WEEKLY SENTINEL.

MONDAY, - - - - - - - - - MAY 16.

THE CAMPAIGN SENTINEL.

THE WEEKLY SENTINEL will be furnished to clubs of ten or more, during the campaign, at the following rates:

For Six Months..................75 Cents.
For Four Months................50 Cents.

☞Democrats are especially urged to extend the circulation of the Sentinel during the present campaign, in every township in Indiana. my9

Mercy and Murder.

Under this title the Journal of yesterday attempts a defense of Governor Morton from the charges contained in the Sentinel of the 10th inst., and those who have read both articles must plainly see how far it falls short of showing facts, even mitigating the Governor's conduct.

We charged that Governor Morton had used the pardoning power to protect his political friends from the penalty fixed by law when they have been convicted for murdering Democrats, simply because they were Republicans, when there was no pretense that they were not guilty, or that they have not had a fair trial.

We showed that he was in two cases—the only ones to which we referred—influenced by mere partisan considerations, and exercised the pardoning power merely because the persons to be punished were his political friends.

The cases to which we referred were those of Ulpheus B. Houston for killing William Sill, in Shelby county, and Alexander Hatton, for killing John Brown, in Brown county.

We showed that as to Houston, it was understood among his friends previous to the session of the court that he would be pardoned, that the petition gave reason why he should be pardoned; and that it was accompanied by affidavits urging, as a reason, that the sheriff had in some instances failed to put Republicans upon the jury when he had an opportunity; that the affiants were not satisfied with a mixed jury, but thought it sufficient ground for a pardon that the jury was not *exclusively* Republican, and that he was pardoned the same day he was sentenced.

What does the Journal say in reply to this? Simply this: that the defendant was only eighteen years of age, and that two years imprisonment "would have proved utter and total ruin." This is a new reason for pardoning a person for taking human life. The law does not receive it as an excuse for crime, and has been unable to see that a murder committed by a person of that age shall go unpunished

Governor Morton, by this act, has said to every young man of eighteen—"You may murder, rape, and rob, and I will pardon you, provided you are of my political faith, and your victims are of another."

Houston slew a fellow being, a mixed jury convicted him, and Governor Morton is so solicitous for the young man's morals that he thinks it best for the interests of society that he should not be punished, and lets him go scot free.

It is a serious subject for the people to consider what protection they have from the manifestations of the subjects of the Governor's moral upon experiments

In the Hatton case the parties had had a political dispute. Hatton called Brown "secesh." Brown retorted "Abolitionist."

That night, after Brown and his wife had gone to bed, Hatton was discovered standing near a window, at the head of the bed, with a pistol pointed at Brown, snapping it. Brown went out, a scuffle ensued, and as Brown got up off Hatton, he was stabbed mortally. The question of guilt was submitted to the jury, also what penalty should be inflicted. They found that the defendant should be hung.

Here is a cool, deliberate murder, proceeding from political heat, and Morton commutes the sentence. Now what causes it?

The Journal says that a number of the people of Brown county petitioned for it, and that *nobody remonstrated against it.*

The fact that a petition is presented, signed by a number of persons, argues nothing in a case of this character, as there never was a man sentenced to be hung whose friends were not able to work upon the sympathies of many who, for the sake of the criminal's friends, will sign a petition, even when they believe him guilty, and when a man is *guilty* of a crime, a petition by citizens furnishes no reason for a pardon or commutation. The crime is tried by the court and jury, and not on petition by the Governor.

The fact that no one *remonstrated*, is a ridiculous consideration. No public notice was given of the filing of the petition, or that remonstrances were expected, or would be considered. The Shelby county case shows what Morton thinks about remonstrances, and what weight he gives them Here the papers were prepared in Shelbyville on the day before the defendant was sentenced, he was pardoned on the day the sentence was pronounced, and the pardon was in Shelbyville before it was known to the public that a petition was presented.

The Journal says Hatton was a *half idiot*. We do not know whether it means by this to say that he had so little mind as to be below legal responsibility or not. The jury did not think so, and if the Governor did, he should have let him off entirely.

It certainly appears that he was able to engage in political controversy and parrot the Journal's and Morton's slang about the Democracy being "secesh," and was able to appreciate, and bad enough to carry into practical effect, the teachings of those high authorities, that Democrats deserve death because they do not agree politically with our excellent, impartial, and pure-minded Governor.

The Journal publishes a letter from Mr. John D. Howland, of this city, who it says was sent as the Governor's special detective into Brown county to investigate the matter, and who is damned by the Journal with praises of his *ability and integrity*.

Mr. Howland says: "I could obtain no notes of the evidence. The charges of the Judge who tried the cause, if in writing, were not upon the files of the Court."

Finding nothing of an official character, he proceeds to explore other and "various sources to which I applied."

He found the defendant a tender youth of about twenty one years of age. "His parentage was degraded; his surroundings such as to make him reckless and depraved."

He further shows that the "various sources" informed him that this amiable young patriot, after a political controversy with the deceased, "walked to a house where he occasionally stayed with a cousin, some half mile distant; procured a pistol and knife; the latter a dangerous weapon; the former, though charged, entirely harmless, as the tube was so battered that the powder could not be fired. He then walked about an equal distance to the house of the deceased. *According to the story of the condemned, he was passing for the purpose of going to a neighbor's house to spend the night.*"

This extract gives the cream of the letter. The only testimony against the defendant as to the circumstances attending the killing was that of Mrs. Brown and the dying declarations of the deceased, and why should they weigh anything against the declarations of this amiable young patriot who arms himself with a pistol and a knife that he might *pass* by Brown's house?

Mr. Howland thinks the pistol would not go off. Hatton and his cousin seem to have thought differently. However that may be, the logic is this: as Hatton might have snapped the pistol all night at Brown through the window without its going off, therefore Brown was perfectly safe in the house and should have stayed there; therefore his death resulted from his going out and getting into a difficulty with him, whereby he became the aggressor.

Governor Morton and Mr. Howland are doubtless profound lawyers; but the murdered man seems not to have understood either the facts or the law.

