

Powers of the Convention

THE SENTINEL.

Wednesday, September 23, 1866.

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

The discussion of this question, at this late period, can have little practical utility, yet it may afford instruction and correct erroneous views. The issues growing out of the acts of the Convention are mainly, if not wholly, judicial, and can only be decided by the Courts.—What we have to say, therefore, is designed to correct error in the public mind.

All our conclusions in regard to the rights of the States, the powers of the President or of the Congress, and indeed the multifarious questions growing out of the war, must be determined by an appeal to the Constitution of the United States, and the official interpretations of that instrument by the Supreme Court of the United States. Appeals to history, or the laws of nations, or the opinions of eminent lawyers, states or otherwise, may afford an interpretation of the instrument, but they settle nothing. The Constitution of the United States, and not the laws of nations, must determine all questions relating to the powers of the Federal government, the rights and powers of the States and the relations they assume to each other.

The contest both of principle and of arms through which we have passed, and which is still unsettled, must find its solution in the logic of facts and in the principles of the Constitution. Inasmuch as many of the questions are new and perplexing, it is therefore not surprising that there have been some errors. What President Johnson ought to have done, may be better determined now, than at the beginning. It is not to be presumed, that mental man could, at once, have looked through the entire of the tangled web which presented itself as the close of hostilities. The most able, the most wise and the most legitimate policy, could not have therefore been developed full upon the President's brain in the outset. Time, circumstances, the reason and the necessity of things, and a careful study of the great charter of his powers and duties, could alone make clear and perfect what was at first obscure and half formed. Certain we are, that President Johnson determined to do right, following his best judgment, and so far, with some abatement arising from the peculiar difficulties of his position, he has done admirably well. Let us, therefore, briefly examine the points in controversy, touching the powers of the Federal government, the rights of the States, the powers of the President and the powers of the late State Convention.

First, as to the rights and powers of the Federal and State governments and of the President. Our appeal in this investigation, as before stated, must be to the Constitution of the United States and to the official interpretations of that instrument by the Supreme Court,—the final legal arbiter. Originally, all supreme authority was lodged with the people of the States. We do not say absolute power, because that only belongs to God. For mutual protection and benefit, a compact was formed by the articles of confederation, but the powers granted to the compact were inadequate to the purpose of the Union. The people of the States, therefore, abandoning the idea, as we humbly think, of a compact, alliance, or league, and forming the necessity of a "more perfect Union," formed a government, (evidently designed by its character to be perpetual,) incorporated under the designation of the "Constitution of the United States." This instrument defined the powers of the Federal Government, the people of the States surrendering all their previously held powers and rights deemed necessary to the formation of this "more perfect Union," reserving all powers not granted, to themselves. Completed and now as this experiment was, the principles of the Constitution, if adhered to and properly understood, were simple to effect the object, through all time. It was the best government in the world. But alas! corruption, gradual encroachments upon the rights of the States, and fanatical, have well nigh raised the fabric constructed by our fathers.

The conspiracy which sprung up, which culminated in an appeal to arms, was first a contest of parties and sections, in which the National government was not a party. Angry feelings and bitter hostility, purely sectional, might have still existed, until cooled down by age and sober reflection, but for the untoward events which followed. At this crisis, the supposed powers of the Federal and State governments came in conflict.

We do not find in the Constitution, in so many words, either the right claimed for the States to secede at will, or the rights of the Federal government to coerce a State. But we do find, what soon came to pass, the right given by the States to the Federal authority, to assume the Constitution and the laws made in conformity thereto, with power to compel and enforce obedience to them. If the right of a State to secede as will be admitted, then it follows, that the right claimed for the Federal authority to force a State to secede cannot exist in any form. But the Federal authority did not admit the right of a State to secede, hence the acts of secession were acts of rebellion and of war against the Federal authority, preventing the execution of the Constitution of the United States and the laws, within their limits. The President, clothed with the Executive authority of the Federal Government both in civil and military matters, as a sworn officer, to execute the laws and the Constitution, had a plain duty before him at this crisis. Finding his civil power inadequate to execute the law, he called for troops to enforce the law. He had no power, in his opinion, and it is to be maintained, that in all positions, and in all the anterior Congress, and in the interview of Mr. Lincoln with the Confederate commissioners at Fort Sumner, no higher claim was set up. The powers claimed for the President or the Congress of the Federal authority, and conceded by some, as a consequence of the States, or their secession, with power to demand conditions of surrender

and restoration, were never claimed officially by the Federal authority, and certainly have not a shadow of warrant in the Constitution. The right is a simple one and extends no further than the right with full power to execute the Constitution and laws of the United States within the limits of the States. And here, the power terminates.

