New Orleans Republican.
OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE UNITED STATES.
OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE CITY OF NEW ORLEANS
OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

THE DEAD BEE.

BY LC BILLINGS SPALDING.

The bed was a snow white daisy,
Where the little creature died;
Its sack half-filled with honey,
And its thin wing open wide.

Its tiny heart ceased beating
While toiling for its hive;
And it left a useful lesson
To many a human life.

The daisy drooped and faded,
But it had not bloomed in vain,
For a weary little worker
Had on its bosom lain.

And its feeble mite of honey
Had been given glad and free
To the worn and weary struggler,
The dying little bee.

And when with doubtful vision
I see no part for me,
I think upon the daisy,
And the little withered bee.

LETTER FROM CLAIBORNE PARISH.

The Disloyal Element on the Rampage—Ineffective Officials.

MINDEN, LA., June 5, 1868.

The reign of terror prevails here most deplorably and unmercifully. The organization known as the Democratic party is most thorough and perfect, and is so well arranged, in such unity and accord, that it can be moved and controlled promptly and unitedly for any purpose. It embraces at least four-fifths of the white men, and the worst, most desperate, and reckless elements of society, as well as those known as the best men of the country. The bad men, under the protection of their connection with this organization, have committed terrible outrages, and violated the laws with impunity. They have formed themselves into clans, with obligations to sustain each other in the perpetration of crime and outrage. They have paralyzed civil government in this portion of Louisiana, and brought us to the verge of anarchy.

The late election showed them how easily they could control the colored vote by intimidation, and these bad men now take advantage of this power. Murders are committed, outrages openly perpetrated upon white and colored loyalists, lives are threatened, and every species of intimidation practiced toward those known as Radicals, and yet no arrests are made.

The feeling of resistance to Radical rule, to the success of the Republican party, is as bitter and uncompromisable as the spirit of rebellion ever was. They hate with undying hatred the party North which now holds the power of the government.

Our newly elected district judge was openly opposed to the constitution, is disfranchised, and has not the nerve or moral courage to enforce the law under the outside pressure of public opinion.

The sheriff of this parish seems completely submissive to public opinion. The Presidential elector for this district could not at this time get a hearing in Claiborne parish. I doubt if he could in safety travel through this country.

Men known as carpet-baggers are denounced, and threats made that they shall not live and hold office here; and I candidly believe the life of any colored man would be in danger who is elected or appointed to office by the Radicals. Meadows was murdered on these grounds alone, and with a view to impress on the minds of the colored population the determination of the hostile element to control or assassinate them. REPUBLICAN.

FROM RAPIDES PARISH.

We publish the following communication from Mr. B. C. McKenney, police juror elect, Plaisance ward, Rapides parish:

Allusions having been made to the Republican party and myself in the *Picayune* of June 9, I deem it due to truth and justice to answer the allegations of the Democratic commissioners of election from Plaisance ward, Rapides parish. The Radicals had no commissioners of election, and the Democrats had it their own way so far as to determine who should vote. Many Radicals were not permitted to vote at Plaisance ward, and had to go to Alexandria to vote. Others who had lost their certificates were told that they would let them vote if they voted the Democratic ticket. As to threats of intimidation they were made, and I found Democratic voters at the polls well armed, with an arsenal in reserve. The sentiments in stating that I was fully satisfied with the fairness of the election is laboring under a mental delusion. I will conclude by saying that I have every confidence in our representative, the Hon. W. S. Calhoun, and believe that he will carry out the principles of the Republican party.

The St. Louis *Republican* of the fifteenth instant says:

Almost daily we receive assurances of the entire feasibility of shipments of grain in bulk via New Orleans to the Atlantic ports and Europe, and as the matter is attracting general attention, not merely in the valley of the Mississippi but at the East and in Europe, we feel assured that by the time the new crop will be fairly in the market every proper facility will be provided for the safe and rapid transportation of all the wheat and corn that may seek a market through the natural and cheaper channel of the Mississippi and its tributaries, and therefore most heartily indorse the efforts of those who are thus moving to advance the interests of the country by cheapening the cost of transporting grain to market.

