THE INDIANA STATE SENTINEL.

VOL. XXIII, NO. 37. INDIANAPOLIS, IND., MONDAY, FEB. 15, 1864. WHOLE NO. 1,283

WEEKLY STATE SENTINEL,

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY MONDAY AT THE

NEW SENTINEL OFFICE,

NO. 11 and 13 SOUTH MERIDIAN STREET,

(CORNER OF PEAL STREET.)

ELDER, HARKNESS, & BINGHAM

Proprietors.

TERMS OF WEEKLY SENTINEL.

One copy one year.....$ 1 50
Ten copies, and one to the maker of the club..... 15 00
Twenty copies, and one to the maker of the club, 25 00

Additions can be made to Clubs at any time at the above rates. The names will be printed on each paper, without extra charge.

☞ Money may be sent at our risk by Express, prepaid, or in Registered Letters by Mail, otherwise we will not be responsible for any loss that may occur.

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 must be handed in by Sunday to secure insertion in the weekly.

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

An ouncing 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 rpices.

Advertisements leaded and placed under the head of Special Notices, fifteen lines or over, will be chaged 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 advertisements 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 sixty cents a month, or seven dollars a year. All subscriptions invariably in advance. Address

ELDER HARKNESS, & BINGHAM.

Judge Perkins' Opinion.

The Journal is evidently afflicted with PERKINS on the brain. Yesterday it had another long essay, the fifth or sixth of a similar kind, reviewing the opinion of Judge PERKINS in which he discussed the war powers of the President. The organ of the Republican party does not meet the issue stated by the Court. It cannot be controverted that the President has assumed, or rather usurped powers, clearly in violation of the Constitution. The leading members of the Administration party concede this position, but they apologize for it on the ground of military necessity. In other words, that it became expedient or necessary to trample under foot the organic laws of the land in order to save what they term the life of the Government. The Journal thus finds itself in the predicament of justifying usurpation and tyranny, and the apology is that the citizen must be deprived of his liberty, of his constitutional rights, in order to preserve or secure them.

A marvellous change has come over the Journal. At one time it argued with great vehemence thus:wise:

"Secession is revolution and the first act of it lifts the whole case above all questions of forms and laws. * * In the present case it seems to us clear that if the enforcement of the Constitution leads to civil war, we shall be better off to let the Constitution be broken and save bloodshed. * * We can imagine no evil equal to an American civil war. The separation of the whole Confederacy into independent nations would be harmless beside it * If coercion means anything, it means to preserve the Union. Of what value will an Union be that needs links of bayonets and bullets to hold it together?"

Such were at one time the sentiments of the Journal. Rather than the terrible evil of civil war now upon the country, it proposed to see the Union separated into independent nations. After acknowledging the terrible evil that must result from an internecine war, it now favors its vigorous prosecution, and for what? An unconditional Union—an Union that needs links of bayonets and bullets to hold it together.

The sole purpose of the opinion and decision of the Supreme Court, which the Journal so fiercely and virulently combats, is to maintain those great principles of civil and religious liberty for which the men of the Revolution contended and which are the basis of all free governments. This the Republican organ regards as a crime—and, in the Republican party application of the term, as "disloyal." It takes issue with the court for upholding the liberty and rights of the citizen as guaranteed by the organic law of the land, fealty to which should be the only test of loyalty. This is the predicament in which the Journal places itself by its attacks upon the opinion of Judge PERKINS.

In this connection we give the following tribute to the professional merits and logic of the opinion, from an eminent and learned jurist of Ohio, addressed to Judge PERKINS:

I take leave as one of the fast friends of the Federal system, to thank you for the ability, learning and independence of the opinion of the Court pronounced by you in the case of Griffin vs. Wilcox. It appears in full to day in the Inquirer, and has been read by thousands of the citizens of Ohio as well as of Indiana. Its spirit can be appreciated by any one, and will find very soon that universal response which lies in the breasts of all freemen to acts of judicial independence. Its professional merits of clearness, research and logic will not fail to influence the opinions of lawyers and judges when they have canvassed the decision and made the ordinary attempt to defend the encroachments of the Executive, and Congress too, upon the rights and liberties of the citizens of the different States. I will not withhold the expression of pleasure it gave me to observe that in these Western States, which ought to be the intellectual fortress of the Constitutions, State as well as Federal, we have a court of last resort, able and ready to defend the citizen from military as well as civil oppression, and which can cite Cicero, Buckle and May, and Washington Irving, as well as Coke, Kent, Wheaton and DeHart. The completion of study and science given to your opinion by this departure from the dry walk of the reports and text books is a most pleasing novelty, and it has made it all the stronger while making it attractive.

The treatment of the ill understood subject of martial law could not have been improved, and the firmness as well as precision of that part of the discussion is worthy of all praise.

