THE SENTINEL.

WM. E. PELL, SEATON GALES. } Editors.

Wednesday Evening, Sept. 12, 1866.

FOR THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES, AS IT IS, AND THE UNION AS IT WAS.
NO FOURTEEN AMENDMENTS.

FOR GOVERNOR,

JONATHAN WORTH,

OF RANDOLPH.

The Powers of the Convention—Mr. Moore's Argument.

In the discussion of this subject, we have, in a former paper, shown that the Constitution of the United States, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, is the charter of *all* the rights, powers and duties belonging to the Federal Government and its officers. We have shown that the Federal Government is limited to one object and purpose, is sending or keeping hostile troops at any time in the States without their consent, and that is, when it is necessary in order to execute and enforce the Constitution and laws of the United States within their limits. We have shown that, yielding the right of secession for the States, a doctrine we never believed, that authority arose when the States passed acts of secession. That is the extent of the war power against the States given by the Constitution to the Federal Government and its Executive.—All beyond this is unconstitutional.

In executing this war power for the enforcement of the Constitution and laws, it may become necessary to do some things from motives of high public policy for the general peace and welfare, which seem to violate other fundamental principles of the Constitution; but it must be conceded, that when a government executes a power, right or duty, which is imperious, that that power, right or duty carries along with it all power and right necessary to perform it.—In judging, therefore, of the specific acts of the Executive of the United States, both before, during and since the war, truth and charity demand that those acts should be judged of with moderation, and always in view of the high public interest which rendered them necessary. We come now to show

Secondly, what were the rights and powers of the late State Convention? Was it an open and unrestricted Convention, or was it limited?

We have shown that it was legitimate for the President, in order to the early exercise of the civil functions of the State, with the sole view and purpose of adjusting its machinery, so as to put it into motion without friction, the execution of the laws of the United States within its limits, to appoint a Provisional Governor, and to authorize the call of a Convention of the people of the State, to effect that object. The absence of specific formula or constitutional provision, left the President to the conclusions of his own judgment as to the manner in which this high trust must be executed, and we contend that reasons of high public policy, as well as his constitutional duty to enforce the laws, authorized and legitimized what his own judgment directed should be done, and what was done in calling the Convention. The election of the delegates by the people and the object of the Convention fixed its character.

In our system, two kinds of Conventions have from the beginning been recognized as legitimate and perfectly consistent with the genius of our government: unrestricted, open or unlimited, and restricted, close or limited Conventions have been recognized. The first and fifth Conventions which have been held in this State, from the beginning to the present time, were open or unrestricted Conventions; all the rest were restricted and limited. Judge Gaston, in alluding to the powers of the Convention of 1835, maintained, and it was generally conceded, that the purposes and objects of the Convention, as set forth in the act authorizing its call and election, were the charter of its powers and limitations.

Many maintain that, in the nature of things, a Convention of the people cannot be limited, but must possess plenary powers to do whatever the people might do, if present and acting. This theory is a mere abstraction, an assumption incapable of proof, and is contrary to the genius and practise of the Government. Every people or nation most certainly limit or abridge their own powers, when they form a Constitution at all, and certainly, when attempting to alter or amend it, the people cannot possess as great power as originally, when without a Constitution. The fundamental principles of a Constitution, we hold, are unalterable, except, after a convention, the people instruct their delegates to alter or change. The people and their delegates are bound by their Constitution until altered according to law. Hence the almost uniform custom of the Conventions of the States, to submit all fundamental changes to the ratification or rejection of the people. This fact, custom or law, itself, explodes the idea of the independence and plenary character of the powers of a Convention. In the early history of State Conventions in the United States, it was the almost universal custom of Conventions, in framing the ordinances to submit their work to the people, to make the caption read thus: "Amendments or changes in the Constitution, proposed by a Convention held at such a time, to be ratified or rejected by the people," showing that what was done, even by a restricted Convention, could not be regarded as the organic law of the land, until ratified by the people. So true is it that "power is always stealing from the many to the few," it is more than questionable, whether any Convention should be unrestricted. An open, unrestricted Convention of the people is the most dangerous body which can assemble in this Republic.

