

The Sentinel.

JOSIAH TURNER, Jr., Editor.
JOHN SPULVIN, Associate & Local Editor.

CONVENTION. Election First Thursday in August.

SATURDAY, APRIL 15, 1871.

CONVENTION.

The opinion of no man in the broad limits of the State carries with more weight than that of Hon. B. F. Moore, the acknowledged head and father of the bar in North Carolina. Mr. Moore is urged by his friends to give an opinion on the constitutionality of the bill calling a Convention. While that opinion is coming, we are glad to find them themselves, the safer would be their rights in person and property. When the federal government took to itself the entire protection of the individual citizen in the State in his person and property, there would be an entire change in our government system. These views are very wholesome, and we are glad to find them in a republican Senator's mouth.

(EXTRACT.)

Mr. Moore's examination:
Question by Mr. Bayard. Will you be called to the Convention to advise the Constitution of the State of North Carolina proposed to be called by the people of the State? Your opinion, as a jurist, is the act of the Legislature lately passed for that purpose constitutional and legal, why is it so? And is there any purpose to affect the liberties of the colored people by drawing distinctions between the races but now tolerated or to invade the franchises of the colored people? Answer. I have no objection and am in accord with the arguments in favor of the bill.

N.C. STATE FAIR.

We learn that Mr. W. H. Battle, who has been elected to the bill, is not elected nor was it intended to, and if it goes into effect will not produce any conflict with or disrepect of the constitution or laws of the United States; but its entire scope and object were to reform some and some only of the political and civil powers of the State government which had been introduced in 1868, amidst times of confusion through the efforts of some of the colored men from other States who were members recently discharged from the United States army, who did nothing of and cared not for the long established usages and customs of the people.

The present constitution is a medley of confusions and contradictions; it is utterly subservient of our long established judicial, municipal and financial systems. In order the more clearly to show the strength of my convictions that there was nothing criminal intended by the bill, I will give a brief synopsis of the arguments for and against the bill.

Those who hold that no Convention could be called through the provisions of the bill, with regard to the same, are of the opinion that the mode provided has not been allowed for want of a two-thirds' vote of all the members of each house, in favor of the bill. Second, that the present State constitution was adopted by it, and therefore accepted by it, and therefore cannot be altered in any other mode than that proposed in it, inasmuch as there is no reservation of power to alter the constitution than by the mode presented.

Those who favor the plan provided by the bill say that the mode provided is not forbidden by the constitution of the State, and that the mode specified in the constitution refers only to amendments made through the legislature; that there is no prohibition in the constitution against the direct vote of the people up on the question whether they desire a convention; that a provision similar to that contained in the bill is not prohibited by the constitution; and therefore is not in conflict with that instrument. They say that by the constitution of the State all powers are devolved to the people; that Congress in accepting the constitution did not intend to restrain or limit the exercise of such powers, provided such exercise was consistent with the constitution and laws of the United States; and that any attempt or provision by one convention to prevent a free expression of opinion by the people at another day is null and void, because such prohibition is a violation of the people's right, and that while the tenth power and constitutional to restrain action of the legislature upon the subject, there is no power which can for ever shut the mouths of a majority of the people against their wish to alter their constitution; that if this was so a new State with a small population framing a constitution for admission into the Union and suitable to it, then condition, might be forever restrained by its first convention from a change of that constitution unless by a unanimous vote of all the people of all the members of the legislature; and therefore they say that a majority of people can in that way be more formidable to alter their fundamental law than any other.

It is contemplated that you shall associate with your committee on the same at our next State Fair as large an exhibition of objects under your care as possible. All who have attended our previous State Fairs have noticed with regret that very many articles, which would do the State credit, have not been exhibited. We hope to have a more complete and more interesting exhibition this year. We trust that your committee will be successful in their efforts to interest the public in the exhibition.

Very respectfully,
KEMP P. BATTLE,
President.
Chairman of Committee.