MORAL DEPRAVITY.—Nathan Roberts was recently arrested in New Albany, Indiana, for abusing his family. When the charge was read the old gentleman responded by informing the court that he had to do such things. He said that his son was trifling and would not work, and because he told him that he was able to be living for himself, instead of living off the hard earnings of his father, a disturbance arose and he had filed the complaint. The old man further stated that his daughter, Rosa Roberts, was a bad girl, and had been living in a house of ill-fame, but had come home a few days since, and insisted on receiving company at his house. She was upheld in this determination by her brother, while the old man "got his foot down," and declared she should not stay under his roof with any such intentions. This declaration on the part of the old man resulted in an open rupture, in which he was largely in the minority, having the entire household to contend against. The charge was dismissed.

HUMAN EXISTENCE.—The brevity of human existence—the rapidity with which the waves close over a passenger life—how they bury it from sight—the slight hold which death has on his surroundings, and the ease, if not indifference with which the world bears his loss, has ever been a favorite subject of thought for the moralist and poet. Looking over the advertising columns to-day we think of a young man, a passenger life-boat at River Falls a pastor, honored by his charge, respected by all—a man of great mental power, with a power of logic almost as resistless as the will of God. He was the central figure, the commanding mind in the community in which he lived. He moved as he died. In San Francisco this morning we read several weeks ago notice relating to the death of his sister. His name appears in print for the last time—for him it is the last of earth, and you probably but few who read this paragraph are said mourners have even noticed it. Life is very little, and its littleness should teach humility to us all.—*Lake Traverse Chip Bonnet.*

Grand Ratification Meeting

REPUBLICAN MASSES IN LAFAYETTE SQUARE.

THE SOUTHERN HEART FIRED.

POPULARITY OF GRANT AND COLFAX.

Republican People Aroused

Eloquent Speeches and Patriotic Resolutions.

MUSIC, BANNERS, AND DECORATIONS.

The grand ratification meeting of Republicans Wednesday in Lafayette Square was one of the most gratifying assemblages of the loyal masses ever convened in this city. Bands were playing, banners streaming, fireworks illuminating, and when the hour arrived for the announcement of the officers to preside, Hon. Oscar J. Dunn, the Lieutenant Governor elect, as Chairman of the Executive Committee, proposed the name of Governor H. C. Warmoth for President, which was welcomed with deafening applause. He also announced a list of Vice-Presidents and Secretaries, which was adopted as the organization of the meeting.

For President.
H. C. WARMOTH.

For Vice-Presidents.