Bad as all this is, it is but a pretext. Morton simply wanted a sort of excuse for doing what he had already determined on.

The key to Morton's system is found in the following letter from Mr. William R. Harrison, chief fugleman of the Loyal League of Morgan county, and a candidate for Secretary of State, before the Republicans State Convention, to Mr. A. H. Conner, Postmaster in this city, and Chairman of the Republican State Central Committee.

We take pleasure in informing the Journal that it is neither *counterfeit* nor *stolen*. The *italics* are those of the writer:

Martinsville, Ind, Dec. 26, 1863.

Dear Conner:

Will you see the Governor, relate the facts to him in relation to the man to be hung in Brown county, and get from him just what *we*, of this county, and the Union men of Brown county, will have to do, if anything we can do, to effect his *pardon*, or commutation of his punishment. "By the Eternal," he *must* not be hung by those "d—d rebels." Don't lose any time in seeing the Governor about this, and writing to me in reference thereto Another expedition is being prepared, but *phlebotomy* might result from it, and the interposition of executive clemency would save any further hazard on the part of His Excellency's most excellent friend.

My friends are becoming a little zealous for my nomination, and so am I.

Yours, &c. W. R. Harrison.

P. S *Little* Dr. Wright, late Clerk, by the grace of God, of the Morgan Circuit and Common Pleas Courts, is now in your city, I am informed, struggling to make his way to a nomination on our ticket for Clerk Supreme Court.

He is *not our style*, and therefore does not like *me*, and it is suggested that he is laboring as much *against* me, as *for* himself.

H.

The Governor's policy is producing its legitimate fruits, indicating a spirit of lawlessness rendering insecure everything for the protection of which society is organized.

The Object of the War—Condition of the Rebellious States.

It cannot be denied that the object of the war, so far as the Republican party is concerned, has been changed in every aspect, and this is admitted in every action of the party in power. A few days ago we referred to the resolution of Mr. Harding in the House, which was voted down. We give that resolution entire so that we may have a clear record of the Republican party. It is as follows:

Resolved, That the Union has not been dissolved, and that whenever the rebellion in any one of the seceded States shall be put down and subdued, either by force of the Federal arms or by the voluntary submission of the people of such State to the authority of the Constitution, that such State will be thereby restored to all its rights and privileges as a State of the Union under the constitution of such State and the constitution of the United States, including the right to regulate order, and control its own domestic institutions according to the constitution and laws of such State, free from all Congressional or Executive control or dictation.

Mr. Harding had spoken upon his resolution when first offered, early in the session. Previous to the vote being taken he made the following remarks, which most happily and forcibly define the position of the party in power:

"I take it for granted that no Union man can object to this resolution. It takes the ground that the Union has not been dissolved, and the remainder is the necessary sequence from that.

"The question upon which this whole controversy turns is whether the Union has or has not been dissolved If it has not been dissolved, then whenever the rebellion in any one of these States is subdued the authority of the Constitution and laws of the United States are immediately restored, and neither the President, nor Congress, nor any other department, has any shadow of a constitutional right to dictate to the people of those States in regard to the form of government which they shall set up, nor in regard to any matter pertaining to their local jurisdiction. Whoever contends that this resolution is wrong places himself in the position of declaring that this Union is dissolved. He must either be a revolutionist or he is a secessionist. A man who takes the ground that the Union is dissolved can oppose this resolution, but no other man can.

"I know, sir, that it has become quite common nowadays for gentlemen who once espoused the cause of the Union with great ardor, men who once stood where President Lincoln stood in his inaugural address, when he declared that the Union was not dissolved and that it could not be dissolved, who are now repudiating that whole doctrine, to take the ground that the Union has been dissolved, and that these Southern States constitute a foreign Government.

"Sir, if it be true that the Union has been dissolved, then by what authority is it that taxes are being collected in the seceded States? by what authority is it that their lands are being sold and parceled out? If the Union has been dissolved, how did it take place? Was it by virtue of these ordinances of secession? Is there any gentleman here prepared to acknowledge that there was virtue in those ordinances of secession to dissolve this Union? If not, then how did the Union become dissolved? Was it by force of the Confederate arms? Could that which was void and nugatory be made operative by violence and force and bloodshed? Were their ordinances of secession utterly null and void? Gentlemen say they were How then was the Union dissolved? Was a void act made operative and obligatory by force and bloodshed? No man can say that. The Union, therefore, has not been dissolved. What then is the matter? Why, there is a rebellion there among a portion of the people. When that rebellion shall be subdued by force of the Federal arms, the only justification of the war will be gone. The only thing that could justify the President in moving at all by force of arms is the rebellion, and the moment that rebellion is subdued and put down, the cause of the war ceases, and with it the war must cease also; and if the President or this Congress should, for abolition purposes, protract the war a solitary day beyond the suppression of the rebellion, then your become rebels; you rebel against the Constitution; you change places with the rebels, and become revolutionists and rebels yourselves.

"My resolution then takes the ground that the Union has not been dissolved, and that when the rebellion is suppressed by force of the Federal arms, or by the voluntary submission of the people of those States to the authority of the Constitution, that that State is thereby restored to all its rights and privileges under the Constitution, may send representatives to Congress, and do all other acts which any other State in the Union can do.

"Sir, what difference is there between the States in the Union, the rebellion being suppressed? There is no more constitutional power to intermeddle with the local institutions of the State of Louisiana than with those of Massachusetts, and any attempt to do it is nothing more nor less than revolution, as unjustifiable in its character as the revolution in the South, because it is equally a revolution against the Constitution of this Government; it seeks to subversion and utter overthrow.

"Any attempt to control a State organization after the rebellion shall have been overthrown proceeds upon the ground that the Union is dissolved What right can we have to re-establish State Governments in the South if the Southern States be still in the Union? The very idea of reconstruction is an absurd and revolutionary idea, because it admits the dissolution of the Union There can be no reconstruction of a State Government that is still in existence.

—The Lawrenceburg Register has changed hands. A. Bookwalter retires, after eleven years connection with the paper. He is succeeded by Messrs. Noah M Givan and Creighton Dandy, gentlemen of talent and energy, thoroughly imbued with sound political principles. Under their management the Register will continue to be an influential and valuable auxiliary in the Democratic cause.