So, too, the accurate statement of the origin and nature of the war of sections in which the North and South are engaged, which is so constantly misrepresented. Nothing could be so appropriate as the illustration drawn from our colonial history of the position of affairs, and of the right of discussion, which you well say stands on the very same foundation as the case in hand.

The Enrollment Act.

The following are the leading features in the proposed amendments to the enrollment act, and they will probably be adopted: The commutation will be three hundred dollars, and not four hundred dollars; and the payment of that sum will exempt the person drafted from further liability for the full period for which he was drafted. The bill as it stood previous to amendment was in manifest violation of justice, as, under it, the person paying commutition might be again drafted within the next three months, or even on the next day, if the government should so soon order a new levy. The law will be substantially as it stood at the time of the last draft, except that the two classes will be consolidated into one, and all citizens between the ages of twenty and forty five are alike liable.

The Public Debt.

We publish this morning a remarkable letter from THURLOW WEED, a leading Republican politician of New York, upon the present and prospective condition of the public finances. Mr. WEED estimates that the war will cost, when terminated, *four thousand millions of dollars*, and that it will entail upon the country a national debt of at least three-fourths that sum. He anticipates, as must every man of common sense, "an approaching momentous financial crisis—a crisis which, if not seasonably provided for, may prove as serious a trial as the war itself which has produced it." These are momentous words, and coming from the source they do, it cannot be charged that it is an expression i. sympathy with the rebellion.

How is the crisis to be avoided—in fact can it be? The measures proposed by Mr. WEED are not adequate to provide against the approaching evils which fills his mind with such glaring apprehensions. There is one remedy, and that is a system of taxation ample for the emergency. And here arises the question whether the productive industry of the country will submit to such a burden. We trust the statements of Mr. WEED, in regard to the public indebtedness and the evils it will entail, will receive that consideration they merit. Is it not time for every good citizen to look whither the present management of public affairs is drifting the country, and is it not wise policy to avoid the further accumulation of an indebtedness which must result in either repudiation or else a grinding taxation which will continue for generations to come?

The Draft.

The Lafayette Journal, which assumes no small share of political sagacity and influence, in its issue of Saturday charges that "the Indianapolis Sentinel does not directly oppose the draft, but the tendency of its articles upon the subject is to lead the people to believe that Mr. LINCOLN has been deceiving the nation and trifling with the people." The people were assured by high officials in the confidence of Mr. LINCOLN that the call for three hundred thousand men would be the last. More than this, since that call was issued, the telegraph, under government supervision, has reported to the country from day to day, that the rebel armies were demoralized, that the desertions from them were fabulous in numbers, and that the rebellion was nearly played out. Right upon the heels of these declarations, to use a homely comparison, another requisition is made for troops. And what is the apology offered for this new call? The telegraph advises us that the news from the South, the vigorous efforts being made by the Confedeates for the campaign of this year, made this call for additional troops a necessity. We said not a word against the draft We only censured the Administration for its lack of sagacity and its inability to appreciate the resources of the enemy. The country has a right to expect that those to whom are committed the management of public affairs will be able to comprehend the trust confided to them. If we have committed an error it is in placing or even expressing any confidence in either the ability or honesty of the present representatives of the government. But a short time ago, early in January, Senator WILSON, Chairman of the Military Committee in the Senate, in alluding to the last call of the President for three hundred thousand men, remarked:

"The government has called for three hundred thousand men, and I presume that is the number the government wants, either of old veterans who re enlist or of new men. More than half of those men, I think, we shall have enlisted within the next twenty or thirty days."

But the Journal apologizes for the new call by stating it would not have been necessary, "but for the fact that the War Department decided to credit the re-enlisting veterans to the State quotas under the last call for 300,000." The Chairman of the Senate Military Committee states that the War Department had taken that feature into consideration when the last call was made.

In the same speech Senator WILSON expressed the opinion that "there was more danger from the want of money than the want of men," and if such be the case, this additional call will only increase the embarrassment. We quote another extract from that speech to show that the Administration party is furnishing the most potent arguments against the policy of the draft and the ability of the nation to stand up under it. Said Senator WILSON:

A large number of the States will furnish volunteers; some will not. I think we shall have a draft; but I do not think it will be necessary to continue drafting. We have in the service of the country, and are paying in our army, I think not less than 650,000 or 700,000 men. We must have from 400,000 to 500,000 effective soldiers in this field. I do not believe that the rebellion has over 225,000 men in arms, and I have very good reason so to believe. I believe that if we do our duty, the military power of this rebellion will be crushed out before the first of October next. * * * * * *

I want to adopt a policy that shall bear as lightly as possible upon our people—upon our productive industry—and shall fill up our armies. That is the first question; and I want to save the treasury all the expense that can possibly be saved. I believe our danger is more from want of money than from want of men.