O. J. Dunn.	G. M. Wickliffe.
A. Dubuclet.	George E. Bovee,
Simeon Belden,	T. W. Conway,
T. V. Coupland,	C. Wilcox,
H. J. Campbell,	J. Monette,
C. C. Packard,	M. F. Smith,
S. M. Todd,	J. Wittgenstein,
R. Poindexter,	P. O'Hara,
L. B. Jenks,	J. S. Harris,
A. R. Whitney,	John Ray,
J. B. Lewis,	G. Y. Kelso,
C. B. Darrell,	A. R. François,
J. R. Williams,	John Lynch,
Curtis Pollard,	B. Collins,
F. C. Antoine,	R. H. Isabelle,
Mortimer Carr,	J. Mansion,
O. Belot,	H. L. Ray,
C. T. Adolphe,	Frank Alexander,
Milton Morris,	G. H. Hill,
P. Guignet,	John Pearce,
E. Lehman,	A. W. Faulkner,
B. C. Wrenn,	David Young,
W. L. McMillen,	John Gair,
Isaac A. Abbott,	R. J. Taylor,
P. G. Deslonde,	M. Raymond,
P. L. Dufresne,	G. Gartscamp,
T. B. W. Evans,	John Page,
Henderson Williams,	Wm. Murrell,
Paul Guidry,	E. F. Buckingham,
Charles Leroy,	W. C. Melvin,
Frank Morey,	O. H. Brewster,
R. J. Moran,	Wm. Smith,
Emile Honore,	W. S. Calhoun,
Harry Lott,	S. E. Cuny,
Peter Harper,	Ch. Grey,
Adolphe Turce,	Dennis Burrel,
J. B. Esnard,	A. J. Demarest,
J. W. Hutchinson,	J. S. Mathews,
W. M. Holland,	Ulger Dupart,
A. L. Lee,	William Young,
M. A. Southworth,	Robert Rhodes,
B. F. Joubert,	T. G. Tracy,
J. M. G. Parker,	J. Hall,
D. H. Reese,	J. K. Belden,
C. Donato,	W. J. Douglas,
H. R. Steele,	J. B. Noble,
Seth W. Lewis,	W. C. Dibble,
William H. Green,	J. F. Deane,
J. B. Carter,	S. S. Fish,
Don A. Pardee,	W. George,
S. Thezan,	J. B. Jourdain,
E. Staes,	C. Camp,
A. P. Dumas,	V. Gerodias,
L. W. Baker,	G. F. James,
F. J. Lecher,	Lewis Banks,
R. H. Shannon,	Thomas Lynne,
J. A. Craig,	H. J. Campbell,
J. R. Clay,	E. C. Morphy,
Simon Jones,	J. A. Noble,
S. B. Packard,	A. J. Thornton,
N. Underwood,	R. Johnson,
James Lewis,	M. Vidal,
D. C. Woodruff,	W. J. Blackburn,
Ben Campbell,	J. H. Sypher,
St. F. Casanave,	W. P. Kellogg,
Pete Cool	G. Bruning,
F. Mackay,	L. Guichard,
E. Hiestand,	Sam Houston,
D. W. F. Blabee,	J. A. Masicot,
J. P. Becker,	C. H. Merritt,
J. Pesoen,	J. A. Bayzal,
W. B. Armstrong,	B. Soulie,
E. Heath,	W. G. McConnell,
C. W. Lowell,	James Graham,
W. R. Miller,	Gustave Dewees,
R. G. Gardner,	H. Heidenhain,
W. R. Fish,	L. A. Sauer,
James Crosbie,	W. S. Mudgett,
Martin Flood,	Charles Collins,
William Ray,	Samuel Parsons,
Henry Raby,	Raphael Blunt,
Alaxander Hart,	Thomas Schuman,
W. B. Cummings,	D. C. Macarty,
William Malford,	C. L. Ferguson,
A. Villas,	Robert Browie,
F. Riard,	P. Verret,
C. Glandin,	G. D. Geddes,
S. G. Brower,	T. T. Delassise,
	T. Delaroche.

And one hundred others.

Secretaries.

William Vigers.	F. J. Llorens,
H. Von Werthen,	C. B. Young,
J. L. Dupart,	H. C. Murray,
O. C. Blandin,	A. J. Wilder,
W. B. Gray,	E. Perrault.

Lieutenant Governor Dunn on calling the meeting to order said:

FELLOW CITIZENS—I have the honor to call this meeting to order by nominating as its President his excellency H. C. Warmoth, Governor of Louisiana.

Remarks of the Hon. H. C. Warmoth.

FELLOW CITIZENS—I thank you sincerely for the high honor you have conferred upon me in selecting me to preside over this very numerous and intelligent assembly. We have met to-night for the purpose of ratifying the nominations of the Republican party for the offices of President and Vice-President of the United States. This will be the first occasion on which Louisiana has had to vote for the first offices within the gift of the people of this country for the last eight years. During that time wonderful changes have been brought about in this Southern country. The black thousands I see before me to-night have never before had the privilege of expressing their preferences as to the chief rulers of this great republic. But to-night we take the initiative—we stand here together, and under the blackness of night we see no color whatever in each others' faces, we recognize no distinction whatever on account of color; but standing together as American freemen, having but one country and one flag, we unite our voices together and declare which one of these parties we will stand by in this contest. (Applause.) We are to say to-night whether that party which has ruled this country for the last eight years amid trials and difficulties never before known to our history shall rule it for the next four years to come. We are here to say whether the loyal men of this State will agree that that party which made four millions of our people freemen and enfranchised citizens shall still have "the confidence of the American people. I believe that the heart of every loyal man in this State responds to the sentiment. I believe that no men could have been selected as the representatives of the principles we have advocated who would give greater satisfaction to the people than those who have nominated. We have said to the American people, both friends and foes, politically, all we ask is peace. We ask not the blood of any man. We have prosecuted the war that we might save the nation. We have expatriated none of those who were against the country; we have executed none of those who fought against the republic, however criminal they were; we have confiscated none of their property; we have proscribed only each of them as was necessary to secure the peace of the country.