Reply of Judge Perkins to the Democratic Club of Lawrenceburg.

Lawrenceburg, April 29, 1864.

Hon Samuel E Perkins:

My Dear Sir—I have the honor and great pleasure to inform you of your election as an honorary member of the Democratic Club of Lawrenceburg. The resolutions offered on the occasion I transmit herewith, and I need not add that the esteem therein expressed for yourself and services is fully shared by me. Please favor the Club with a letter of acceptance, and if you should see fit to make it a medium of conveying to the public your opinions upon the present status of the country, general currency will be given to it.

I am, very truly, &c.
Creighton Dandy,
Corresponding Secretary.

Indianapolis, May 6, 1864.

Creighton Dandy, Esq, Corresponding Secretary of the Democratic Club of Lawrenceburg:

Dear Sir—I am in receipt of yours of April 29, ultimo, enclosing copy of a resolution of the Democratic Club of Lawrenceburg, making me an honorary member of that society.

Absence from home has prevented an earlier acknowledgment of its reception.

I thank the Association for the compliment, and you for the kind manner in which it is communicated. It is true, I am unacquainted with your constitution and by laws; but a man rarely goes amiss in acting with old Union loving Democracy under whom the country was always happy.

The resolution speaks approvingly of my humble efforts to sustain the constitution and laws, and courts of the country. I am rejoiced to witness this feeling of respect for law and order. Let me say that the war, with all its attendant evils, which now afflicts the country, is but the consequence of a refusal to abide by the Constitution of the United States as expounded by the judicial tribunals of the nation.

Less than one hundred years ago, our fathers framed and adopted a constitution for the United States; and in it they provided that all questions arising about its meaning and the respective rights of the States and people under it, should be decided by the courts of the United States, and not by the States and people themselves, according to their own several notions, upon the higher law principle. Had this provision been uniformly respected, peace and prosperity would now have reigned throughout the land.

It has been disregarded in three memorable instances.

1. By the New England Federalists.
2. By the Southern Nullifiers.
3. By the Northern Lincoln men

FIRST—THE CASE OF NEW ENGLAND.

It was during the attempt to establish a New England Confederacy, that Mr. Josiah Quincy, one of the ablest and most accomplished men of Massachusetts, the near connection of J. Q. Adams, then a Federalist, and now a radical, and ardent supporter of Mr. Lincoln's Administration, gave an exposition of the constitutional views held by the federal and radical secessionists of the eastern section of the Union. The particular occasion was this: Soon after Mr. Jefferson became President, Louisiana was acquired, whereby the United States got the control of the Mississippi river. New England opposed this acquisition because it tended to increase the power of the South and West, and thus relatively diminish hers; and on the 19th of January, 1811, on the bill to provide for the formation of a State Government in a part of the acquired Louisiana territory, Mr Quincy asserted that the passage of the bill would be, ipso facto, a dissolution of the Union. Excitement was produced by this proposition. Mr. Poindexter, a leading Southern statesman from Mississippi, and a bosom friend of Henry Clay, called Mr. Quincy to order, declaring that "it was radically wrong for any member to use arguments going to dissolve the Government, and tumble this body itself to dust and ashes."

"Mr. Quincy repeated and justified the remark he had made, which, to save all misapprehension, he committed to writing in the following words: If this bill passes, it is my deliberate opinion that it is virtually a dissolution of this Union; that it will free the States from their moral obligation, and, as it will be the right of all, so it will be the duty of some, definitely to prepare for a separation, amicably if they can, violently if they must." And the House, by three majority, refused to sustain Mr. Poindexter, of Mississippi, and decided that Mr. Quincy's treasonable remarks "were in order," and he proceeded in his speech, to enforce them thus: "I will add only a few words in relation to the moral and political consequences of usurping this power. I have said that it would be a virtual dissolution of the Union; and gentlemen express great sensibility at the expression. But the true source of terror is not in the declaration I have mad, but in the deed you propose. Is there a moral principle of public law better settled, or more conformable to the plainest suggestions of reason, than that the violation of a contract by one of the parties may be considered as exempting the other from its obligations ?" 4 Bent. Deb, p 326, et seq.

SECOND—THE CASE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

Congress enacted a tariff law. It was oppressive upon the South. The South declared it a violation of the Constitution; and, failing to get the law repealed, South Carolina proceeded, in 1832, to pass a nullification ordinance prohibiting the enforcement of the law in that State Gen. Jackson was then President. He came out in a message declaring that, "however it may be alleged that a violation of the compact [the Constitution] by the measures of the Government, can affect the obligations of the parties, it cannot even be pretended that such violation can be predicated of these measures until all the constitutional remedies shall have been fully tried. If the Federal Government exercises powers not warranted by the constitution, and immediately affecting individuals, it will scarcely be denied that the proper remedy is a recourse to the judiciary." 10 Bent. Deb, p 19. And in his proclamation he said: "I consider, then, the power to annul a law of the United States, assumed by one State, *incompatible with the existence of the Union;* contradicted expressly by the letter of the Constitution; unauthorized by its spirit; inconsistent with every principal on which it was founded; and destructive of the great object for which it was formed." Accordingly the Courts of South Carolina pronounced the nullification ordinance void, sustained the law of Congress, the ordinance was repealed, and South Carolina finally submitted to the decision of the Courts. South Carolina righted herself.

And here I wish to notice a moment the point so often made, that, in the case of the United States Bank, Jackson refused to act upon the rule that the decision of the Supreme Court was binding. The assertion is not true. The Supreme Court of the United States never decided that, as a banking institution, a bank of the United States was constitutional. But, on the other hand, that Court decided that a bank could not be created, simply as a bank of the United States, but that, if it was necessary, as a fiscal agent of the Government, it was constitutional as such agent; and, if it was not necessary as such agent, it was not constitutional. Jackson accepted the decision of the Court in its terms; and was of opinion, as matter of fact, that it was not necessary as a fiscal agent, and, hence, was unconstitutional by the decision of the Court, and the experience of the last twenty-five years has proved him right in his opinion. He was against rechartering the Bank on the expiration of its original charter.