Mr. Moore claims that the late State Convention was open and plenary powers, was unrestricted in its acts, and was not dictated to or limited by the President. He quotes the following language from the proclamation of the President to prove his assumption:

"Therefore, "as President of the United States and Commander-in-Chief of the army and navy of the United States," he appointed "William W. Holden Provisional Governor of the State of North Carolina, whose duty it shall be, at the earliest practicable period, to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for convening a Convention, composed of delegates to be chosen by that portion of the people of said State who are loyal to the United States, and no others, *for the purpose of altering and amending the Constitution thereof, and with authority to exercise within the limits of said State all the power necessary and proper to enable such loyal people of the State of North Carolina to restore said State to its Constitutional relations to the Federal government, as will entitle the State to the guarantee to protection by the United States thereof, and its people to protection by the United States against invasion, insurrection and domestic violence:* Provided, That, in any election that may be hereafter held for choosing delegates to any State Convention, as aforesaid, no person shall be qualified as an elector, or shall be eligible as a member of such Convention, unless he shall have previously taken and subscribed to the oath of amnesty as set forth in the President's proclamation of May 29th., 1866, and is a voter qualified as prescribed by the Constitution and laws of the State of North Carolina in force immediately before the 9th. day of January, 1861, the date of the so-called ordinance of secession; and said Convention when convened, or the Legislature that may be thereafter assembled, will prescribe the qualifications of electors and the eligibility of persons to hold office under the Constitution and laws of the State—a power the people of the several States composing the Federal Union have rightfully exercised from the origin of the government to the present time."

The italics in the above are our own, and are designed to direct the attention of the reader to what we deem to be the restrictions under which the late Convention met. The President had no express *right* to call a State Convention, and his entire language shows that he did not intend to assume such a right. As the Executive authority of the United States, in attempting to enforce and execute the Constitution, he found himself necessarily holding the States under military or martial law or rule. The people of the State could not, in that condition, call a Convention or exercise any civil functions. The power of the President to hold the States under military rule was for a specific object and temporary. He, therefore, designed by what he did, to suspend military rule in so far as was necessary to enable the States to resume their civil functions by the will and in the exercise of the rights of the people, by electing a Convention. The call of a Convention, simply, cannot impart validity to it. It is the election by the people, that gives it authority.

The election of the Convention was submitted to the people of North Carolina. The objects of the Convention, its design and only design, were expressed both in the proclamations of the President and of the Provisional Governor, to be, "for the purpose of altering and amending the Constitution thereof." In what respects and in what particulars? Why, during the revolution, the Constitution, which the President recognized to be still in existence, was so marred by amendments conflicting with and hostile to the Constitution of the United States and its laws, that, so long as these remained, he could not execute the national authority or the civil law without friction. The Convention, therefore, was to have power to alter and amend the State Constitution in these respects, and further, it was to have "authority to exercise within the limits of said State all the power necessary and proper to enable such loyal people of the State of North Carolina to restore said State to its constitutional relations to the Federal government as will entitle the State to the guarantee of the United States therefor," &c. Was there ever a Convention called before with more specific and precise limitations? Can any one point out an instance in the history of the country, in which the duties and powers of a Convention were more specifically defined? The sole object of the Convention and the sole power conferred upon it, was "*to restore the State to its Constitutional relations to the Federal government.*" Nothing more, nothing less. These matters were all presented and discussed before the people. No new amendments, except those relating to the restoration of the State to her Federal relations, were named or discussed. The people understood the object, the one purpose of the Convention, and endorsed and ratified it by the election of delegates to the Convention, conferring upon it all the power to do that thing and no more! Nothing can be plainer.

Mr. Moore twits those who favored the action of the Convention of 1861, but who object to the action of the Convention of 1865-6. The two bodies were entirely dissimilar as to their powers. The Convention of 1861 was called without restrictions and without even the purpose for which it was called being named, and the people endorsed and ratified the call by the election. We have seen that the Convention of 1865-'6 was quite a different one.