We come before you to-day in the courageous Chicago platform—no discrimination—no compromise—no concession—but with a demand for peace and the hope of prosperity. This and this only is our platform. When General Grant said in the concluding words of his letter of acceptance "Let us want to pause" he sounded the keynote of the Republican party. Give us peace in this broad land and we will ask nothing more; we will submit these questions of politics to the judgment and discretion of the people. In a calm discussion of them and a final decision we will all abide. This is all we ask, but in asking it we feel that we have the power to secure it and the power to enforce it. (Cheers.)

Fellow citizens, you are here to-night not to hear me make a speech, but to hear other and more able and distinguished gentlemen. You are here to listen to your favorite orators—men, both white and black, whose patriotism and fidelity to the country is known and appreciated all over the land. I have the honor and pleasure of introducing to you on this occasion a gentleman whose duty he appreciates, and whose courage has led him to execute that duty amid all the social and political proscriptions that have been entered against him—Judge Howe, of our Criminal Court.

Speech of Judge Howe.

FELLOW CITIZENS: The place in which we meet to-night is peculiarly appropriate and the occasion is one of the deepest interest. We have met in Lafayette Square, named after a gallant young soldier of our first war, to ratify the nomination for President of the hero of our last war. Lafayette freely offered his fortune and his life in support of the declaration of independence of 1776, while General Grant stands to-day the chosen standard-bearer of the party who strive to carry that declaration of independence into full practical effect in 1868. Lafayette drew his sword for the doctrine of equality of all men before the law, and to-day General Grant is our leader in the great struggle to make that doctrine a living and dominant truth in the whole land. It is fit and proper that for such an occasion we should meet in such a place.

I need not weary you with dry discussion of dogmas to-night. We all know that the late war left the rebellious States without any legal governments. We know it because Andrew Johnson told us so in his proclamations of 1865. We all know that the Constitution of the United States requires the United States to guarantee a republican and of course a legal form of government to every State. We also are sure of this because Mr. Johnson told us so in his proclamations of 1865. We know that Mr. Johnson, instead of taking the true course, which was to allow the "United States" to act in the matter; that is, let Congress pass the necessary laws, the President execute them, and the supreme court interpret them in such cases as might properly come before it—we know that Mr. Johnson started on the wrong track, and undertook to be the "United States" all by himself, and to set up in those States such governments as suited his own ideas. We know that Congress (and we think wisely) took issue with him, declined to recognize his governments, and at last passed the reconstruction laws, under which at last we have a constitution of equal rights before the law.

By these events the lines have at last been sharply drawn, and so far as we of Louisiana are concerned the contest comes down to one point. On this one side we have the Republican party of the nation, with Grant at its head, pledged to protect us all in the enjoyment of equal rights to liberty, to franchise, to education, and to religion under our new constitution. On the other side we have the Democratic party, with nobody at its head at present, pledged by every fact of its history and every declaration of its principles to take away those rights. There could not be simpler issue. If you are for equality before the law for all men who have minds to be educated and souls to be saved you vote for Grant; if you are against such equal justice you vote against him.