THIRD—THE CASE OF LINCOLN AND HIS FOLLOWERS.

Congress enacted a law for the return of fugitives from labor and service. The Supreme Court of the United States unanimously decided it constitutional. Many of the people and States of the North refused to obey it, and several States enacted nullification laws obstructing its enforcement in such States. These laws, according to the proclamation of Gen. Jackson against South Carolina, were "*incompatible with the existence of the Union.*" Some of them have not yet been repealed.

Again; a question arose as to the rights of the people of the several States to move and settle in the common territories of the Union with their different kinds of persons and property. In the enactment of the popular sovereignty laws of Mr. Douglas touching this subject, it was the mutual understanding that the question of such right, according to the principle of the Constitution, was to be laid before the Supreme Court of the United States for decision. This you will find stated repeatedly by Mr. Douglas himself, by looking into the several biographies of him that have been published. Accordingly, that course was taken, and, in 1858, the question was solemnly decided by the high tribunal provided by the Constitution to determine such questions. The decision was in favor of the right of the people of the States to thus settle I am not mistaken in this. Mr. Holt, in the spring of 1861, then an officer of the Government, and now Mr. Lincoln's Judge Advocate General, published an address to the people of Kentucky, in which he said: "The Supreme Court has decided that the citizens of the slave States can, at will, take their slaves into all the territories of the United States. * * *That it will be loyally enforced by the present Administration I have no doubt.* * * * Kentucky should consider this great and undeniable fact, before which all the frothy rant of demagogues and disunionists must disappear as a bank of fog before the wind."

And now, what course did Mr. Lincoln and his supporters take in the premises? Did he, like Calhoun, the treasonable nullifier, take the ground that the decision of the Supreme Court was not to be submitted to? See 1st vol. of his works. Or did he, like Jackson, say the decision of the judicial tribunals must be submitted to? Did he run his Presidential race in 1860 on that Jacksonian doctrine? Did he, ere yet carnage had begun, proclaim that doctrine in his inaugural message? Did the Republicans commit, in this matter, a great moral national crime? What answer shall I make to these questions? Shall I refer you to the tears and desolation and spilt blood of the nation for an answer? I forbear.

The South, assuming that if the decisions of the courts were to be disregarded, she was without security in the Union, made the fact a pretext for secession. And the old Abolitionists who felt that they could not, in conscience, give the South her constitutional rights in the Union; who felt that the Constitution, on this point, "was a league with hell," wanted to let the South go; but the majority elected to hold her and make her change her institutions so as to accord with Northern consciences, and, in this sense, slavery was the cause of the war.

And the above facts show us that the Union men of the North are divisible into two classes. The Democrats and the Lincoln men in Indiana are all Union men, but there is, and always has been, this difference between them:

The Democrats are for holding the South in the Union, but, at the same time, respecting her constitutional rights in it.

The Lincoln men are also for holding the South in the Union, but without respecting her constitutional rights in it.

For the act of secession of the South I have no words of condemnation too severe. There was in the Senate still a majority of Democrats, and in the North a large party of them who respected the Constitution and laws; and when that bulwark might fail, there yet remained an appeal to the people of the Union for a new convention in which all questions might be peacefully, and we are bound to presume would be fairly settled and adjusted. Hence, I have at all times, while feeling calm and self sustained in the consciousness that the Democracy were innocent of provoking it, and sorrowing that there were those in the North who were not, condemned the rebellion, and sympathized with and honored the soldiers who have gone forth, in obedience to the laws of the country, to put it down. And we may well be proud of the alacrity with which our western people have poured forth in obedience to the calls of the National Administration, to fill the quotas of the army And we must remember, as a ground for withholding censure of apparent tardiness in filling the present call, that there is a difference in volunteering to fill an equal requisition by the National Administration and to fill an extra contract of our Governor "to furnish" 20,000 white citizens. And while on this topic, I cannot withhold a remark in vindication of New England. She *respects the blood of her white men*, and the industrial interests of her people. And is that, in itself, censurable? She partially filled her quota with negroes from Indiana, under the equal calls for white men of the Administration, and but partially; and if, when that class failed, our Western Governors were willing to turn out Western white men who are good fighters, to make up deficiencies for New England, and Western men are willing to go, why should New England be abused about it?

PRESENT CONDITION.

You are pleased, in your letter, to intimate that you would like to know my opinion as to the condition and prospects of the country.

Our present condition is that of a country engaged in a gigantic war that ought to, and might have been avoided by just, peaceful measures; but which not having been, it became our duty, as it was our pleasure, to vigorously prosecute it for the legitimate purpose of securing an honorable peace, by putting down the armed rebels. Had it been thus prosecuted it would have been closed long ago without the accumulation of a debt beyond our ability to pay. Why, but a few months ago the Administration told us that North Carolina was negotiating to come back, if her rights as a State under the Constitution should be left to her. Had she been received back the rebellion would necessarily have ended. Where is North Carolina now, and why is she where she is? So of Tennessee I wish you would procure a statement of facts touching this latter State, from Col. Fitch, of Logansport.

But if, having determined to refuse any fair terms to our brethren of the South, the Administration had vigorously prosecuted the war for extermination, as vigorously as they are now doing, the war would have been over two years ago; but the Administration felt that the end of the war would be followed by the end of their political power; and, hence, determined to nurse it along, in order to have it to use as an instrument to carry the election with this year. What ought the people to think of such men? Are blood and misery playthings? My doctrine was to settle the national difficulty without war; but after the Administration got us into the war, to vigorously prosecute it simply to put down the rebellion and restore peace; and, after the Administration determined on the extermination policy, it was my doctrine to rush that, so that, as speedily as possible, the flow of blood might be stanched; the flames of burning dwellings and cities be extinguished; the shrieks of perishing women and children cease to anguish the ear, and the mountain of debt to rise. See my letter to Messrs. McDonald and others, last fall

We also find ourselves under an Administration that is, so far as I am advised, by general consent conceded to be composed of men who tolerate the most corruption; men the most wasteful of the public treasures, of any that the history of the world records as ever having been in possession of government—men who have been, according to the deliberately published statements of leading Republican papers, purposely prolonging the war for the selfish purpose of perpetuating their own political power. The consequence is that the country may be described as being in the condition of "a certain man who went down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and fell among thieves, who stripped him of his raiment, and wounded him," leaving him half dead. And in future years, as our people are groaning under the burden of taxation, the remembrance that it is aggravated by the licensed plundering by government contractors will add to its bitterness; for the remark of a great writer is most true, that the sting of taxation is wastefulness.