The reader cannot fail, after reading the general principles we have laid down, to follow out the argument. If he do, we think he cannot fail to arrive at our conclusion: that the call and election of the late State Convention were legitimate and proper; that its powers were limited to those acts "necessary and proper to restore the State to its constitutional relations to the Federal government;" that its powers ceased, when it had performed those "necessary and proper" acts; and that all its acts besides were unauthorized. But though grounded in this belief, it must be observed, that its unauthorized acts are not annulled by the late rejection of the Constitution by the people. Thank Heaven! there is no authorized surrender of the Constitution and the laws, yet, in the State and in the United States. To that arbitration all acts claiming to be organic or statutory law must be referred, and that arbiter is the Supreme Court.

If it be admitted, that the Convention was legitimate and limited, it does not follow that all its acts are valid or strictly legal. Only such acts as come within its charter of powers can be regarded as strictly legal, yet acts originating in high public policy and necessary to the peace and quiet of the nation may be held by the Courts as valid, on account of the reason and necessity of the maintenance of the public peace and the general welfare.

The Late New Orleans Riot.

We have hitherto forborne much reference to the recent bloody disturbances in New Orleans, for the reason that, amid the mass of conflicting and contradictory evidence relating to them, we found it almost impossible to eliminate the exact truth. We felt perfectly satisfied in our own minds, from what had transpired as to the designs of the Congressional Jacobins, as exhibited in their caucus, and from the revolutionary convocation of the extinct and spurious Louisiana Convention, that all the guilt of the blood shed upon the occasion rested upon the heads of the Radical malignants and anarchists. We publish, to-day, from the New Orleans *Picayune*, a clear, succinct and calm statement of the whole case, which confirms our belief and places the responsibility where it legitimately belongs.

The startling fact cannot be longer disguised that it is the policy and purpose of these bad men to foment and encourage similar outbreaks elsewhere thoughout the South, in order to intensify sectional and local bitterness, and afford them plausible pretext for their fiendish schemes of oppression and ruin. If their nefarious counsels are not rebuked by the sober and patriotic voice of the conservative masses, there is no pourtraying the horors which await the country. If unchecked, they will culminate in making the North the theatre of lawlessness and civil strife and the South the scene of another St. Domingo. Every movement of sympathy with them in our own midst, by disappointed and revengeful Southern men, abetted and stimulated *by Radical emissaries sent from the North to stir up the dying embers of passion*, aids the unholy work. Every imputation, by Southern-born men, upon the loyalty of their fellow-citizens is calculated, and, we honestly believe, intended to strengthen the purposes of the Radical blood-hounds and egg them on in their pitiless course.

Thank Heaven! there are but few such men in the South, but these few are dangerous and can do, as they have done, and are doing, incalculable mischief. They are impotent and possessed of no influence at home, but the effect of their course at the North may be ruinous to us in the extreme. If Radical counsels, with their incidents of confiscation, disfranchisement and negro suffrage ultimately prevail, our homes and fields will be blasted by the fires of persecution and ruin, and our fair land, just beginning to emerge from the blackness of war and to assume some of its ancient beauty, will be made uninhabitable for a proud and self-respecting people. But what boots all this to those who have already forfeited the esteem of those among whom they live? What are these horrors, compared with the gratification of their hate, and an unfettered monopoly of office and public plunder!

But *apropos* to the New Orleans riots, we invite attention to the following imperfectly reported extract from the speech of President Johnson at St. Louis, a few days since. It will be seen that, with all the emphasis and solemnity attaching to his official position, he declares that every drop of blood that was shed there is upon the skirts of Radicalism. Hear him:

While speaking to the citizens, the President was interrupted by the cry of "New Orleans" from some persons in the crowd; whereupon he said:

"Perhaps if you had a word or two on the subject of New Orleans, you might understand more about it than you do. (Laughter and cheers.) And if you will go back and ascertain the cause of the riot at New Orleans, perhaps you will not be so prompt in calling out "New Orleans." If you take up the riot at New Orleans and trace it back to its source, or to its immediate cause, you will find out who was responsible for the blood that was shed there. If you will take up the riot at New Orleans and trace it back to the Radical Congress, (great cheering and cries of "Bully,") you will find that the riot at New Orleans was substantially planned. If you will take the proceedings in their caucus, you will understand that they knew (cheers) that a Convention was to be called which was extinct, and that the intention was to organize a new government to enfranchise one portion of the population called the colored population, who had just been emancipated, and at the same time disfranchise white men. (Great cheers.) When you design to talk about New Orleans, (confusion) you ought to understand what you are talking about.