The Journal had better settle accounts with its political friends before it makes an issue with its political opponents. We will however excuse the ignorance of that print, if it will hereafter make a reasonable effort to comprehend the questions it attempts to discuss

The New Confiscation Bill.

The Louisville Journal comments with severity upon the unjust, nay more, vindictive features of the new confiscation bill now before Congress. In connection therewith, it refers to the following facts in regard to confiscation measures, which are deserving of consideration at the present time. It remarks as follows: "The New York Times, in an excellent article upon this subject, says that it can recall no instance of such sweeping, wholesale confiscations, as this bill contemplates. The old Roman Empire has the name of being about as hard a conqueror as the world has seen—and yet its usage was not to confiscate the property of its enemies, entirely, but to reserve for the original proprietor one third for the subsistence of himself and family. Cromwell's confiscations in Ireland, which have always figured as particularly severe, were yet attended with allotments in Connaught, such as the Protector deemed sufficient for family support. Russia's *regime* over Poland after the insurrection of 1830 has been considered almost merciless. Fifty thousand Poles were sent to Siberia, and about ten thousand estates were confiscated. But these estates were only a small proportion of the old soil of Poland. In the State of Virginia alone there are over a hundred thousand freeholds; within the limits of the "Confederacy" at least three-fourths of a million. Nearly all of this vast amount of real estate would be forfeited forever by its present proprietors if this confiscation measure were carried out according to its terms; for there is scarcely a real estate owner in the South who has not participated in the rebellion in one way or another. Such sweeping work, were it practicable, would throw into the shade everything of the kind known to history.

"The object of the Polish and the Irish confiscations was to make quiet *subjects*. Their success may be read in the chronic discontent and repeated insurrections of the two countries down to the present day. The object of our confiscations must be to make willing *citizens*, for our republican system admits of no such condition as that of subjects. We may strip these rebels of their possessions if we please, but we have got hereafter to share political power with them, and so have our children with their children. We should like to have some of these wholesale confiscators answer this question: *If qualified or limited confiscations in Ireland or Poland failed to make good subjects, how will unqualified and unlimited confiscations make good citizens?*"

Thurlow Weed on the National Debt —He Suggests a Scheme for Avoiding Heavy Taxation—Should our Public Lands Yield a Revenue?—Repeal of the Homestead Law Demanded.

ALBANY, January 29.

MY DEAR SIR: The rebellion having assumed proportions which few, if any, anticipated, it imposes corresponding obligations, and demands from our rulers and representatives the thoughtful exercise of their best faculties. The time approaches, if indeed it has not arrived, when the duties of statesmen, in importance and difficulty, will rise even above those of Generals. If the rebellion, on the one hand, has been the most wicked and destructive the world ever witnessed, it has, on the other hand, been met by the loyal people with a spirit and determination, and by sacrifices of treasure and blood wholly unparalleled in the history of wars and of nations. The people, great as the emergency, and terrible as the ordeal, have proved themselves equal to both. Three years of eventful experience and observation has taught us one priceless and precious truth, viz: that this rebellion is sure to result in its own overthrow, in the vindication of our government, and in the restoration of our Union And the penalty for rebellion will be the inevitable subversion of the power which caused it—the only retribution proportioned to the magnitude of the crime.

Assuming that we are, no matter at what further cost, and in defiance of all obstacles, to preserve our government and Union, it behooves statesmen to divide their time and thoughts between the present and the future. We shall, when the war terminates, find that it has cost at least four thousand millions of dollars, three-fourths of which amount will remain as a national debt

Even this formidable debt, required to preserve our nationality, exceeds not that nationality's intrinsic value. But is it not time to gird up our fiscal loins and gather strength to bear this heavy burden? Should we not cast a financial anchor that will enable the treasury to ride safely through a crisis equal if not greater than England ever encountered?

When the Federal Government was established the old States ceded their respective rights to the territory wrested from Great Britain to the United States. By the purchase of Louisiana from France, in 1803, and the cession of Florida by Spain in 1819, we became possessed of a domain almost boundless and fabulous in extent and value. This domain was encumbered by the Indian right of possession. But it soon, though at immense cost, worked itself free, leaving its proceeds applicable to the support of the government and payment, first, of the Revolutionary War debt, and next of the war debt of 1812.

Though ever prodigal with the public lands, the government found, in the revenue they yielded, an unfailing resource. In various forms of bounties, endowments and benefactions, Congress has parted with hundreds of millions of acres; and yet the aggregate revenues derived from the public domain cannot be less than one hundred and fifty millions of dollars

An early Congress, with a wisdom and foresight which I hope did not die with it, anticipating the value of the public domain, established a uniform price for the lands and turned the proceeds into the treasury. That Congress discerned in the vast wilderness of that day, a gradually increasing deposit, ample for past and future exigencies. The most sanguine, however, failed to compute its value. And though impaired—nay, even frittered away—by subsequent legislation, all charges, and each fresh demand upon that reserve, failed to exhaust the fund. The Indian wars and the war of 1812 only created debts to afford the government the luxury of extinguishing them with the proceeds of the public domain. And when, under the administration of General Jackson, we had nothing more to pay, that fund accumulated so rapidly that its distribution among the States was ordered, lest so much surplus money would exert a baneful influence upon the action of Congress.