FUTURE PROSPECTS.

This is too extensive a subject to be discussed in a necessarily brief and hastily drawn letter. Some points in it, however, are obvious enough

1. Whether the rebellion succeeds or fails, (and I pray it may fail; and, as I have formerly written, it will fail if Providence is on our side; and it will fail if Providence does not interfere on either side; for, without any outside interference, naturally twenty strong States must whip ten weak ones;) but whether it succeeds or fails, I take it as a fixed fact that our social condition in future years is to be that of a but partially taxed moneyed aristocracy, and a people of poor laborers and peasants, with none of the comforts, and but few of the coarsest necessaries of life. It will take about all of the earnings of the people to pay their stamp taxes, license taxes, tariff taxes, &c ; and if enough shall be left to enable us to subsist on corn bread and gruel, we may deem ourselves happy. I know I shall be regarded as altogether mistaken in this. I know writers are, as they think, actually demonstrating that these taxes will be light—scarcely felt, and even actually beneficial.

But I know that such writers are deluding the people. I remember well, and so do the old and middle-aged men of the State, that we had just such writers and speakers when we created our debt for the old internal improvement system. I know they told us then that an extra hen and chickens or two would pay all. I know, also, that they deceived the people, that the system broke down, that for years the people could not pay even the extra tax required by that debt, which was nothing compared with the mountain that is now rising, and that the debt was finally compromised; thus furnishing, as we shall again furnish, a confirmation of the great truth so pithily expressed by Burke, "that too often different is rational conjecture from melancholy fact." Read the accounts that writers give us of the condition of the laboring population of England. In the meantime the North will be decreasing, to some extent, in population. The South by the war is being converted, if reports say true, into a desolate waste. It is a battle-withered region. After "this cruel war is over" that country must be re-peopled, re-improved, re-built. Our population will flow down there until an equilibrium is produced, and property with us will decline. Indiana may not be as populous ten years hence as she is now. The South suffers from the war now; the North will suffer hereafter.

2. In the midst of sufferings from oppressive taxation, the people may become dissatisfied, so that it may be considered unsafe to permit a free expression of public sentiment at the ballot box, and thus our political liberties may pass away. Indeed, at Indianapolis, the elective franchise has now become a mockery. How it is in other parts of the State, I know not; but here, under the eye of our civil and military governors, the ballot-box no longer utters the people's will. Take an example: At our last election for Councilman in the Ward in which I live, less than a month ago, I went to the polls to vote. While I was there, a company of soldiers from Camp Shanks was marched up under the Captain. I heard a Republican remark that those men were not voters of the Ward. Their votes were received by the inspectors, and woe to any Democrat who objected; a good man, loyal to the Administration, was elected! And I mused a while on the respect of Lincoln men for law and rights, and the probability of the permanency of republican institutions. It seems to me reasonable to infer that but for military orders the soldiers would not be guilty of such acts, and, hence, that they are not the party most subject to condemnation therefor. On this point, however, I speak inferentially, not knowingly. But I am extending this communication beyond contemplated limits, and will bring it to a close.

Do you ask me, in conclusion, what we shall do? In answer, I would say, be industrious, honest and economical; obey the laws, pay your taxes, allow of no riots; be provoked into no illegal acts; render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's; demand, with the Germans and the Irishmen, and exercise the rights of free speech, free press, and fair ballot—our constitutional birth-rights—and by these means bring about a change in administration for the better (it can't be worse); drive away the vampyres that are sucking out the life-blood of the nation, and put honest, discreet, prudent, thoughtful and patriotic men in administration, who, like the good Samaritan, will bind up the wounds of our bleeding nation and try to yet save something from the general wreck, and, at any rate, WILL SAVE US POLITICAL LIBERTY.

Do you ask how, in these times, we should bear ourselves? I answer, when the wicked rule the people mourn; but let us feel resigned, and as happy as we can; trust in God, and hope that possibly there may be a better time coming. Especially, let us bear no hatred or malice towards our political opponents. And, in future years, as we gently submit our necks to the yoke of serfdom and slavery, bent down by the heavy load of taxation, let us be cheerful, contented; let us drink deep of the cup of consolation in the glorious thought that we live in a land and age of meek Christianity and mild civilization—that we have witnessed the removal from our land of a great sin, taking the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as authority; in short, that Jehovah has triumphed and the negroes are free.

Your ob't S. E. Perkins

General Butler Shown up—His Administration in Norfolk—His Exploits as a Dog Killer—Prostitution of the National Livery to Tyranny and Money-getting.

Governor Pierpont, of Virginia, in a recent letter to the President, makes a thorough and crushing *expose* of the misrule of Ben. Butler at Norfolk. This exposure comes from a loyal man, whose opposition to the rebellion and rebels cannot be questioned, and it therefore falls with crushing weight upon one whom the evidence convicts of prostituting his position to tyranize and advance his personal interests. As a part of the history of the times, we give the following extracts from the letter of Governor Pierpont, regretting that we have not space for all, but it is enough to show the character of the man whom he justly excoriates:

Among the few orders Gen. Butler issued when he went to Norfolk in November last, was one threatening punishment to any person who used disrespectful language to any officer or soldier in the Union army. Next was an order directing all permits granted by his predecessors to be returned to him. Then came an order charging one per cent on all goods shipped into his military district, to go to the support of the Provost Marshal's fund. All vessels clearing from his district paid from five to fifteen dollars, according to size, to the same fund. Oyster men were taxed from fifty cents to one dollar per month for the privilege of taking oysters; if in one field, fifty cents, if in two, one dollar The Provost Marshal's court was fully established, trying causes in controversy from one dollar to writs of ejectment; judgments rendered in land cases, and writs of possession given in five and ten days from date of judgment. One man, unable to pay a large judgment rendered against him, was placed in a felon's cell in jail and a guard put over his house! Costs, on about the scale of a civil suit in court, with a per centage for collection, were charged, bringing money into the Provost Marshal's fund in a stream.