When you read the speeches that were made, or take up the facts on Friday and Saturday before that convention sat, you will find that speeches were made incendiary in their character, and exciting that portion of the population—the black population—to arm themselves and prepare for the shedding of blood. (A voice, "That's so," and cheers.) You will also find that that convention did assemble in violation of law, and the intention of that convention was to supercede the recognized authorities in the State government of Louisiana, which had been recognized by the government of the United States; and every man engaged in that rebellion, in that convention, with the intention of superceding and upturning the civil government, which had been recognized by the government of the United States I say that he was a traitor to the constitution of the United States, (cheers) and hence you find that another rebellion was commenced, having its origin in the Radical Congress. These men were to go there, a government was to be organized, and the one in existence in Louisiana was to be suspended, laid aside and overthrown. You say you talk to me about New Orleans—and then the question was to come up, when they had established their government—a question of political powers—which of the governments was to be recognized. A new government, inaugurated under this defunct convention, set up in violation of law and without the will of the people. Then when they had established their government and extended universal or impartial franchise, as they called it, to this colored population—then the radical Congress was to determine that a government established on negro votes was to be the government of Louisiana. (Voices: "Never," and cheers, and "Hurrah for Andy.")

So much for the New Orleans riot; and there was the cause and the origin of the blood that was shed, and every drop of blood that was shed is upon their skirts, and they are responsible for it. (Cheers.) I could test this thing a little closer, but will not do it here to-night."

In St. Louis the wife of a sick man could not pay for a prescription. The physician tore it up and the man died.

THE NEWBERN RADICALS, AGAIN.—President Thomas was unfortunate in his appointment of delegates to the Raleigh Radical Convention. He had better try again. We mentioned the names of three gentlemen, on yesterday, who repudiated any connection or sympathy with the Newbern *fuss*. The last *Commercial* is authorized to speak for a fourth,—a prominent merchant, Mr. Sydney Tuttle, who avows himself an unconditional Johnson man.

Mayor Jno. N. Washington writes an admirable letter to the Newbern *Times*, in the course of which he says:

"If I understand the object of that convention, it is to bring out candidates in opposition to the policy of the President of the United States, and the present able and acceptable Governor of this State. I know of nothing in my intercourse with my fellow-citizens of this city, (and it has been particularly free and candid with a large number of those who composed that meeting) that could for a moment justify them in supposing that I could, under any circumstances, affiliate with those who seem to have banded together for the purpose of undermining the only foundation upon which I conceive any rational hope for the future can be based."

Judging from the Newbern abortion, the Raleigh Convention will prove an ill-gotten, mis-shaped affair. We wonder if *Tourgee* will be here.

LIKE ANOTHER savage, Thad. Stevens has painted his great ugly body, and appears once more "upon the war-path." Last Tuesday, at Bedford, Pa., he delivered a speech replete with his habitual expressions of cordial ill-will and ferocity towards the South. This speech is not remarkable for anything particular, but it contains the assertion that "old Thad" will be more savage next session than ever, and will urge his ferocious designs more persistently. We are glad to perceive, however, that his fierceness is tempered with apprehensions of failure in carrying the fall elections.

BISHOP SOULE.—The *Christian Advocate* for last week has an interesting account of a recent visit to Bishop Soule, at his residence, seven miles east of Nashville:

"On Wednesday last the Bishop was eighty-five years of age, having been born in the State of Massachusetts, in the District—now the State—of Maine, August 1, 1781. The aged minister of the Gospel received his visitors with his accustomed courtesy and cordiality, seeming to be much pleased that his birthday had been remembered. He is very feeble, but cheerful and kind and communicative—a fine specimen of 'narrative old age,' without the boring garrulity which so frequently characterizes second childhood. His memory of things long since passed is surprisingly accurate. In the course of the conversation he quoted, *ad punctum*, long passages from Addison's *Cato* and Pope's *Homer*, ever a great favorite with him. He called up many reminiscences of his early ministry, and spoke of his old contemporaries who have all passed off the stage of action, leaving him, as it were, alone—the oldest Methodist minister in the world."