After years of discussion and debate the popular idea of "voting yourself a farm" obtained, and in 1861 the "Homestead law" was enacted. This, in effect, rendered the public domain value less to the government. The argument in favor of the homestead measure, that the government did not need the proceeds of the public lands, was *then* conclusive. But is it so *now*? Shall we not, when the "din of war" ceases, need every available resource to maintain the national credit? The war has been prosecuted by the indomitable energies of the people. We are the creditors of the government. Its securities are our only assets. Nor, as in other countries, or even in our own, on former occasions, are the creditors of the government confined to bankers and capitalists. The farmer, the mechanic, and even the laborer, has loaned his earnings and his savings to the government.

With the public domain immensely augmented by valuable acquisitions sacredly devoted to the payment of the national debt, the national credit will be placed upon an impregnable basis. In the proceeds of that domain we should have a fund annually increasing in amount, and as enduring as time. The war, ended, we all know with what an elastic spirit our people will return to their ordinary pursuits, and with what giant strides our country will resume its march of improvement. The iron ways already pointing to the Pacific will be presently pushed to their destination, rendering the whole public domain available. The population and wealth of Europe will purchase, people and cultivate our territories, whose teeming inhabitants will soon organize new States for admission into the Union.

In view, therefore, of an approaching momentous financial crisis—a crisis which, if not, so far as is possible, seasonably provided for, may prove as severe a trial as the war which has produced it—will not Congress immediately rescue the public domain by a repeal of the homestead law? There is no such sure way of fortifying the national credit. There is no such easy, simple, or equitable mode of providing for the payment of interest on the public debt. The proceeds of the public domain, under a proper system, will ballast the treasury. With that vast deposit, facilitating the other financial operations of the Government, and easing the burdens of the people, the country will shoulder its debt, and the people, with confidence in the wisdom of their Government, will go cheerfully to their work and watch, that a destiny of greatness and glory for the republic, temporarily arrested by rebellion, may be triumphantly accomplished.

In a recent conversation with Governor Fish, upon the financial future of our country, that gentleman suggested a difficulty which claims the earnest attention of statesmen. In the event which we all contemplate—a restored Union—the inauguration of a system of taxation adapted to the circumstances of the country, will be a difficult and delicate duty. The then existing debt will have been created for the purpose of constraining insurgent States back into the Union. The citizens of those States, unlike ourselves, are not creditors of the government, and have no interest in the debt. Shall they be taxed to pay it? This would be regarded as a stern infliction, or penalty, after their offense had been expiated. That this will, however, in a degree, become a necessity, is more than probable; for rebellion, like other wrong doing, subjects its victims to "infelicities," But is it not equally just and wise that we should make these "infelicities" as little burdensome and irritating as possible?

All and each of the old States, and the whole people, are jointly interested in the public domain. It is a common inheritance. And how can the enlightened views and patriotic intentions of the fathers who bequeathed that princely estate to us, be so faithfully observed as in devoting it to the preservation of a government and Union, transmitted with the estate to our keeping?

The repeal of the homestead law would subject none who voted for it to a charge of inconsistancy. All the circumstances and conditions of the country and people have changed. The claims of the Government, even if those claims conflicted with the interests of the people, are paramount. But there is no such conflict. Those for whose benefit the law was enacted are now giving their services and blood to the Government. And what is a prospective "homestead" worth without a government to protect and a Union to concentrate it? Is it not, then, the imperative duty of Congress to reclaim and husband every acre of this broad, fertile and rich domain? Held, inviolable, as a trust fund for the protection of the national credit, our national debt, however large, instead of depressing agriculture, manufactures and commerce, would furnish guarantees for the fidelity of our rulers and representatives, and impart strength and stability to the Government.

Very truly yours,
THURLOW WEED.

Hon. E. D. Morgan.

The Eligibility of Governor Morton.