THE CASE OF MR BILISOLLY.

Mr. Bilisolly resided in Portsmouth. Some of the neighboring women took some silver to his house, and put it in the possession of the female members of his family without his knowledge. The old man is about seventy years of age, and was a director of the Savings Bank. He was summoned before General Butler and interrogated as to this silver The old man knew nothing of it, and so replied General Butler told him he was a liar, and he would put him in Fort Norfolk on bread and water until he learned to tell the truth. The old man replied, "Sir, I am your prisoner, or you should not address me thus"

The old man was put into the fort without a blanket on the cold floor, and is still there. I received a letter from one his daughters, a good Union woman, in which she says: "My dear mother sent to Fortress Monroe a nice new cotton mattress, a pair of blankets, one comforter, one pair of sheets and one pillow, which were never delivered to father." At the time Bilisolly was arrested they found in his house, deposited as above stated, in one bundle, a large soup ladle, two silver mugs, two pair of sugar tongs, half a dozen old fashioned tablespoons, with other tablespoons and teaspoons; and another bundle, somewhat larger, consisting of twenty-seven pieces, from soup ladle to salt spoon.

Bilisolly is an eccentric man; he laid in liquors at the birth of his children, as well as at their wedding. When his youngest daughter was born, now twenty years ago, he had a surplus of one dozen bottles of wine and eight bottles of brandy, which he corked up and laid aside to break when she got married. But the wine and brandy went with the silver, and, I suppose, not since separated, have gone into the Provost Marshal's fund together.

NEWSPAPERS AND MAGAZINES.

In February, General Butler issued an order asking for bids until the first of March, for the privilege of furnishing newspapers and periodicals in his district, by the month, promising to award the monopoly to the successful bidder—not the highest An old Jew by the name of Bohu, was the successful bidder, at the price of six hundred dollars per month. All other dealers were closed up, among whom were Mayhew & Brother who had a news store in Norfolk, had paid a license to the city, State, and United States Government, and were doing a fair business. They supposed the order did not refer to Norfolk, and, as they had paid their internal revenue license, they continued their business.

Soon, however, they were summoned to Old Point before Captain Cassell. When they got there, Cassell asked them if they took the papers They replied, "We do." Said he, "Do you read them?" Reply, "We do." "Then," said he, "do you understand what you read?" Answer, "We do, or suppose we do." Said he, "Do you live in Norfolk?" "Yes." "Did you see the order awarding the privilege of supplying this district with papers and magazines to Mr. Bohu?" They answered, "We did." "Well," said he, "that order was issued by command of General Butler, and if you persist in bringing papers into this department, I will use all my influence to have you punished." Thus American citizens from Pennsylvania, who have resided in Norfolk near two years, are cut off from business. They paid the United States Government $18 44 for internal revenue license alone, with a solemn undertaking on the part of the Government to protect them in their business. And this in addition to what they would pay on income; but the income has gone into the Provost Marshal's fund.

THE DOGS.

It was supposed that all the sources whence money could be derived were exhausted. But a happy thought occurred, as deep contemplation occupied the mind of the soldier; not like that which absorbed Alexander when he wept because there was not another world to conquer, but "where was more money?" The dogs! happy thought; dogs occupy a tender place in the affections of the old, and young, and middle aged, and there is a good supply in the two cities from the poodle to the butcher's bull dog So the following order was issued, verbatim:

Headquarters Norfolk and Portsmouth,
Norfolk, Va, March 7, 1864

General Order, No. 6.—Let every fourth dog in the district be killed. The Provost Marshals of Norfolk and Portsmouth will see this order executed.

By command of Brigadier General E. A. Wild.
George H. Johnson,
Captain and Assistant Adjutant General.

The decree was very general, not like Herod's in regard to children. But every fourth dog, generally, without regard to age, sex, or condition. This order produced great sensation; it was so general. How would they ascertain the fourth dog? At last my friend Peter Whitehurst declared that all the dogs in the department would have to be killed but three, then there would be no fourth dog left. This produced great consternation among the old maids and the young sportsmen for the poodles and pointers, so they rushed to the headquarters and inquired for an interpretation of the order, when they were informed by the following answer:

Ladies and gentlemen, we do not desire to hurt a hair of your dogs' backs It is only to increase the provost marshal's fund, that order is made. All of you who will pay two dollars to the provost marshal, get a license for your dog, and a collar and put on his neck, can keep him to comfort your declining years and youthful sports." On the 23d of March, near one thousand five hundred dollars had been paid in. I did not learn whether a Boston friend had the monopoly of selling dog collars. But the order must be carried out by way of paying the money. The veteran soldiers—white soldiers—were detailed to hunt them up and bring them in for redemption.

When we landed in Norfolk the other day, I went up Main street to the hotel. After I passed the Provost Marshal's office, I met a veteran soldier leading with a rope, a fine, noble countenanced pointer dog. The poor fellow looked restive. He seemed to recognize a friend in me, and ran around me, bringing the rope around my limbs. I extricated myself and told him I was only a civilian. A little further on I met another soldier with a medium sized cur, with his head and tail down, showing his teeth a little, looked surly, and as much as to say, "I didn't know this war was about dogs; I don't care a —— which side whips;" or such sentiments as might be expected from a mean cur. A little further on I met another soldier with a line around a little dog's neck; he was between the spaniel and the poodle—white wool, but dirty; his chin was close to the ground, his eyes upturned meekly, and wagging his tail gently as he went along. A juvenile freedman, who was standing on the pavement, said, "Little doggie, if you don't get two dollars, Massa Butler will take de wag out ob your tail."