Meeting of the Governors—Is There Not Revolution Ahead?

[From the New York Herald of Saturday.]

The secret conclave of the Radical Governors of the Northern States in Philadelphia, after the adjournment of the Convention on Tuesday last, is one of the most significant and alarming signs of the times. A portion of the proceedings leaked out, and the correspondent of the *Herald* gave the public the benefit of that on Wednesday last. But we have the strongest reasons for saying that the question then ventilated about dodging negro suffrage was not the only or most important one discussed by this conclave. It is understood that a revolutionary programme was entertained looking to future political contingencies—that is, to prepare arms and efficient armed State organizations for a conflict with the Conservatives, and possibly with the President, in the event of the Radicals being in danger of losing their power through the result of the fall elections. It is evident that these really dangerous leaders of a dangerous party are determined to hold on to their power at all hazards; for, as Governor Cony, of Maine, said, if they lose it now "then all is lost." They are doubtless prepared to impeach and remove the President and to place Ben Wade or some other violent Jacobin in his place, and would resist the legitimate power of the Executive to the extent of calling out the militia of the States.

Eleven Governors of States, besides ex-Governors and Lieutenant-Governors, composed this new secret Jacobin club. The violent declamations of the miserable firebrands, male and female, black and white, in the Convention and at public meetings in Philadelphia, might not be regarded as very serious; but it is far different with the secret meeting of a body of men who have the executive power of eleven Northern States in their hands.

There is danger ahead, and it behooves the Conservative masses of the North to look to it. As to the South, there is no danger there. The people of that section have experienced the horrors of civil war to such a degree and are so thoroughly subdued that they will not try rebellion again. The danger is at home. We may have, before we are aware of it, a bloody civil war in every State, county and city of the North.

"WHAT IS THIS MYSTERY."—The correspondent of a Fredericksburg paper states that the remains of a woman, with long black hair, have been found concealed near the road leading from Fredericksburg to Alexandria at the point where the road crosses Acquia Run. The body had been partially devoured by hogs. A linen handkerchief on the neck of deceased was marked "S. K." Last May a man, woman and a child about three years old, who stated they were from Goldsboro, North Carolina, and on their way to Alexandria, encamped near this place. It is now believed that the man, who was a rough looking customer, murdered the woman and child and buried them. So says the aforesaid correspondent.

MAY FORREST.—During the war, and while the Federals occupied Memphis and were overrunning Tennessee, some of Gen. Forrest's men found a little girl in the woods, who was too young to tell her name, or the residence of her parents. They tenderly cared for her and nursed her with a mother's devotion until a suitable opportunity was presented, when they carried her to Memphis, and confided her to the kind Agnes Convent. The little creature was found in the forest by Forrest's men in the month of May, and the Lady Superior has named her May Forrest.—*Jackson, Miss., Clarion.*

The mahogany colored fop of New York have opened an legant banking house. All the officers are full-blooded offspring of African ancestors.

General Sheridan's Dispatches.

[From the New Orleans Picayune.]

It will be seen, by our dispatches from Washington, that General Sheridan was swift to bear witness against the city authorities in the matter of the July riots. He was absent when they occurred, and returned on the 1st. instant, the second day after. The day previous to his return, General Baird had appointed a commission of investigation. The grand jury of the parish had already taken up the subject, and the State officers, Attorney General Herron, and Lieutenant Governor Voorhies, were occupied by taking testimony as to the facts. While these things were going on, with a view to inquiry, General Sheridan makes haste to decide and condemn. On the 2nd of August, these investigations pending, he hurriedly forwarded to Washington a hot denunciation of the city authorities *en masse*. The Mayor and police had conspired to perpetrate a useless massacre!—Such is the harsh judgment pronounced within twenty-four hours after reaching the spot, and when he could not possibly have had any proofs of the facts he assumes, more than the confused and excited stories brought to his ears by a class of men who had their own misdeeds to excuse by covering others with obloquy.