The Madison Courier, an intense Republican sheet, contains a communication from a correspondent whom it terms one of the ablest and most experienced politicians of its party, taking grounds against the eligibility of Governor MORTON to hold the office for another term. It makes but little, if any difference to the Democracy whether the Republicans nominate O. P. MORTON or POP GUN SMITH as their candidate for Governor, and one is as much entitled to public confidence as the other, but as His Excellency has been at great pains and expense to convince the people that he is constitutionally eligible to hold the office of Governor indefinitely, we give a Republican view of the question antagonistic to his claims. Says this able and most experienced Republican political correspondent of the Courier:

As this question is one purely of Constitution and law, it would be out of place, in the following suggestions, to interpolate anything of a personal or partisan character. The question is one that concerns the people of the entire State, and the vast public interests involved overshadow all questions of personal or individual claim or choice. O. P. Morton was elected and inaugurated as Lieutenant Governor. Three days thereafter, Governor Lane, having vacated the office of Governor, O. P. Morton, Lieutenant Governor, was installed as Governor; The language of the Constitution, whatever may be said for or against its wisdom, is simple and easily understood, when it declares, sec 1st, art 5th, "The executive power of the State shall be vested in a Governor He shall hold his office during four years, and shall not be eligible more than four years in any period of eight years"

Reference to the debates in the Constitutional Convention on this clause will satisfy any one that the true intent and meaning of that body, in adopting this section, was to prevent the possibility of an executive incumbent employing the power and patronage of the office, during one term, so as to secure a re election to a second or subsequent term, thus doing all in its power to restrict the attention and fidelity of the executive to a simple discharge of the duties of that office. Has Oliver P. Morton been Governor during the present term? If he has been Governor he would, by the terms of the above section, be disqualified from serving during another term immediately succeeding the present. To this question I answer, first, he signs himself, officially, "Governor of Indiana," thus giving his own construction of his constitutional status.

Secondly, the constitution provides in section 12, article 5, "the Governor shall be commander in chief of the military forces, and may call out these forces to execute the law." Section 4, art. 13: "He (the Governor) shall, from time to time, give the General Assembly information touching the condition of the State, and recommend such measures as he shall deem expedient," &c. Section 14 provides that every bill which shall pass the General Assembly shall be presented to the Governor, who shall approve or return it with his objections" Section 17 says "he (the Governor) shall havs the power to grant reprieves, commutations, pardons, after convictions, &c., together with many other functions which the Constitution devolves directly on the Governor." The present executive has done all this; he has been commander in chief of the military of the State, he has called out this force to repel invasion; he has communicated with the General Assembly, and given them information, and recommended such measures as he thought for the interest of the State. He has approved bills that passed the General Assembly and returned others with his objections. He has exercised the pardoning power, transacted business as Governor, with the several officers of the State government, issued commissions to various civil and military officers whom he had appointed, and in fact exercised all the functions of Governor of the State. These substantial, material functions, exercised and discharged by him, in compliance with the terms and requirements of the Constitution, identify him as, and, in fact make him Governor, though the mere form of election, as such, is wanting. It is safer to conclude that he is Governor, than, for any personal or partizan purpose, to argue that he is not. If he is not, and has not been Governor, then his acts as such, which the Constitution clearly provides, shall be discharged by the Governor may indeed be questioned, while, if he is Governor, they are undoubtedly valid. But, fortunately, we are not wholly left to speculation, argument and construction on this point. The Supreme Court of the State, in Carson vs. McPhintridge, 12th Indiana Reports, takes up this question, and disposes of, at least a material portion of the controversy.

This case, it is true, refers to the office of County Clerk, but the point involved is the same, and the language of the Constitution in both cases similar. That instrument declares that the Clerk shall continue in office four years, and no person shall be eligible to the office of Clerk more than eight years in any period of twelve years. The Court decides in this case that the disabling or restricting clause in the Constitution *includes the capacity of holding, as well as the capacity of being elected to, an office*. The Court also in this case clearly recognized fractions of a term of office. Now if we apply the principal of the decision in this case to the case of the Governor, as he will have held the office for nearly four years, it follows that he would be disqualified to serve in a second term just so much time as he held the office during the first term. If this be logical and true, it also follows that he would be qualified and eligible to hold and serve in a second term just such period of time that he did not hold the office during the first term. The conclusion, then, would appear inevitable that Gov. Morton may be elected and serve as Governor for three days, or so much of the former period as was occupied by Governor Lane. Whether the people of Indiana will attach so much importance to a complimentary indorsement of the present executive as such an election would be, it is for that people to say. Whether such an indorsement under all the circumstances would be desirable, even by Governor Morton, is for him to decide.

Promotions.

The names of Colonels GROSS, COLSOVE, WILDER and SCHRIVER were sent into the Senate on Tuesday for promotion to Brigadiers. It appears that after a protracted debate they were returned to the President with the information that only one more Brigadier General, in addition to those already appointed or nominated, was authorized by law, and requested that he should designate which of the four should fill the vacancy.

—Ohio and California are the great wine producing States, as yet—the former producing in 1860 562,640 gallons, and the latter 494,516 gallons.

[From the Chicago Times.]

The Fenian Brotherhood—The Difficulty with the Catholic Clergy—A Circular from Bishop Duggan, of Chicago, Denouncing the Brotherhood—Letter from Col. Mulligan indorsing the Association.