The resistance of the States or people of the States to the execution of the Constitution and the laws having been suppressed or overcome, the Federal authority, in re-adjusting and reconciling the difficulty, extends no further than those acts necessary to the adjustment of the machinery of the Federal and State governments, in order to harmony in the execution of the laws. The results of the war conferred no new powers either upon the President, or the Congress or the entirety of the Federal government. We are not talking of what the President or the Congress or the army did during the war and after, but we are enquiring as to what they had the right to do, under the Constitution. We repeat, it was simply, from first to last, the power to execute the Constitution and the laws of the United States. Hence, when hostilities ceased, what was the duty of the President? To restore or reconstruct the States or the Union? Certainly not. The Union had not been dissolved, nor were the States broken up. But the people of the States in their alienation and refractory course towards the Federal government, both in the exercise of legislative and executive powers, had adopted such organic changes in their Constitutions and laws as still prevented the execution of the Constitution and laws of the United States. The States themselves could not consent to rejoin, nor by any act, except by force of arms, destroy the Union.—Whatever of legal or moral guilt had been incurred, attached to the people and not to the States, and it may well be questioned, if the States themselves were not tainted, as the President admits, whether any taint could attach to the official acts of their officers. Whatever of guilt was personal, and its character must be determined by the Courts alone, in full view of the law, the motives and the circumstances.

The suppression of the armed resistance of the States to the authority of the United States suspended temporarily the functions of the civil governments of the resisting States, and necessarily subjected them to the control of military authority. As soon as the resistance to the National authority ceased, there was no power under the Constitution in the President or any other branch of the government to hold the States under military rule. The only legitimate object of the war being the restoration of the National authority and the enforcement of its laws, as soon as the refractory States were in a condition to exercise civil functions and bear their part manfully in the machinery of the government, the President or the National government could no longer, under the Constitution, exercise military authority in those States, without their consent.

The question then arises, by what legitimate method was this to be effected? It strikes us that there were three methods by which this might be done. Let it first be premised, that when the President says, in his proclamation, that the rebellion "has in its revolutionary progress deprived the people of the State of North Carolina of all civil government," he certainly meant to say simply, that the functions of the civil governments of the States had been suspended and superseded by the military authority, and not that the governments of the States were defunct or annihilated. And further, when he says, "it becomes necessary and proper to carry out and enforce the obligation of the United States to the people of North Carolina in securing the enjoyment of a republican form of government," he certainly does not mean to say that North Carolina was at that time without a Constitution and without a Republican form of government. By no means. But in order to assure the people of North Carolina of his purpose to abide them of no rights or privileges pledged to them by the Constitution, but strictly to hold the Federal government to the full discharge of its guarantee to the States, he would so suspend the operation of martial law as to enable the people of North Carolina themselves to carry out and exercise the functions of the Republican form of government they already had, so that they might after or amend what had been done by them during their revolutionary state, and so conform it to the Constitution of the United States so as to enable the National Executive to execute the Constitution and laws of the United States within its limits. It will be seen, taking the idea all along, that the sole legitimate object of the National government, in taking up arms, in prosecuting the war, and in reinstating the civil governments of the States, was not conquest, not subjugation or the reduction of the States to the condition of conquered provinces, but simply to restore the National authority in order to the full execution of the Constitution and laws. The entire action of the government, so far as it strictly concerned this idea, was perfectly consistent and in accordance with the Constitution.

We are not speaking of the manner in which the war was conducted, or of the extraordinary and unconstitutional acts of the Executive, the Congress or the army pending the war; but we are showing what was legitimate and entirely within the powers of the President at the still and military Executive chief.