Robert P. Hope, Raleigh.—Fertilizers, W. C. Kerr, Raleigh.—Minerals, and Marketable Plants.

George W. Blacknall, Raleigh.—Horses, and Mules.

R. P. Wilkinson.—Trial Bread.

Robert W. Wyman, Raleigh.—Cattle, Sheep and Goats.

Richard B. Haywood, Raleigh.—Swine, Pork and Bees.

William A. Blount, Kinston.—Vegetables, Flour, Meal, Bacon, Fish, Salt Provisions of all kind, Bread, Cakes, Preserves, Dried Fruit, Soap, &c.

J. M. Heck, Raleigh.—Fruit, Fruit Jam and Wine.

William L. Upchurch, Raleigh.—Cotton, Grain, Potatoes, Tobacco, and all Farm Products in a raw state.

Peter E. Smith, Scotland Neck.—Farming Implements and Plowing Machines.

B. P. Williamson, Raleigh.—Machinery.

E. A. Vogler, Raleigh.—Vehicles, Saddlery, Cabinet Work, Shoes, Hats, Hand Wear, Earthenware, Holloware, Brick and Marble.

Thomas M. Holt, Haw River.—Textile Fabrics, Paper and Printing.

E. Brevard Davidson, Charlotte.—Field Furniture.

Foster F. Poole, Raleigh.—Household Fabrics, Fancy Work and Flowers.

Daniel M. Barringer, Raleigh.—Statuary and Paintings.

C. Committee to Revise Premium Lists.

Robert P. Hope and William G. Upchurch, Raleigh.

Thomas M. Holt, Haw River.

Information about any article of any Department can be had of the gentleman in charge thereof, or from

KEMP P. BATTLE, President.

J. LITCHFIELD, Super.

**

Judge Settle started for New York on Monday night from which port he will sail on the first steamer for Peru. "Don't you go, Tommy, don't go!"—that's an awful country for earthquakes.

**

"Tom Sloan," of Greensboro, has invented an ingenious substitute for an alarm clock. It is said to be an excellent thing. We bet that it cannot exceed the Irishman's barum, which only required you to get up at any hour, pull a string, and you were sure to be awake.

**

A CITY WITHOUT A SMITH.—A correspondent says that the name of Smith does not appear once in the directory of Winston-Salem, N. C., a city containing fifteen thousand or more inhabitants. What a miserable place it must be!

REPUBLICAN VIEWS OF THE KUKLUX BILL.

Delivered to the House of Representatives Saturday, April 1, 1871, on the Adjournment of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I have an urgent message to the power of Congress to introduce. The simple statement of its purposes forces the conclusion upon mind, with unswerving clearness, that it is a bill of indemnity for the violation of the constitution. It is a fact, for one of a series of measures which the party of secession has taken for the destruction of state power, to the destruction of state authority. Congress had no right to institute the federal for the State courts. The latter were not the people, and the nearer the administration of justice to two men and man was brought to the people themselves, the safer would be their rights in person and property. When the federal government took to itself the entire protection of the individual citizen in the State in his person and property, there would be an entire change in our government system. These views are very wholesome, and we are glad to find them in a republican Senator's mouth.

**

RADICAL TRUTH.—The Radicals of Rutherford and Cleveland have opened the campaign. To-day (Friday) the vote on the Kuklux and the Amnesty bills were looked for in Washington. Just in the nick of time a man named Carpenter arrived in this city ostensibly in search of Gov. Caldwell who was known at the time to be luxuriating in Burke, and by advice we propose to go to Washington to tell a tale of kuklux outrages, and that in consequence of rumored threats Judge Logan was absent to hold court this week in Cheyenne. Now we believe that to be an infamous radical trick looking to military interference in the approaching election. Is Justice of Rutherford's side? But now, tolerated or not, the facts in the matter where does the general

truth lie?

**

MR. MOORE'S EXAMINATION:

Question by Mr. Bayard. Will you be called to the Convention to advise the Constitution of the State of North Carolina?