Who is General Grant? I claim the privilege of answering this question, for I served under his command in the campaigns of Corinth and Vicksburg; and though my modest rank did not bring me probably to his notice, yet it gave me opportunity to observe him. I observed his habits and his methods of action, and since the war has been over I have watched narrowly his course at Washington, and I say in all earnestness and honesty that I believe him to be the best candidate for the Presidency ever offered to the suffrages of the American people since the days of Washington.

And yet we are gravely told by the editors of the Democratic press (and you know they always speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth,) that Grant will not make a good President because he can not make a long and pretty speech. Well, if the only duty of the President of the United States is to *talk* there would be some force in the objection. But alas for our Democratic friends, we do not want a President to do our talking for us. We have plenty of young lawyers and politicians to do that. What we want in the White House is a man of *action*, not a man of words; a man who can seek and find the will of the people, especially as embodied in the laws of Congress, and then execute that will. Why the fact is that professional oratory sought for its own sake is about the cheapest and poorest thing in the world. The lesson of history is that oratory, *as a trade*, begins just where heroism leaves off. When I hear a man making a speech just for its own sake I always think of the story of the young man at a country party, who, on being introduced to a young lady, and not knowing exactly how to begin a conversation, started off in this way:

"Do you known anybody that would like to buy a shirt?"

"Why, no," said she, "have you got one to sell?"

"No, oh no. I only said it for *talk*."

And one great curse of our country in its politics is that oratory for its own sake is saying things "for talk." So far then as this objection to General Grant is concerned, I think it greatly in his favor. When he shall be elected (and he certainly will be) we shall have a President who will not talk much, but who will act a good deal.

There is another remarkable objection to General Grant which our virtuous and truthful friends, the Democratic editors, have raised. They say that he is not a great soldier. And they not only say this, but they ask us to believe it. Was there ever a more remarkable proposition presented to human credulity? General Grant was in active service four years in the last war alone. He was pitted in succession against the chosen generals of the Southern armies. The accomplished Sidney Johnston, the scientific Beauregard, the cautious Joe Johnston, the tenacious Bragg, the skillful and educated Lee, all contended against him with all that subtlety and learning and valor could accomplish, and were defeated and captured. Donelson, Vicksburg, Mission Ridge, the march to the sea, which "it is now known that Grant planned, and the closing scenes at Richmond, these, we are asked to believe, were all matters of good luck and not of skill, science, and vigor. In other words, that for four years the destinies of this tremendous conflict were left to chance and not by the laws of God. It was not luck, but a great game of roulette, and that Grant was successful because he was lucky. It is by such puerile conceits that our opponents hope to mislead the people.

You have all perhaps heard the old story of the man in Noah's time, who would not believe there was going to be a deluge, and made light of the labors of the patriarch. But when the deluge came, and the black floods began to roll up around him he hastened in "in the rain to apply for admission to the ark." But Noah said, "No, you have derided and derided my ark, and I can not let you in." "Very well," said the old infidel, already up to his waist in water, and half choked in the falling torrents; "you can go long with your old ark." I do not believe in going to be very much of a shower." Now, three years ago these same Democrats were perfectly delighted with the military career of General Grant. He was according to their own statements the greatest of modern soldiers. And why did they then acknowledge his merits? Because they hoped to get him in some way committed to their views and plans, and then use him as their own candidate. But they failed in this neat little plan. They did not have any more success in capturing Grant than Mr. "Bob Lee" did. And so their plan is now to abuse him, and especially to underrate his military achievements. Like the obstinate and disappointed old man in the story, they say, "It isn't very much of a shower." "General Grant" they say, "isn't very much of a soldier." If we may believe the papers, though I hope the story is not true, General Buckner, lately of New Orleans, and now editor of the Louisville *Courier*, says that Grant is not much of a soldier. But the people will recollect that in February, 1862, General Buckner was in Fort Dondelson, with 17,000 men; that General Grant by skillful movements invested the place (and a very good "investment" it was); that in a short time General Buckner found it convenient to send a flag of truce and offer to surrender on certain conditions; that General Grant replied "I demand an unconditional surrender, and propose to move immediately on your works." And so General Buckner and all his host did unconditionally surrender. The people will remember that this was only one of General Grant's many victories achieved by genius, by patience, by courage; and now that General Buckner has turned Democratic editor and a leader in the Democratic party, we of the great Republican party are going under the leadership of General Grant to try the Donelson tactics again, and give notice to General Buckner and his Democratic batteries that we propose to move immediately on his works. (Great cheers.)