We have said there were three methods by which the States might resume their functions legitimately, provided all of them agreed with the views and will of the Executive, who then held them temporarily under martial or military rule. First, he might have allowed the return of the recent officers of the States to the exercise of their functions, (the regular call, and a meeting of the Legislature and the call of a regular Convention of the people according to the forms of the State Constitutions. It is enough to say that this method did not meet the views of the President, or as a safe and certain one to effect the object of the restoration of the national authority. Secondly, admitting his

right to hold the States temporarily under military rule, which none can deny, he might have so far empowered that rule as to allow the people to meet and elect a new Legislature, which might have called a Convention in due form. Or, thirdly, he might have it was legitimate for him to act as he did, to suspend martial law, so as to allow the people to elect a Convention de novo. His proclamation was both authoritative and permissive,—requiring the people to act under prescribed conditions and then leaving them free to act, subject to certain limitations. It may be said that the conditions imposed, prohibiting certain classes from taking part in the election of the Convention, violated the existing Constitution of the State and vitiated the legitimacy of the Convention itself. It may be that the Courts might differ with the President as to the guilt or innocence of the exempted classes, but there was no time to wait for the decision of the Courts. His right to hold the States under military rule was only temporary, and the peace and safety of the Republic demanded an early restoration of the national authority in its civil functions over the entire States; hence an imperious political and moral necessity obliged him to act pro-tem.—Hence we conclude, that the authority to authorize the people, in whom he could confide, to act, and to permit the election and assembling of the Convention, was legitimately and properly exercised, granting to the President the liberty to act upon his best judgment, in the absence of any specific directory or any established rules laid down by the Courts or the Constitution for his guidance in the premises. We dissent, as foreign to the question, all claims set up for the President as a conqueror of the States, or their liability to subjugation as conquered provinces or territories, or the claims set up by the Congress to prescribe terms of restoration or conditions of rehabilitation. None of these ideas properly enter into this question, or have anything to do with the case. The sole authority of the Federal Government in raising troops, levy a war and suppress the rebellion of the States, lies in the power expressly given in the Constitution to enforce obedience to the National authority in the execution of the Constitution and the laws.—The claim set up by Congress, of its right to impose new conditions of restoration and reconstruction, or to hold the States indefinitely under military rule, or to reduce them to a territorial condition, is no where found in the Constitution of the United States and palpably violates the guarantee made to the States in the Constitution, to preserve to them, under all circumstances, "a Republican form of government."

We, therefore, conclude with Mr. Moore, that the act of the President in calling a Convention and in granting the people the liberty to elect a Convention to reinstate the National authority in North Carolina, was legitimate, and right and proper in the nature and reason of things.—We dissent with him, as to the powers of the Convention. That point we must leave to another day.

To those, the Ohio Abolitionists, who had the unblushing impudence to profess to represent North Carolina, in part, in what Mr. Holden calls "the legal Convention" in Philadelphia, made a speech, indeed he appears to have been the spokesman of the Delegation, and to have entirely obscured such lesser lights as Giddings, Hon. A. H. Jones, and others. From a sketch of this dirty fellow's remarks in the New York Herald, we extract the following:—"I was told by a Quaker in North Carolina, as I was coming here, that he had seen the bodies of fifteen murdered negroes taken from one pond. Seven hundred loyal men had petitioned President Johnson for redress from the rebel oppressions, and the petition was referred back to the disloyal Governor of that State, and never came back to the authorities."

Of course all this is a falsehood manufactured out of the whole cloth. Who was the Quaker that told that marvellous story? Give us his name, *Toussaint*. The statement relates to Gen. Worth's infamous invention, and *Toussaint* knew that he was lying when he uttered it. But *Paul Douglas*, *Anna Dickinson*, *Emilium Brownlow*, and the New Orleans *Standard*, recanted it all as gospel truth, well warrant, and that was all that *Toussaint* wanted.

"There are now, in this State, about eighty thousand voters. We fear that thirty thousand of those are 'unmistakably loyal' and 'loyal' Union men; and that twenty thousand more of them, though not as cordial in their feelings towards the Union and the Northern people as the thirty thousand referred to, are nevertheless not newly disposed, but anxious to see the Union restored."—*Standard*, Sept. 8.

In January last, standing under the defeat of the E.-P. O., the *Standard* said:—"If Gen. Holden is not Governor by the vote of the people, it is because a majority of our people are so situated, as they should be, in spirit and truth, to the Federal Union."

We are glad to see that the *Standard* now thinks that there are 30,000 of our people who are loyal. But how many of that number will be disfranchised, if the Howard amendment, which Mr. Holden used the Legislature in sanction in advance of Congress, is adopted? We can tell our dear and dear one thing: of that 30,000, if they all go to the polls, 10,000 will vote for Jonathan Worth for Governor!

The *Standard* also in Newbern publishes the list of delegates appointed by the Chairman of the late meeting in that town in the Convention which is to assemble here on the 20th. As we expected, the majority of them are Yankee adventurers and Northern Radicals. We agree with Mr. Ridgway, however. A Northern Radical is a far more respectable character than a domestic Jacobin.