GENERAL BUTLER'S MILITARY ADMINISTRATION IN THE FIELD.

Since General Butler has been so vigilant in trying to impress the public mind that the civil government was inefficient at Norfolk, it may not be amiss to advert to the administration of military affairs in the field in that vicinity. The first movement was to send about one hundred men to Smithfield, on James river, in the face of the enemy, with no mode of retreat, and only to be supported by gunboats going up a creek that is little more than a quagmire at low tide. The result was the loss of the whole command, and the destruction of a gunboat which got aground.

The next was General Wild's notable raid into North Carolina and Princess Anne county. I never want to see the history of that raid until the war is over. The taking of Miss White a prisoner is only one of the occurrences.

The next was the projected raid on Richmond, for the liberation of the Union prisoners. The failure was regretted. It was attributed to the desertion of a Union soldier, who carried the news to Richmond, and gave them time to rally and defeat the project. And the public have been amused and satisfied with this story, and General Butler lauded to the heavens for the conception of the noble idea. He insulted the navy by attributing to the officers unfaithfulness, and imprisoned a lady thirteen days, keeping her on bread and water, to force her to tell what naval officer had told her of the contemplated expedition to Richmond, when she knew nothing about it. Of all of this the public was duly notified through the press. But is it not strange how a soldier who deserted knew anything about the objects of the army, so as to give information so long beforehand? I asked the first four or five men I met from Norfolk if it was known there publicly before the expedition started, that it was going. Every one of them replied that they knew it from six to ten days before it started; the troops that were going, the object, and all about it. It was told by his own officers. General Butler knew to whom he had confided his plans.

Why did he not strike there for the person who revealed the secret? I think it very likely that the news of the raid was communicated from Norfolk to Richmond, and it was suggested in the letter, "publish that you got this news from a Union soldier who deserted" But it was known at Williamsburg, and talked of among the soldiers for at least six days before the expedition started. Yet censure is heaped on every body, to keep observation from General Butler and his confidential advisers.

The last military exploit I heard of, was a raid into North Carolina and the capture of two lighter loads of corn and meal, with some contrabands, and the selling of the corn at public auction, and the proceeds of sale went into the provost marshal's fund

WHAT BECOMES OF THE PROVOST MARSHAL'S FUND.

I might answer this question by repeating the question, what does become of it? Perhaps this is about as satisfactory an answer as the country will ever get.

It does not go into the treasury of the United States, nor do I suppose it relieves it of any of its burdens. It is estimated by those who have pretty good opportunity of knowing, that there has been collected since Gen. Butler went to Old Point last fall, from two to three hundred thousand dollars into this fund. There has been a system of excessive fines introduced for one supposed offense and another, varying from fifty to five thousand dollars In addition to this mode, property, captured and confiscated, all goes into the Provost Marshal's fund, with a tax on goods shipped into and out of the district, tax on oysters and dogs, clearances of vessels, &c., &c.

IMPORTANT POLITICAL MANIFESTO.

THE RADICAL CALL FOR THE CLEVELAND CONVENTION—LETTER FROM WENDELL PHILLIPS ENDORSING THE MOVEMENT

To the People of the United States:

After having labored ineffectually to defer as far as was in our power the critical moment when the attention of the people must inevitably be fixed upon the selection of a candidate for the chief magistracy of the country; after having interrogated our conscience and consulted our duty as citizens; obeying at once the sentiment of a mature conviction and a profound affection for the common country, we feel ourselves impelled on our own responsibility to declare to the people that the time has come for all independent men, jealous of their liberties and of the national greatness, to confer together and unite to resist the swelling invasion of an open, shameless, and unrestrained patronage which threatens to engulf under its destructive wave the rights of the people, the liberty and dignity of the nation.

Deeply impressed with the conviction that, in the time of a revolution, when the public attention is turned exclusively to the success of armies, and is consequently less vigilant of the public liberties, the patronage derived from the organization of an army of a million of men, and an administration of affairs which seeks to control the remotest parts of the country in favor of its supreme chief, constitute a danger seriously threatening to the stability of republican institutions; we declare that the principle of *one term*, which has now acquired nearly the force of law by the consecration of time, ought to be inflexibly adhered to in the approaching election

We further declare that we do not recognize in the Baltimore Convention the essential conditions of a truly national convention Its proximity to the center of all interested influences of the administration, its distance from the center of the country, its mode of convocation, the corrupting practices to which it has been and inevitably will be subjected, do not permit the people to assemble there with any expectation of being able to deliberate at full liberty.

Convinced as we are, that in the presence of the critical circumstances in which the nation is placed, it is only in the energy and good sense of the people that the general safety can be found; satisfied that the only way to consult is to indicate a central position to which every one may go without too much expenditure of means and time, and where the assembled people, far from all administrative influence, may consult freely and deliberate peaceably with the presence of the greatest possible number of men whose known principles guarantee their sincere and enlightened devotion to the rights of the people and to the preservation of the true basis of a republican government; we earnestly invite our fellow-citizens to unite at Cleveland, Ohio, on Saturday, the 31st of May next, for consultation and concert of action in respect to the approaching Presidential election.

Signed by B. Gratz Brown and 42 others.

Judge Stallo:

Dear Sir: Since you asked my judgment as to the course to be taken in cominating a candidate for the presidency, I have been requested to sign a call for a convention for that purpose, to meet at Cleveland in May next.

Let me tell you the national policy I advocate:

Subdue the South as rapidly as possible. The moment territory comes under our flag reconstruct States thus: Confiscate and divide the lands of rebels; extend the right of suffrage broadly as possible to whites and blacks; let the Federal Constitution prohibit slavery throughout the Union, and forbid the States to make any distinction among their citizens on account of color or race

I shall make every effort to have this policy pursued. Believing that the present Administration repudiates it, and is carrying us to a point where we shall be obliged either to acknowledge the Southern Confederacy or to reconstruct the Union on terms grossly unjust, intolerable to the masses, and sure soon to result in another war, I earnestly advise an unpledged and independent convention, like that proposed, to consider public affairs and nominate for the presidency a statesman and a patriot.