We have another objection to General Grant upon the part of these able editorial Democrats. They say he has "no policy," and they are so unhappy, apparently, on this subject that they can't sleep o'nights. Now I beg to suggest that if General Grant's views on this point are considered with any fairness at all, they ought to furnish great cause for thankfulness. We have had enough of presidents who talk about "my policy." The country has been kept in confusion for three years by a President who had a pet "policy." The whole theory of our government has been strained and twisted in the attempts of Mr. Johnson to force his policy on the United States. Now in the reasonable and natural construction of General Grant's language on this subject we ought to see matter of congratulation and comfort. He says, and no candid man could wish him to say anything else: "I have no policy in opposition to the will of the people." "If I am elected President it will be my duty and my delight to execute the will of the people." If our opponents say that because General Grant declares he has no policy as against the will of the people he has therefore no principles, they say what is absurd, and what they know to be untrue. He announces as his principles the doctrines of the Chicago platform; he is especially in favor of union, of liberty, and of impartial suffrage. He believes in the right of the people of the United States to govern the United States. He believes that the people speak through their Representatives in Congress, and that when they so speak it is the duty of the President to execute their will. That is the true theory of the American government, and I repeat, therefore, that every good citizen will applaud General Grant for the simple and forcible manner in which he has expressed it.

There is one more matter to which I wish to allude as briefly as possible, and I allude to it because I am sorry and ashamed that our enemies should have so far forgotten their self-respect as to indulge in malignant slander of our candidate. I refer to the ridiculous and contemptible story set afloat by the Democratic press that General Grant is a drunkard. There is no more reason for the rumor than there would be for the assertion that General Washington was a drunkard. But the story has been devised by party malignity, and it is being circulated by Democratic papers.

Now if the matter is to be treated jocosely we might adopt the idea of the lamented Lincoln, who when during the war he was told that Grant was too fond of whisky, said with his singular mixture of wit and wisdom, "I wish somebody would give me a barrel of Grant's whisky. I would like to send it to some of my other generals." I think we might express the same wish. If General Grant be a drunkard, we wish such inebriety might attack some other people. I would like to get hold of a barrel of his whisky, and have it bottled for distribution. I would like to send a bottle or two to some other headquarters, and see if under its benign stimulus a little love of republican doctrines might not possibly be excited. I would like to send a dozen to the editors of Camp street, and see whether it might not inspire them with a little patriotism and a little grammar. In short, if whisky is likely in all cases to prompt the exhibition of so much genius, patriotism, courage, and prudence as it seems to have done in the case of Grant, we would do well to have the tax removed, and encourage its habitual use, especially in this latitude.

But jesting apart, what is the origin of this extraordinary charge against General Grant? I can not tell, for so often as I have seen him I never saw a more temperate looking man, a man with a clearer eye or a healthier cheek or more steady nerves. I can only account for the charge on one theory, and I think the theory a philosophical one. We are apt to measure the designs of other people by our own. We are apt to judge in other people the same cravings that we feel in ourselves. Now if there be anything that a Democratic editor is fond of it is whisky. To "vote the regular ticket and take his liquor straight" is his idea of duty; and it does not enter into his imagination to conceive that a man can occupy a position where he gets a regular salary without spending three fourths of that salary in drink. I remember a year ago being at General Sheridan's house one evening and he showed me a copy he had just received of a very filthy paper called the Memphis *Avalanche*, in which there was a long article accusing General Sheridan of being a drunkard—and I am sure Sheridan was never drunk in his life. And I said to him at the time: "The man that wrote that is probably a drunkard himself, and to his diseased fancy it seems impossible that you should have a salary of four hundred dollars a month *and keep sober*. (Great laughter.)