If there be anything clearly established beyond the possibility of doubt, it is that the military authorities, who represented General Sheridan in his absence, might have averted the catastrophe of that day if they had observed the understanding with these calumniated city authorities, and held the troops ready where they were expected to be to preserve order. The main, it would hardly be unjust to say the sole, responsibility for the breaking out of the disorders, lies on this military tardiness. It has been unfortunate for the correctness of General Sheridan's judgment, that the chief sources of information, on which his violent conclusion was so suddenly adopted, must have been the very persons who had their own delinquencies to cover, and the most direct interest in criminating others. All the testimony which has come to light since General Sheridan wrote that despatch comes inevitably to those conclusions.—What may have been obtained afterwards, in the secret investigations of the military commissions, we, of course, cannot tell. We have some experiences that do not strengthen our expectations of candid investigations by bodies of which the general character, as described by a prominent Republican member of Congress, is, that they are "organized to convict." But we must insist, that with the scanty means for authentic information which General Sheridan had on the 2d, he displayed more of the temper of a judge-advocate of a commission so organized than the patient pursuit of truth, which becomes a man clothed with the transcendent powers he wielded. *Festinat audit qui dolet* was the classic description of the judge who sat on the bench in that place beyond the Styx, to which Thaddeus Stevens is in the habit of consigning the Southern people for judgment and execution—the execution coming first. "*He punishes and then he hears.*" The homelier English saying calls it "Jedwood justice—hang first, and try afterwards."

It is a good sign that the precipitate judgements of General Sheridan were not received at Washington as conclusive. On the 3d, after this dispatch got to Washington, instructions were sent out granting to General Sheridan, on those representations, the extraordinary powers he has since used, at the same time directing him to lose no time in investigating the facts. The same was repeated on the 7th. They were not so fast and fiery at Washington to condemn without a hearing and without evidence. They are happily in a position to examine the testimony which General Sheridan did not have, and are freed from the influences which misled him, and from that unfriendly bias of temper of his which assigns to petty local matters such an exaggerated consequence.

For example, the appointments on the police are the staple complaint of the Radical convention-fillers' faction here, as the proof of a subsisting spirit of rebellion, and as indicating a disloyal purpose in the appointing power. General Sheridan takes up the talk and gives it a consequence, without which it might pass as the mere gabble of party discontent with office-holders. It is not that bad appointments may not have been made, for there are many which do not give satisfaction. Men of bad repute have been taken into the employ of the police; we wish they were fewer. But to allege that vaguely, and to make much of the employment of ex-confederates as proof of disloyal purposes or conspiracy against government or individuals is grossly unjust. We should like Gen. Sheridan to explain when it has happened, where he learned anything of the police system, that men of exemplary lives and of experiences entirely virtuous are selected as the only men fit to be entrusted with the duty of tracking and arresting rogues. Are the favorite detectives of New York the models of innocent ignorance of the world's wicked ways? Or did he, when he wanted a soldier as a spy, require a certificate of his moral character from the parson of his parish? The use of men not so very nice in their record is part of the police system everywhere, and is, in fact, a necessity; as much so as for a General to pick out the sharpest rogue when he wants to find out an enemy's secret.—The police of New Orleans was not different in that respect from the police of other cities.—The only difference fit to be entertained is whether it is more or less so in degree, and more or less necessarily so. But to prove that any excess, if there be one, is chargeable to the design of the appointing power, and proof of a corrupt and dangerous conspiracy, something in the nature of facts must be alleged and proved. It must be shown that something has been done by the force, while under the direction of the appointing power, which proves a design in these particular appointments. It will not do to charge that bad acts committed by such individuals are proofs that they were selected for that purpose; much less can it fairly be said, as General Sheridan says in substance, that because there were men on the police with whose political antecedents he is not pleased, and men of whose morals a great deal unfavorable has been said, therefore these men were capable of the great crime of which he accuses them, therefore they committed it, and therefore the Mayor and the civil authorities appointed them for the purpose.