Yours, faithfully,
Wendell Phillips.

Boston, April 21.

STATE ITEMS.

—The Democrats of Rochester, at the corporation election on the first Monday in this month, elected five of the seven candidates on the ticket. Last year the Democratic ticket was entirely defeated Straws, &c.

—The Terre Haute Express says that E. B. Allen surrendered the Auditor's office to B. H. Cornwell, Esq on Thursday last. A majority of Mr. Allen's attorneys advised him to do so, as the action could not longer be successfully defended. Right will triumph in the end.

—Tragedy in Fountain County—The Legitimate Consequences.—We were shocked this morning by the receipt of intelligence of another of those frightful occurrences that have become so frequent of late.

Two men, residents of the southeast part of Fountain county, had occasion to go some distance from their homes, and in a short time after their departure, their horses came back riderless. Search being made, one of them, named Hawkins, was found dead by the side of the road, and the other, by the name of Crawley, mortally wounded by a rifle ball through the neck

No clue to the perpetrators of these deeds has yet been discovered, and our informant states that but little excitement has been aroused, and but little sympathy has been manifested for the victims. They were both active participants in the recent disturbances in that quarter, and their assassination was most likely in consequence of private hatred. Crawley, in particular, is represented as a quarrelsome, bullying disturber of the peace who, as a matter of course, had many and bitter enemies.

It may be necessary for us to recur to this subject in a future issue, and we will only say now that the prevailing lawlessness, and the almost universal disregard of human life and human suffering, are the legitimate, the logical sequences of Abolition precept and example.—[Lafayette Argus.

—The Excitement at Brazil.—Some excitement has existed throughout the country this week on account of reports concerning a military display at Brazil. We had intended to pass it by without notice, and should have done so had not glib tongued scandal mongers for partisan purposes attempted to give it a false coloring and greater magnitude than the facts will warrant. The truth, as we have heard it, is this:

A military drill of the people, for a common purpose, to be prepared to resist a common enemy, was publicly announced to come off at that place on Tuesday. As soon as the notice became public it was denounced as a "butternut drill," and the "Leaguers" and "Home Guards" refused to participate, and set about trying to break into the arrangement.

Col. Streight, whose name it was thought was clothed with a sublime degree of terror, owing to the daring exploit and unenviable fame which he achieved in his celebrated "raid" upon defenseless women and children, (*a la* Quantrill, at Lawrence,) was requested to be present and speak. The time arrived, and a number of citizens came to meet the appointment, and the opposition which had been arrayed against the exercises created some little excitement, but nothing worthy of special note, had not partisan malice endeavored to make a great bear out of the bug

Had nobody "flew out of the traces," the Leaguers and the Guards, the citizens and the soldiers could all have engaged and been benefited, and all might have went "merry as a marriage bell," and pleasant as the musters of the olden time, but the opportunity to display a little cheap patriotism and make a little party capital, was too good to be lost.—[Clay County Democrat.

Short Line Railroad from Lafayette to Chicago.—A meeting was held in Lafayette on Wednesday last, fully attended by the leading men of that city, and citizens living along the proposed route. It was stated by the President of the meeting that he was authorized to say that all needful funds were ready to build the road without delay. All that is now necessary is action on the part of those interested along the line and its termini.

Great interest in the success of the undertaking was manifested by every person present. The meeting adjourned, to meet at Chicago, May 26, for further consultation and action.

— Governor Morton and the New Albany Ledger.—The Ledger thus responds to a recent attack upon it by His Excellency O. P. M. :

A few days ago there appeared in the local columns of the Ledger a short article, published upon the authority and at the request of a gentleman who, having raised a company for one of the late regiments, complained that Gov Morton had refused to commission him. The Governor makes this paragraph the pretext for a violent assault upon the Ledger, through the columns of his Indianapolis organ;—for, though the article assumes the editorial form, it was evidently inspired, if not actually written, by His Excellency himself The gist of Governor Morton's article is that one of the "proprietors" of the Ledger was an applicant for a field office under Governor Morton, which the Governor refused to give him because he was assured by "Union men of New Albany" that the Ledger was rotten and treacherous. If the "Union men of New Albany" were aware of the "treachery" of the Ledger, we should like to know who there was to be betrayed Certainly not the "Union men" (i. e., Republicans) in question, because if they were aware of its treachery in advance, it was impossible to betray them.

The Governor says the "proprietor" to whom he alludes made the application for a field appointment himself. The "proprietor" in question is not in the city when this is written, but we are sure the Governor is mistaken. In fact, the "proprietor" was told by some of the Governor's confidential friends in this city that if he would make the application in person he would be sure to get it. His Excellency, we suppose, takes a delight in having applicants for his favors fawning at his feet. But no personal application was made, and the appointment was withheld. We were not before aware that the Governor regarded it as a crime for a man to desire to serve his country in the "field" in the war for the suppression of the rebellion. But so it seems in this case.

The Governor, as is usual in such cases, speaks of the Ledger as opposing "the Government," the only ground for which charge is that our local complained, at the request of a friend, at the manner in which certain appointments were made! This is contemptible, to say the least of it. The Governor knows that the Madison Courier, a leading Republican journal, has said more and harder things about him than the Ledger ever did. We suppose most of our readers have heard of the story of the Pennsylvania constable who, getting into a bit of a fight with a chap who was a little too much for him, bellowed out, as the blows were falling thick and fast on his "nog," "Remember, when you strike me, you strike the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania."

So when we give His Excellency a slight reminder of his delinquencies, he, like a great calf, bellows out, "Remember, when you strike at me, you strike at the Government!" This balderdash is about "played out." It became so common that even decent Administration men have become utterly ashamed of using it. It was the common resort of delinquent provost marshals, commissaries and quartermasters, when their escapades were pointed out. Why, it is not two months since Governor Morton took credit to himself for opposing "the government" in one of its decisions relating to the filling up of quotas by delinquent counties and townships. Let the Governor hold himself responsible for his own acts, and not, like a frightened chicken, which takes refuge under the old hen's wing, at the least appearance of danger, be forever trying to shelter himself under the wings of "the government."