And I tell you these miserable penny-aliners who malign General Grant in this way are people of the same style. They can not imagine a man having fifty dollars at a time without going on a spree. They can not conceive of a man with such a salary as General Grant's remaining sober. I can fancy one of these seedy writers discoursing on the intemperance of General Grant. I can see the scribe bending over his editorial table, his eyes red with frequent intoxication; his nose—

"Jolly nose, the rich jewels that garnish thy tip
Were dug from the mines in the county of Bourbon"

His hands trembling with continued dissipation; one of those men who live on free lunches, and will write a half-column in praise of a grogshop that will furnish them with free drinks. Oh! my dear sir the editors will inform us that General Grant's habits are not good. And, as I said before, the secret of their theory is that they can not conceive of a man having a considerable income without spending the bulk of it in liquor. They are like the little boy who held to his sister, "Mary when I get to be President I am going to swing on a gate all day!" That was his idea of life; and the ideas of these revilers of General Grant are just about as broad.

I said I was sorry and ashamed that our opponents should manufacture such slanders. I am not ashamed for the honor of American people, among whom such political tactics are allowed. But no one need be surprised. When General Andrew Jackson was nominated for the Presidency the same style of calumniation was adopted. The Democratic press then, as now, made charges against his private life. He was a murderer, they said, a drunkard, and a rake. A pamphlet was published in his own State of Tennessee, charging him with *thirty two* distinct crimes, including pretty nearly all the offenses in the calendar. Yet Jackson was elected and re-elected, his death was mourned as a loss to the country of a hero, a patriot, and a statesman of singular purity of private life, and to-day in Jackson Square in our city you see his equestrian statue—a statue of one of those men whom New Orleans especially delights to honor. The same persecution followed Henry Clay almost to his grave. He was freely denounced by his political enemies as a corrupt man, a gambler, a drunkard, and a rake. The public press of the country disseminated those slanders for years. General Jackson there were people who believed them. But who believes them now? Henry Clay died. A nation wept for him as for one of her dearest sons, and to-day at the corner of Canal and Royal streets in our city you see his colossal statue—the statue of another man whom New Orleans especially delights to honor, and I dare say that some of the very men who tried to break his heart while he was alive helped to build his monument after he was dead. So, fellow citizens, the idea that General Grant is a man of intemperate habits is nothing but a cheap slander.

We have then a noble leader in Ulysses S. Grant. He is a soldier who was never defeated. He is a statesman who has never gone backward. He is a politician who has struck the true key note of American politics when he declared that if elected it would be his highest care to execute the will of the people. He is a man of liberal education and large experience. He was graduated at the best school in America. He has seen that time had a wide experience of affairs. Above all, he is a man of honest purpose, of perfect personal integrity, of clear perceptions and determined purpose. He must be elected. He will be elected. (Loud applause.)

Fellow-citizens, some of us were in the army of General Grant during the war, and some were not. Some of us were called to serve our country in the field, and some just as good were called to serve her in other ways. The war is over, but the great political campaign which is to secure us, we hope, the legitimate fruits of the victory of the Union arms has just begun. In the peaceful struggle for the supremacy of our principles we are all soldiers, and Grant—not as a soldier, but as a citizen—is our leader. We will move on like a true army. The true soldier is an unselfish man. He fights not for himself, but for his flag; so will we contend. The true soldier is a brave man. He cheerfully risks health, comfort, and life for the good of the cause; so will we contend. The true soldier is a man of discipline. He obeys orders and observes rules; he fights with the army; so will we contend. Shoulder to shoulder—so will we go on, elbow touching elbow, and each foot keeping time to the music of freedom and the Union. (Great applause.)