Two distinguished citizens of Memphis, Hon. Landon C. Haynes, ex-Confederate Senator from Tennessee, and Gen. Marcus J. Wright, formerly of the Army of Tennessee, have been pardoned by the President.

The Epistle Convention.
This important convocation, as announced in our Secretary's telegram, adjourned on Friday evening.

The address to the people of the United States, prepared by the Committee, has been published. We have no idea of inflicting it upon our readers. It declares that the President's policy everywhere South of Mason and Dixon's line has wrought the most deplorable consequences, socially, morally and politically. It recounts a long series of wrongs, persecutions and outrages received by Union men at the hands of "rebels," and charges the President with the specific acts tending to restore them to power and endanger the lives and liberties of Union men in the South. It calls the President an "infamous traitor," the reckless man in the Presidential chair, who adds credence to the charges and who yields willing obedience to the "rebels," the "traitors" of the South. It charges with complicity in the crime of the Convention at the ballot box, and the belief that when the States were at the South are warned by the Northern elections that the power that conquered the rebellion is still alive, the freedom will be proffered the right of franchise.

The character and quality of the resolutions reported and adopted will appear from the following, which we select:—

1. Resolved, That the unhappy policy pursued by Andrew Johnson, President of the United States, in its effects upon the loyal people of the South, is unjust, oppressive and intolerant; and accordingly, however ardently we desire to see our respective States once more represented in the Congress of the nation, we would deplore their restoration on the inadequate conditions prescribed by the President, as tending not to abate, but only to magnify the perils and sorrows of our condition.

2. Resolved, That the political power of the Government of the United States in the administration of public affairs is by its Constitution confided to the popular or law-making department of the Government.

3. Resolved, That the political status of the States lately by rebellion to the United States Government and the rights of the people of such States are political questions, and are, therefore, clearly within the control of Congress, to the exclusion of the independent action of any and every other department of the Government.

4. Resolved, That there is no right, political, legal or constitutional, in any State to secede or withdraw from the Union; but they may, by wicked and unauthorised revolution, and force, sever the relations which they have sustained to the Union; and when they do, and assume the attitude of public enemies at war with the United States, they subject themselves to all the rules and principles of international law and the laws of war applicable to belligerents, according to modern usage.

5. Resolved, That the organizations in the unrepresented States assuming to be State governments, not having been legally established, are not legitimate governments until recognized by Congress.

This address and these resolutions not being considered sufficiently emphatic in favor of national suffrage by the "rebels" of the Brownlow and Hamilton stripes, the border States withdrew in disgust, leaving the Convention in the hands of the "Southern loyalists," proper, who also adopted resolutions and an address, talking grand unreservedly in favor of the enforcement of their constituents, — the negroes. The following proceedings were had thereupon:—"Mr. Warmouth then read the address prepared by the Committee of the Non-reconstructed States."

Several portions of the address were applauded, and at one point groans for Andrew Johnson were called for and given. The paragraph in reference to impartial suffrage was cheered very enthusiastically.

Mr. Goodloe, of N. C., while sympathizing with the sufferings of the people, as detailed in the address, did not agree in the conclusion thereof; in other words, he was opposed to imposing negro suffrage on the South, particularly under the present Administration, as the result would be the opposite of that desired by the convention. He subsequently added, that he himself was in favor of negro suffrage.

Capt. Toussaint of M. C. spoke in opposition to his colleague's views and in favor of negro suffrage, saying that he had definite instructions from two thousand men in his State on that point.

While he was speaking, Fred. Douglass entered the hall, and was greeted with cheers and the clapping of hands.

Mr. Goodloe asked whether his colleague thought that even if he had impartial suffrage the negroes would be allowed, while Andrew Johnson was president, to go to the polls and vote.

Mr. Toussaint replied that they would be.

A delegate from the North would enforce the right. (Cheers.)

Mr. Bryant, of Ga., added that four millions of black men in the South would help. (Renewed cheers.)

Mr. Randolph, a negro delegate from Louisiana, as he sat in a seat in the convention, spoke in reference to negro suffrage. He called upon them to come up and "face the music," let the consequences be what they might. He appealed to them as the representatives of four millions of people to do their justice. If not, they would regret it; for when the time came that the negro did vote, they would be likely to remember their friends and not forget their foes. (Cheers.)

Parson Hummel of Virginia followed on the same side of the question.