Mention has frequently been made, in the columns of the Times, of an association of Irishmen having the title of the "Fenian Brotherhood." Its objects and purposes, as expressed by itself, is to foster and organize a sentiment of Irish nationality, and to ultimately redeem Ireland from the yoke of British oppression. Reference also has been made to the difficulty between the "Brotherhood" and the Catholic clergy. The organization was denounced some time since as a secret one, repugnant to the discipline of the Catholic Church. At the National Convention of the Fenians, held in this city in November last, it was sought to remove this objection by the passage of the following resolution:

Resolved, That we most distinctly declare and make known to all whom it may concern, that the Fenian Brotherhood is not a secret society, inasmuch as no pledge of secrecy, express or implied, is demanded from members thereof, neither is it an oath bound society, for no oath whatever is required to entitle a man to all the privileges of the association. Hence, if the mere fact of its members pledging themselves to secrecy can render an association sinful according to the laws of the Catholic Church, there being no pledge of secrecy, there can be no sin in becoming a Fenian Brother. Again, if the mere fact of its members being required to take an oath upon entering it can render it sinful, where there is no oath required there can be no sin, on the grounds above stated, in joining the Fenian Brotherhood.

Resolved, That, in order to prevent misconception as to our obligations in the future, the following be adopted as the only form that henceforth is obligatory in order to entitle a candidate to all the rights and privileges of membership in the Fenian Brotherhood:

"I, ——, solemnly pledge my sacred word of honor, as a truthful and honest man, that I will labor with earnest zeal for the liberation of Ireland from the yoke of England, and for the establishment of a free and independent government on Irish soil; that I, ——, will implicitly obey the orders of my superior officers in the Fenian Brotherhood; that I will faithfully discharge the duties of my membership, as laid down in the constitution and by-laws thereof; that I will do my utmost to promote feelings of love and kindly forbearance among all Irishmen; and that I will foster, defend and propagate the Fenian Brotherhood to the utmost of my power"

This appeared to satisfy many Catholics, who previously had consciencious scruples against connecting themselves with the Brotherhood, and the Fenians increased rapidly in numbers and influence. It did not satisfy the clergy, however. They regarded the Fenian resolutions as cunning evasions, designed to mislead by an ingenious arrangement of words, without going into the essence of the point at issue. The Fenians propose holding a National Fair in Chicago, in March next, and the grand preparations making for the affair has brought the Brotherhood once more very prominently before the public. Bishop Duggan embraced the opportunity thus presented to express again the sentiments of the church relative to the Brotherhood. On Sunday, January 31st, he alluded to it in an address from the pulpit. One paragraph was quite significant:

"There is a secret in the inner circle, although its external outward members do not know it and take no oath; but there is a secret in the inner circle, which I cannot ascertain and which I have a right to demand of Catholics connected with this society, what its object, what its meaning. That secret I have not been able precisely to learn. I have been told the object is to sever the dependence of Ireland on England, and this is to be accomplished, not by moral measures, but by violence, by force of arms and bloodshed. To those I could not have given my consent; it was contrary to the laws of the church, and that the members of it fall under the ban of many rescripts and bulls of the Pope, who has long ago condemned such associations."

He also denounced the fair as an effort of certain Irishmen to "traffic in the sympathies of their countrymen," in innuendo, that the objects of the association are unattainable, and therefore the proceeds of the fair will be appropriated to the personal use of the leading men of the Brotherhood.

Not stopping here, the Bishop addressed the following circular to the clergy of the Diocese, which will be read and commented upon from all the pulpits to-day:

"CHICAGO, Feb. 3, 1864.

"REV. DEAR SIR: I feel myself again compelled to call your attention to a certain society, the dangers of which I have already pointed out, and against which you were directed to warn the members of your flock.

"This society, calling itself the 'Fenian Brotherhood,' has been solemnly condemned as a secret, and in every sense an illegal, association, by the unanimous votes of the Bishops of Ireland, and by every Bishop in this country before whom the matter has been brought.

"Its movements and workings are secret, the ruling or 'Inner Circles' being bound to secresy by the obligation of an oath, whilst its avowed object is to overturn a recognized government, and the present condition of society in Ireland, by violence, force of arms, and consequently bloodshed.

"I need not remind you that all such associations are condemned by the laws and spirit of the church (and in a special manner by the bulls of her Pontiffs,) as dangerous to faith and morals, and contrary to the interests of society.

"All the artifices usual in such secret associations have been of late freely used in this city, and throughout the entire Diocese, to propagate their schemes and compass their ends; and to increase the number of their associates—who are at once their victims and their dupes—neither calumny, nor falsehood, nor misrepresentation has been spared. In the prosecution of their unholy designs, they have shown a disregard, if not a positive contempt, of all authority, and have resorted to every means, however objectionable, to attain a temporary success. I would also remind you that their ostensible object seems to be a mere pretence—if not an unmitigated fraud. They cannot surely hope to succeed in the dark plot of violence and blood, whilst their real design contemplates the enjoyment of the ill directed generosity of their deluded associates.