Answer. I have no objection and am in accord with the arguments in favor of the bill.

**

MR. MOORE'S SWORN OPINION:

Delivered to the House of Representatives Saturday, April 1, 1871, on the Adjournment of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I have an urgent message to the power of Congress to introduce. The simple statement of its purposes forces the conclusion upon mind, with unswerving clearness, that it is a bill of indemnity for the violation of the constitution. It is a fact, for one of a series of measures which the party of secession has taken for the destruction of state power, to the destruction of state authority. Congress had no right to institute the federal for the State courts. The latter were not the people, and the nearer the administration of justice to two men and man was brought to the people themselves, the safer would be their rights in person and property. When the federal government took to itself the entire protection of the individual citizen in the State in his person and property, there would be an entire change in our government system. These views are very wholesome, and we are glad to find them in a republican Senator's mouth.

**

MR. MOORE'S SWORN OPINION:

Delivered to the House of Representatives Saturday, April 1, 1871, on the Adjournment of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I have an urgent message to the power of Congress to introduce. The simple statement of its purposes forces the conclusion upon mind, with unswerving clearness, that it is a bill of indemnity for the violation of the constitution. It is a fact, for one of a series of measures which the party of secession has taken for the destruction of state power, to the destruction of state authority. Congress had no right to institute the federal for the State courts. The latter were not the people, and the nearer the administration of justice to two men and man was brought to the people themselves, the safer would be their rights in person and property. When the federal government took to itself the entire protection of the individual citizen in the State in his person and property, there would be an entire change in our government system. These views are very wholesome, and we are glad to find them in a republican Senator's mouth.

**

MR. MOORE'S SWORN OPINION:

Delivered to the House of Representatives Saturday, April 1, 1871, on the Adjournment of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I have an urgent message to the power of Congress to introduce. The simple statement of its purposes forces the conclusion upon mind, with unswerving clearness, that it is a bill of indemnity for the violation of the constitution. It is a fact, for one of a series of measures which the party of secession has taken for the destruction of state power, to the destruction of state authority. Congress had no right to institute the federal for the State courts. The latter were not the people, and the nearer the administration of justice to two men and man was brought to the people themselves, the safer would be their rights in person and property. When the federal government took to itself the entire protection of the individual citizen in the State in his person and property, there would be an entire change in our government system. These views are very wholesome, and we are glad to find them in a republican Senator's mouth.

**

MR. MOORE'S SWORN OPINION:

Delivered to the House of Representatives Saturday, April 1, 1871, on the Adjournment of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I have an urgent message to the power of Congress to introduce. The simple statement of its purposes forces the conclusion upon mind, with unswerving clearness, that it is a bill of indemnity for the violation of the constitution. It is a fact, for one of a series of measures which the party of secession has taken for the destruction of state power, to the destruction of state authority. Congress had no right to institute the federal for the State courts. The latter were not the people, and the nearer the administration of justice to two men and man was brought to the people themselves, the safer would be their rights in person and property. When the federal government took to itself the entire protection of the individual citizen in the State in his person and property, there would be an entire change in our government system. These views are very wholesome, and we are glad to find them in a republican Senator's mouth.

**

MR. MOORE'S SWORN OPINION:

Delivered to the House of Representatives Saturday, April 1, 1871, on the Adjournment of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I have an urgent message to the power of Congress to introduce. The simple statement of its purposes forces the conclusion upon mind, with unswerving clearness, that it is a bill of indemnity for the violation of the constitution. It is a fact, for one of a series of measures which the party of secession has taken for the destruction of state power, to the destruction of state authority. Congress had no right to institute the federal for the State courts. The latter were not the people, and the nearer the administration of justice to two men and man was brought to the people themselves, the safer would be their rights in person and property. When the federal government took to itself the entire protection of the individual citizen in the State in his person and property, there would be an entire change in our government system. These views are very wholesome, and we are glad to find them in a republican Senator's mouth.