After he had been speaking for some time, respecting personal matters in reference to the treatment he had received in Fredericksburg and Richmond, Mr. Fernandez, of Louisiana, rose and protested against the time of the convention being occupied in listening to a biography of the delegates from Virginia. The chair sustained the point of order.

Hummel resumed his remarks, but had again to be called to order on the same grounds. He then proceeded to advocate negro suffrage, and stated that the masses of Richmond had voted a party of 1000 to and his hat.

The Convention then adjourned, when Miss Dickinson delivered a speech, in which she begged and begged the delegates to support the cause of the colored man.

After the adjournment, Mr. Fernandez, who was one of the speakers, was seen to have a sword of Jesus Christ tucked up in his coat.

If it is not enough to disgust all decent people, then we have, indeed, fallen upon evil days.

The Diminution of a Race.
Humanity is threatened with a terrible calamity—the Yankee race is disappearing. By Yankee race, we mean the variety of the human kind which inhabits New England, and which many naturalists, among others the celebrated Agassiz, have minutely described. It is a race which we should give to other Americans, therefore, that we should give to them, and not merit under any head.

In short, the Yankee race is disappearing.—Last year we had already experienced some fears to-day, doubt is no longer permitted; we cannot disseminate that fearful truth. In July, 1865, the Secretary of State of Massachusetts published the annual statistics of the deaths and births, and we remarked with astonishment that an immense majority of new births was due to foreign parents. Such commentary upon the fact was published in that time, and we asked ourselves, if the children of the Yankee race, properly called, had diminished in such a alarming manner, or if the women of Massachusetts had voluntarily yielded to foreigners the care of populating the population.

Mr. Agassiz, who was just on the eve of departing for Brazil, was consulted. He replied that, indeed, the race did not appear to him any longer called with the same vigor as it had formerly imported from Europe. That the race was excessively elongated, and the pale, thin face was an unequivocal sign of that decline, but that moral or other immaterial causes influenced equally upon that declining discipline. Mr. Furtess, a Puritan minister, highly esteemed on account of his fanaticism, was also consulted. He replied by a citation from the Bible no blunter than modestly prevents us from reproducing it.

We waited with impatience for the statistics of this year, and were hoped they would give a tidings to those of last year. Vain hopes—no tidings too. The number of children born to the fathers of New England, which is far from being a constant. The official exhibit of births at Boston for the last year is published by the *Advertiser* of that city, and we find there the following passage:—"The table of births shows that the number of children born of parents natives of the United States is 1,306, making only 34 per cent. of the total of births.—This proportion is still less than that of last year, which was about 38 per cent. The number of children born of Irish parents in 1864 was about 40 per cent. In 1865 it has been 43 per cent. The total number of children born of parents, foreigners by birth, is considerable, &c., &c."

In other words, of 4,361 new births, 3,255 owe their life to foreign parents, and that in the capital of New England, the cradle of all that is excellent, the city which is offered as a model to the universe! Among the foreigners, the Irish are the most numerous, and equal by the most prolific. The consequences which must result from a like state of things cause us to shudder. In a generation or two Massachusetts, the land of protestant fanaticism, will be peopled by Catholics. In a generation or two, the Everett, the Adams, the Winthrop, the Somers will be supplanted by the O'Shaughnessys, the McGeehans, the McFoddis, the Brannagans, the O'Callaghans, &c.

Let it not be alleged that the apparent want of vitality on the part of the Bostonians proper is due to emigration; the population born upon the soil of Massachusetts is still as much as that born abroad. Where then is the mystery? Whence comes the fruitfulness of the European ladies? To what must we attribute the relative vitality of the New England ladies? Shall we blame the women, or must we accuse the men? How is it that the power of the will to engender is being lost by a people who believe themselves superior to all others? Grave questions, which we will not undertake to solve, and which agitate less, as we believe, to the province of the physiologists than to that of the moralist. For we have never heard it said that views of chastity are common in New England, but, judging from the scandalous law suits which arise, from those which are equal in their impudency,—from the customs which they illustrate, and from the abundance of a certain class of newspaper advertisements, we fear that it would not be difficult to divine the causes to which we must in a great measure attribute the present diminution of the Yankee population, not only in the cities, but, moreover, in the rural districts, where they are repressed by the Germans.

Happily the United States are not embraced in New England alone, and it is not in the Western, Southern or Central States that it will be necessary to found professorships of vitality. Massachusetts treats those States with all the intolerance of her pride, but better would it be if she were slave to the dangers which threaten her.