"On next Sunday then, you will bring clearly and forcibly before the members of your congregation the motives contained in this circular, and such others as may be suggested by your own knowledge and zeal, to deter them from entering this unhallowed association.

"After this general warning throughout the Diocese, should any prove so perverse as to become members of a body so unequivocally reprobated by the laws of the Church and of civil society, or directly aid and abet by their contributions and presence its unholy objects, they are to be excluded from the sacrament until they perform suitable penance for the scandal given by their conduct, and for the disobedience of which they shall prove themselves convicted.

I remain, reverend dear sir,
Faithfully yours in Christ,
✠ JAMES, Bishop of Chicago."

The Fenians have passed a resolution to the effect that they will hold no discussion with the clergy relative to the matter at issue.

In the meantime, preparations for the fair are progressing finely, and it receives the encouragement of many illustrious and influential Irishmen. Among them is Colonel James A. Mulligan, who has written a handsome letter to the Fenian Brotherhood of this city, in which he expresses his warmest sympathies with the aims and objects of the association. Col. Mulligan's letter was received on yesterday, and we append a copy with which we have been favored:

HEADQUARTERS 2D DIV., DEP'T. WEST VA.,
NEW CREEK, WEST VA., Jan. 29, 1864.

Dear Sir—I have your letter of invitation to the "Irish National Fair" to be held at Chicago, March 28, for the purpose of raising a fund to aid in establishing and sustaining the cause of "Irish nationality." It is a good purpose, and here is my aid—one hundred dollars—and if, by the grace of God and the consent of the United States, we come to blows in support of the same holy cause; then having first solidly settled the present questionin favor of the Union, I devote all my heart and all my strength and whatever experience I possess to aid in establishing and maintaining the cause of Irish nationality.

Faithfully, JAMES A. MULLIGAN.

I. O. S. B. FITZPATRICK, Assistant Secretary of I. N. F., Chicago, Ill.

FROM WASHINGTON.

The New Conscription—A Republican Senator on the Duration of the War—Why England and France remain Neutral—They Enjoy the Spectacle of our Self-Destruction—Lively Times in the Shenandoah Valley—Matters at Charleston—State of feeling at the South—Consequences of the Covetous Policy of the Administration.

[Special Correspondence of the Chicago Times.]

WASHINGTON, February 1.

This continual cry of the Administration for more men—more human lives—more widows and orphans—more suffering, and anguish, and despair, ought to make the American people realize their true condition. The cry for more men will not stop here. These 500,000 lives will be sacrificed, as three times 500,000 have been before them. And then Mr. Lincoln will call for another draft, and another, and another. The war is interminable. How long will the people stand this draft upon their life-blood? How can they permit this thing to continue, when they see that the war has been entirely diverted from its original purpose? The Administration no longer pretends that the war is for the restoration of the Union. Every man can see for himself now that the war is prosecuted solely for the negro, for the abolition of slavery in the Southern States, for the enriching of contractors, and in order to enable the Republican party to retain themselves in power.

The unceasing and still recurring demands of Mr. Lincoln for more human lives is absolutely appalling Where are the million and a half of human beings which the war has already swallowed up? At least one million of them have been sacrificed to gratify the malignity of the radicals towards the South. Are the ghosts of this million to be followed to the gloomy shades by the ghosts of another million of victims? It will certainly be so, unless the people rise at the next election and declare otherwise.

So far as the Southern States are concerned, they are not only unconquered, but, under the present policies, unconquerable. This is the truth; and is it not wiser to recognize it to day than to recognize it four years hence? Mr. Nesmith a Republican Senator from Oregon, in a recent speech took this very ground, concluding his argument thus: "With their present resources, they have the ability to resist our military policy for the next ten years, and indeed, to protract the war indefinitely." Can you find room for some paragraphs from the Western Senator's eloquent speech? How effectually he demolished the administration theory "That because the rebel currency is depreciated therefore the armed resistance of the rebels must soon cease."

In the facts that I have alluded to above lies the key to the conduct which England and France have pursued towards us during the war. It is for the interest of both those countries that our civil war should be protracted until the arms-bearing population is so greatly depleted as to be able to afford no barrier whatever to their ambitious designs. That period is not far distant now. When the war began, we were about 26,000,000 people, not counting the negroes; about 17,000,000 in the North and 9,000,000 in the South. Of these the arms-bearing population was about 3,500,000 in the North; 2,000,000 in the South. Mr. Lincoln has used up about 1,500,000 of his men. A simple statement in the rule of three will show how much longer it will require to use up the remaining 2,000,000. Jeff. Davis, on his part, has used up a million of his men, and he has only a million left. England and France would both have interfered long ago; but they saw that, if they held aloof, in a few years we would be so exhausted and so helpless that we would be powerless to resist any European aggression. Therefore they have pretended neutrality, but all the time have been furnishing to both parties arms, ammunition, and the means of destroying each other. In two or three years more, perhaps in a year or two more, England and France will both step in, and while France occupies, not Mexico alone, but Texas and California also, and extends her imperial sceptre over all the ancient province of Louisiana, extending even to the Mississippi river, England will seize upon Oregon and Washington Territories, and upon Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Northern New York. And who shall prevent their aggressions? We are already powerless to resent the flagrant violation of the Monroe doctrine; we have had to submit already to the most shameful national insults. Such are the fruits of Republican administration.