**

MR. MOORE'S SWORN OPINION:

Delivered to the House of Representatives Saturday, April 1, 1871, on the Adjournment of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I have an urgent message to the power of Congress to introduce. The simple statement of its purposes forces the conclusion upon mind, with unswerving clearness, that it is a bill of indemnity for the violation of the constitution. It is a fact, for one of a series of measures which the party of secession has taken for the destruction of state power, to the destruction of state authority. Congress had no right to institute the federal for the State courts. The latter were not the people, and the nearer the administration of justice to two men and man was brought to the people themselves, the safer would be their rights in person and property. When the federal government took to itself the entire protection of the individual citizen in the State in his person and property, there would be an entire change in our government system. These views are very wholesome, and we are glad to find them in a republican Senator's mouth.

**

MR. MOORE'S SWORN OPINION:

Delivered to the House of Representatives Saturday, April 1, 1871, on the Adjournment of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I have an urgent message to the power of Congress to introduce. The simple statement of its purposes forces the conclusion upon mind, with unswerving clearness, that it is a bill of indemnity for the violation of the constitution. It is a fact, for one of a series of measures which the party of secession has taken for the destruction of state power, to the destruction of state authority. Congress had no right to institute the federal for the State courts. The latter were not the people, and the nearer the administration of justice to two men and man was brought to the people themselves, the safer would be their rights in person and property. When the federal government took to itself the entire protection of the individual citizen in the State in his person and property, there would be an entire change in our government system. These views are very wholesome, and we are glad to find them in a republican Senator's mouth.

**

MR. MOORE'S SWORN OPINION:

Delivered to the House of Representatives Saturday, April 1, 1871, on the Adjournment of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I have an urgent message to the power of Congress to introduce. The simple statement of its purposes forces the conclusion upon mind, with unswerving clearness, that it is a bill of indemnity for the violation of the constitution. It is a fact, for one of a series of measures which the party of secession has taken for the destruction of state power, to the destruction of state authority. Congress had no right to institute the federal for the State courts. The latter were not the people, and the nearer the administration of justice to two men and man was brought to the people themselves, the safer would be their rights in person and property. When the federal government took to itself the entire protection of the individual citizen in the State in his person and property, there would be an entire change in our government system. These views are very wholesome, and we are glad to find them in a republican Senator's mouth.

**

MR. MOORE'S SWORN OPINION:

Delivered to the House of Representatives Saturday, April 1, 1871, on the Adjournment of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I have an urgent message to the power of Congress to introduce. The simple statement of its purposes forces the conclusion upon mind, with unswerving clearness, that it is a bill of indemnity for the violation of the constitution. It is a fact, for one of a series of measures which the party of secession has taken for the destruction of state power, to the destruction of state authority. Congress had no right to institute the federal for the State courts. The latter were not the people, and the nearer the administration of justice to two men and man was brought to the people themselves, the safer would be their rights in person and property. When the federal government took to itself the entire protection of the individual citizen in the State in his person and property, there would be an entire change in our government system. These views are very wholesome, and we are glad to find them in a republican Senator's mouth.

**

MR. MOORE'S SWORN OPINION:

Delivered to the House of Representatives Saturday, April 1, 1871, on the Adjournment of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I have an urgent message to the power of Congress to introduce. The simple statement of its purposes forces the conclusion upon mind, with unswerving clearness, that it is a bill of indemnity for the violation of the constitution. It is a fact, for one of a series of measures which the party of secession has taken for the destruction of state power, to the destruction of state authority. Congress had no right to institute the federal for the State courts. The latter were not the people, and the nearer the administration of justice to two men and man was brought to the people themselves, the safer would be their rights in person and property. When the federal government took to itself the entire protection of the individual citizen in the State in his person and property, there would be an entire change in our government system. These views are very wholesome, and we are glad to find them in a republican Senator's mouth.

**

MR. MOORE'S SWORN OPINION:

Delivered to the House of Representatives Saturday, April 1, 1871, on the Adjournment of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I have an urgent message to the power of Congress to