Mexico—Rumored Abdication of Maximilian.
Special Dispatch to the New York Times.
NEW ORLEANS, Sept. 6.—A private letter received here to-day from Monterey says that Maximilian abdicated in favor of Prince Napoleon on the 10th ultimo.

Latest by the Cable.
London, Sept. 16, P. M.
The Eastern question seems to be looking up in the future. Russia shows signs of coming out more to the public presence in the Danubian principalities, and probably eventually of Constantinople.

Vienna, Sept. 16, P. M.
An order has been issued by the Minister of War, that the Austrian recruits should attend the King and Princess of Prussia, the Duke of Baden, and nine others, shall come to be announced.

Liverpool, Sept. 16, P. M.
Readings from Providence, Sept. 16, P. M.

TELEGRAPHIC.
The President Invited to New Orleans.
NEW ORLEANS, Sept. 6, P. M.
A meeting of prominent citizens was held here to-day to invite the President to extend his visit to New Orleans.

Radical Meeting in Philadelphia.
PHILADELPHIA, Sept. 8.
A large meeting was held last night, in front of the Union League House, which was addressed by Carl Schurz, who reviewed the situation of affairs and the policy of the President.

The President in St. Louis—Affairs in Missouri.
ST. LOUIS, Sept. 9.
The President was received with great enthusiasm at Alton and in this City, to-day.—Speeches were made by himself and Secretary Seward.

By the Atlantic Cable.
HISARY'S CONVENT, Sept. 9.
The shore end of the cable of 1865 was safely landed here at 4 P. M. on yesterday.

The Maine Election.
PORTLAND, Sept. 10, P. M.
At 1 o'clock the Republican majority in this city was about 1,000. In 1864 and 1865, it was a trifle less than that in the city. The Republican canvass promised Lynch 2,100 in his district.—Portland is, so far, ahead of the canvass. Vote in the city high.

From Europe.—Per the Atlantic Cable.
BRUSSELS, Sept. 10.
The upper House of the Prussian Diet has passed the bill to indemnify the King for acting without the consent of the Diet in the matter of the budget and army supplies, previous to the war with Austria. The bill passed unanimously.

Florence, Sept. 10.
It is reported here that the King of Saxony has decided to resign in favor of his son.

St. Petersburg, Sept. 10.
It is said that the tribes of Dobruja have revolted against the authority of the Czar.

Florence, Sept. 10.
The Italian government has issued a decree which disbands 38,000 men of the Italian army. Austria has invited Italy to send plenipotentiaries to meet others appointed by Austria for the purpose of adopting measures for the improvement of telegraph and post intercourse between the two countries.

Athens, Sept. 9.
The Cretans have rejected the terms offered by the Turkish government and continue their revolt. The Epirots, inhabitants of Epirus, also claim their freedom from Turkey and have abandoned their habitations and taken to the hills.

LONDON, Sept. 10.
The Directors of the British California bank are urged to wind up the affairs of the institution. Earl Stanley is spoken of as the probable successor of Lord Cowley, as Ambassador to France.

Florence, Sept. 10.
The Conference between the plenipotentiaries of Austria and Italy progresses slowly. The financial question has not yet been settled.

Southern Markets.
NEW ORLEANS, Sept. 10, P. M.
Cotton unchanged. Sales of 650 bales of low middlings at 31 1/2 cts.
Gold 81 1/4. Bank sterling 83.
Mexican silver and Mexican army issues exist in the country, which are not traded by goldsmiths here.

Deaths from Cholera, yesterday, 29.

Montreal, Sept. 10, P. M.
Cotton sales, 16-day, 800 bales. Prices unchanged. Liverpool, 89.

The President in Indiana—Bleatous Proceedings of the Radicals.
INDIANAPOLIS, Sept. 11, M.
The President arrived here yesterday afternoon. Along the route from St. Louis, he was received with great enthusiasm, but before being introduced to the vast assembly here, there were signs of great disorder among the crowd. The confusion was so great, that the President suffered from the balcony of the hotel. Several disturbances occurred among the crowd, with lamentable results. Pistol shots were fired, and many killed and several wounded.

The crowd dispersed from before the hotel about 1 o'clock, at which time everything was quiet.

Disease of Surgeon-Gen. Barnes.
NEW YORK, Sept. 11, M.
A special in the Herald says that Surgeon-General Barnes is dangerously ill at Chicago, of congestive chills. Slight hopes only are entertained of his recovery.