FEBRUARY 3.

I observe that you have a very able correspondent in the Shenandoah Valley, and I leave to him, therefore, a relation of the interesting events that are now in progress there It is believed here that the Confederates have designs against the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, and that their plans even extend as far as another invasion of Pennsylvania; and it is believed, furthermore, that they are prepared to undertake these enterprises with such a force as will afford them a good prospect of success. Such, I say, is the belief that is entertained here in high quarters. The existence of this belief will lead the authorities to keep on the line of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, and near this city, at least 20,000 troops, which, there is good reason to believe, were destined for Gen. Grant until a few days ago And it may be that this is the very object sought to be obtained by the Confederates in their present raid toward New Creek. If the latter is, really, only a stratagem, and if, by it, the Confederates prevent needed reinforcements from reaching Gen. Grant, whereby Knoxville will fall, it will only afford another illustration of Lincoln's military incapacity, and of his absurd foolishness in persisting to manage the war, and direct the movements of armies himself.

My announcement that the siege of Charleston was abandoned was only premature. It is well known here in military circles that all the best troops that were operating before Charleston a month ago were withdrawn therefrom within a week or two past, and have been ordered to other points. It is now stated semi officially that Gen. Gilmore himself has been ordered to report here. In the meantime, an occasional shot is fired into Charleston, but it is only a waste of ammunition.

I repeat the siege of Charleston has been abandoned by the Administration, and all the troops remaining there will soon be withdrawn. There was a significant passage in the recent report of the Secretary of the Navy, in which the old Antediluvian permitted the feline quadruped to effect her escape from the—well, from the bag. Gideon says:

"In a military or strategic view, the place is of little consequence to us;" and this is to be made the pretext for giving up the attempt to capture it. But, the public will ask, if the place was of so little consequence to us, why have such tremendous preparations been made to capture it? and why, above all, have so many thousands of our best troops been kept there for eighteen months, when they could have been of such inestimable service elsewhere?

Since my last letter I have seen some persons from the South who have in their possession evidence of the most trustworthy kind, and of the most startling nature, in relation to the present military strength of the rebels. It appears from this authority (and it is unquestioned,) that the North has been shamefully deluded by the stories which have been circulated under the authority of the Administration, to the purport that the rebellion was on its last legs, and that it cannot survive the coming summer. The stories, and also those that are now circulated in regard to the effect of the President's proclamation of pretended amnesty in the South, are sheer fabrications. The rebel soldiers, as a general thing, spurn and spit upon Lincoln's shallow and delusive promises. There are men in the Southern armies, mercenary wretches, who have no more interest in the South than the hundreds of brigands and criminals who, unhappily, disgrace and stain the Union army, have in the honor and glory of our common country. These are the men who are deserting; and there are few of them at the best. It is childish to try to conceal the fact that the great mass of the Southern soldiers are the people of the South, the owners of the plantations and farms.

It is this measure, and measures like this, that have steeled the heart of the Southern people against the North. They have intelligence enough to see that the men now in power at the North do not want them to return to the Union. They know that what the Administration wants is, first, their negroes and their cotton; and, second, their houses and their lands. This conviction has become firmly planted in the minds of the Southern people, and therefore it is that the veteran soldiers of the South are re enlisting for the war, and in the spring we will be confronted by an army of 500,000 Southern troops, of which 300,000 will be veterans. X.

A Change of Administration the only hope for Union.

The Hartford Times says an "unconditional Union man" is now understood to be a man who won't have the Union on any condition but that of abolition.—[Boston Courier.

Undoubtedly this is now the understanding amongst the radicals. And we may add that in the same quarter "a conditional Union man" is now understood to be a man who will have the Union of the Constitution with or without slavery.

This, however, though the sole object for which the great body of the people are struggling, is not the object of the radical party. It cannot but be observed as a peculiar characteristic of the times, as an able contemporary remarks, that the dominant party has ceased entirely to profess love for the Union or a desire for its restoration. Having used the name of Union for the purpose of catching votes, they have dropped the whole principle of Union, and now avow themselves as solely and wholly devoted to conquest and abolition. We verily believe that greater hypocrisy was never known among men than has characterized the leading politicians on the radical side. The abolition motto, "The Constitution is a league with death and a covenant with hell," was never any too strong to characterize the hatred with which they