This is the entire logic of General Sheridan's attack upon the police, with the grave, additional fact that he has not been able to establish, by any testimony the people of New Orleans have ever seen, that any member of the police was active in what he charges to have been an "absolute massacre by the police." It might be possible to be shown, but it never has been done, that after the firing became promiscuous, and the general disorder commenced, some member of the police fired and struck unnecessarily. We think it likely to be true; for it was a wild scene for an hour, in which hot passions got the mastery. The proof has not, however, been forthcoming. But it is in proof, and it is notorious, that the great body of police engaged acted with great energy for the protection of all parties who were unarmed, and made numerous arrests of all the rioters, within their reach. The prominent Conventionists were taken into custody by this same police, and carried to places of safety, when they had to fight their way through the excitable populace which crowded the streets. Many of the police were badly bruised in their attempts to cover and protect these men from the attacks of that scum of the populace, which comes forth so wildly everywhere in times of riot to disappear when the riots are over. This obligation to the care of the police was acknowledged at first by nearly every Conventionist who was in the melee. When the first impulse of gratefulness subsided, they modified it by saying that while they owe their safety to the protection of the Chief of Police, they did not mean to include his subordinates; some of these behaved badly. The confession is universal that the Chief, Adams, and the great body of his force, worked incessantly to suppress disorder, and stop the killing. If there were exceptions to this fidelity, the proof has never been made, and the criminals have never been identified. What proof might have been got, it is now impossible to say, for the next morning the military emptied the prisons of all the police had arrested. But these facts, notorious as the sun light, disprove absolutely the charge to which General Sheridan has given the currency of his name, to redeem it from the oblivion to which it was hastening, that the police planned and executed the "massacre."

There is nothing in which the minds of nineteen-twentieths of the people of this city are more firmly made up, as incontestible facts, than the following:

1. That the immediate as well as the original cause of the disorder of that day was in the machinations of the men whom Gen. Sheridan himself denominates "bad men," to overthrow the State government by means that were violent and revolutionary.

2. That the excitement against them had nothing whatever to do with loyalty or rebellion, as understood under the issues of the late war. The conventionists were composed mainly of original secessionists and ex-rebels. Their strongest adversaries in the community are to be found among the uniform Unionists opposing a State insurrection as they had done State resistance to the laws of the United States.

3. That the city authorities contemplated only the processes of the law to avert the provocations to an outbreak, and were hindered by the announced purpose of the Commanding General of the United States to resist the civil authorities.

4. That when the disturbances, thus foreseen, were expected to commence, the city authorities had distributed the police in a manner least likely to promote disturbances, but ready to suppress it if it should arise, and relied on military co-operation, should there be a necessity.

5. The police did their part of the duty as well as it was possible, after losing the support they expected; they did subdue the riot before the military came on the field to take note of the sad effects of their tardiness.

These are a few of the reflections suggested by the appearance of the despatches of General Sheridan, which come upon our citizens with something of a shock of surprise, having expected something more just, not only to say magnanimous, from traits of character they thought belong to him. Much more might be said, and may be necessary to be said, in defence of an injured people and a just cause; but we shall not lack opportunities hereafter to speak of points for which we have no room to-day.

Among them we shall take great pleasure in noting General Sheridan's strong censure of the leaders of the Convention movement as "bad men," and the unconscious tribute he pays to the really conservative tone of the population of this city, when, after denouncing, as we think without sufficient cause, the Mayor and civil authorities of the city, he says the removal of the Mayor "would be hailed with the sincerest gratification by two-thirds of the population of the city."

We wonder whether it ever occurred to General Sheridan that he was furnishing very strong testimony of the soundness of the bulk of the population of New Orleans, when he tells the President that two thirds of them repudiate the course of conduct which he endeavors to fix upon the Mayor. The testimony will prove of greater weight when the President comes to know, also, that seven-eights of the population are more amused than alarmed at the bugaboo importance assigned in General Sheridan's visions to Mayor Monroe, as the imaginary head of a mythical conspiracy. They will fancy General Sheridan to have been, while indicting that dispatch, in the frame of mind of Hood's Dublin correspondent, who wrote in the time of an Irish riot, "I am writing this letter with a pistol in each hand and a sword in the other."
