper, to be torn up and rewritten as occasion may seem to demand.

The only safe doctrine, the only constitutional doctrine, the only American doctrine, is that the State sovereignty is never suspended for one instant in regard to any power which belongs to a State, and though every officer of the State be dead, or banished, or a refugee from offended justice, the State sovereignty is immutable, and the State never dies. This is law, Constitution, safety, and this is the principle of the fathers. Rebellious State officers must be punished, rebellious Governors, Legislators, tax collectors and pound masters, from the highest to the lowest, must be driven from office or made to administer office according to the law and the Constitution of the United States. But the proposition to suspend the sovereignty of a State and assume the management of its powers as a State, its debts and its local and municipal laws, its prisons and poor houses, its domestic institutions, slavery or anti-slavery, whatever they are, is not only fraught with mischief, but is rank radicalism and disunionism. This side of the platform will break down with the load of radical people who will take their stand on it. We begin to see that the Union in the name of this party means a union of voters to accomplish an object, but not a union for THE UNION. The doctrine here set forth is precisely that against which Mr. Lincoln has set his face like iron, and unless it be dropped out of the principles of the new party, will be a millstone around its neck, dragging it to well merited perdition.—*N. Y. Jour. of Com.*

From Cincinnati Price Current May 7

Financial and Commercial Summary for the Past Week.

With reference to financial matters in this city there has been no change of consequence. The demand for money is wholly inadequate to the supply, and good business paper continues to be sought after with more eagerness than previously, and anything easily convertible which promises a return of 6 to 8 per cent. is in active demand.

The stocks of the Little Miami and Cincinnati, Hamilton and Dayton railways have advanced materially, and sales have been made within the week at 95 for the C., H. and D., and 100½ for the L. M., and a further advance was asked at the close.

The continued success of the Government troops in suppressing the rebellion is opening a wide speculative field in public securities generally, and in New York the speculative movement has gathered great strength since our last, Government securities and stocks of all kinds having largely advanced, with a sweeping demand.

Gold is, also, advancing, owing to a belief that our foreign importations will rapidly and largely increase, and that the balance of our foreign trade will be suddenly swelled to a large amount against us. This expectation will no doubt be realized to some extent; indeed we have the evidence of it already in the increase in the importation of foreign goods and in the increase in the shipment of specie. Nothing can prevent this but a largely increased duty on foreign goods, which constitute the luxuries of life so as to greatly limit their use, because National prosperity and National extravagance go hand in hand in the United States, and it therefore becomes the duty of our statesmen to look into this matter in time.

The demand for exchange has been moderate, and there has been no important alteration in rates. Gold has advanced, owing to the advance in the East. We quote:

	BUYING.	SELLING.
New York	par	¼ prem.
Gold	2 prem.	3@3½ prem.

The supply of flour has been light, and there being a good local and some export demand, the market has been buoyant, and prices advanced fully 10c per barrel; superfine closing at $4 30a4 35, but rather heavy, under the news from New York. The quantities of breadstuffs now going forward to the seaboard, from the West are large, unusually so, and it is probable that prices will give way under them. We notice that the receipts at Buffalo last Saturday were equal to *two million bushels* of grain.

Wheat advanced to 95a98c. for red, and $1a1 03 for white. There has been a speculative demand for oats, owing to the large quantity wanted by the Government, and prices advanced to 35a36c. and at the close none were to be had below the latter rates. A large demand for shelled corn to fill Government contracts, and 35,000 bushels sold yesterday to arrive, at 35c. in bulk. Ear is firm and in good demand at 34c. Rye 51a52c. and firm. Not much doing in barley.

The whisky market has been a good deal agitated the last few days, and prices advanced to 19c. The Senate committee has raised the tax on this article to 20c per gallon for all distilled after the 1st of June, we think. There was a rumor that the Senate will also tax that on hand 10c per gallon, but this is regarded doubtful, and we think it doubtful that this tax will be passed by the present Congress.

The provision market has been dull and heavy the greater portion of the week; the demand fell off, but holders remained firm with but little exception, and the hope of the opening of the Mississippi river, of which the taking of New Orleans gives strong assurance, greatly assisted in maintaining this firmness, because an impression very generally prevails that a large Southern demand will follow the opening of this great Western river, and that a speculative movement will arise from this impression should even indications of it arise.

The English demand has ceased pretty much, and one of the largest operators has left for home. There seems to be an unwillingness to take bulk meats at over 3¼a5¼c, for that market, and indeed at the close there was not much demand even at these rates. Hardly anything was done in mess pork until yesterday, when 1,000 brls. sold at $10 50 for country, and $11 for city, packed. The cause of this improvement is an advance in New York. The market closed firm at the latter rate for city packed.

Lard was dull in the early part of the week, but was in good demand yesterday, and 1,200 tierces sold at 7½c. This article has advanced in New York to 8¾c, being ¼c advance during the week. Nothing doing in keg. The lower grades of lard are very dull; manufacturers are not buying.

Bacon has been in better supply, and though it was in pressing demand in the fore part of the week at 3¾ and 6c, at the close the demand fell off, and the market was rather dull at these rates. Common hams are dull at 5a5½c. the latter for canvased. A moderate demand for sugar cured at 6¾a7c. for the best brands. Rump pork may be quoted at $6a7, according to the quality and not much offering.

No demand for clear bacon sides and they would not sell for any more than rib.

A VERY STRANGE NOTION.—The Abolitionists have been vehemently insisting that General McClellan should take Yorktown immediately. Well, the General has gratified the Abolitionists, and has captured not only Yorktown, but seventy-one rebel cannon and vast stores of arms and ammunition. Now, because it only cost eight lives, and not ten thousand, to accomplish this, the Abolitionists declare that McClellan ought to be removed. These philosophers must have strange notions of the art of