You cry "Hurrah"—it is a word which is used more often in political campaigns than any other, and a very notable word it is. I mean this word "Hurrah!" I like to study the origin of such words, and I find by looking in the dictionary that it is of Oriental origin, that it was the battle-cry of the Arabians, and it meant "To Paradise," "To Heaven," "To Glory." We use this explosive word with the same idea. We strive for a political heaven in our country; for the millennial reign of liberty, of justice, of equal rights before the law, of universal education, and a recognition of the indefeasible rights of manhood. When we say hurrah for Grant we mean that we are on the way to this happy state; we mean that we are on our way to this glorious consummation, and I tell you, fellow citizens, when these noble truths we advocate shall have free course and full triumph in the United States, it will be as nearly a political heaven as is possible to weak humanity. Toward this we move with Grant as our leader. Shall we, with this idea in our minds, say, "Hurrah for Grant?" (Great cries of "Yes.") Well, then, three cheers for Grant!

Three tremendous cheers were given, and the Judge retired.

In presenting Mr. Durant to the assembled masses Governor Warmoth said there was no need of formally introducing him as his name was a household word; and he had so long identified himself with the Republican party of Louisiana that he was known to almost every individual composing it.

Speech of Hon. Thomas J. Durant.

MR. PRESIDENT AND FELLOW CITIZENS: I was glad to hear the remark of Judge Howe that as a rule there was not much in a professional speechmaker. I scarcely feel on this occasion able to make a speech at all.

I think, fellow citizens, that the moral and political contest in which all are now engaged is not inferior in importance to any in which the American people have been involved since the beginning of this government. True, it is not destined to swell as the contest for and against secession did, into the roar of artillery and the clangor of arms, but it does involve as deeply and as truly the fundamental principles upon which American government is based as any. It involves the very doctrine of popular government. It will decide the question whether in this country the people and their representatives in Congress are to be the supreme power which is to dictate the law of the land, or whether there shall be substituted in will of one man as at the time of his election to be President—whether, in short, monarchy is to be substituted for republicanism—imperialism for popular rights. For as you all understand, familiar as you are with the history of the past two or three years, the claim of the present executive falls nothing short of this; that such laws of Congress as are consistent with his good will and pleasure he will obey, and such as do not meet his approval he will refuse to execute, or what is still worse, he will endeavor to thwart in their proper execution. And if the American people, calmly considering such a claim, knowing its full extent, aware of the consequences to which it must inevitably lead us, are willing to acquiesce in his dictates and support the policy of his party, then they are willing to give up the privilege of popular government, and are willing to submit, as people of less happy countries do, to the imperial sway of a despot. Mr. Johnson has declared that those laws of Congress which he approves he will execute, and those which he does not approve he will not put in force. It was for this he was tried before the representatives of the people. It was not so important that the President should be convicted of the crimes with which he was charged, but it was important that he should be tried. It was important that in the face of the whole world, while Europe, with its monarchical institutions, was looking on, it was important that in the presence of a free people the man who had defeated the laws and, though he was the chief magistrate, had placed himself above the necessity of executing them, that this man should be brought before the Constitutional tribunal and compelled to plead like any other criminal. This was a triumph, whatever the result; this was a triumph of the Republican principles. It displayed to him and to his party and to the world that the American people had the power to try their chief magistrate or any other officer when he pursues a course contrary to the law, and to guide the counsel of the people, who "know their rights, and knowing dare maintain." There is no worthier chieftain than he whose name appears upon that banner; there is no worthier lieutenant than he whose name stands second upon the list, and I think that the men who were nominated at Chicago were the best men, not only now in this nation, to lead the destinies of the republic, but as my predecessor said, they are worthier in every respect than any other men who have been placed in power by the American people since the era of the illustrious founder of our republic. I think that the convention at Chicago presented the most sublime spectacle to the world that any convention of a similar kind ever presented to the eye of man. It was the first time in the annals of America that the whole Union was represented. No State, no portion, no race, no color was unrepresented there.

For the first time in the history of our country a nominating convention was assembled to which were admitted representatives of the African race in America. (Applause.) Men who were born slaves, who from every part of the country, some who had unfortunately adhered to the rebellion, but who had repented, but almost wholly of those who had always been true to their country—of men who themselves and their fathers had always been excluded from the councils of the nation. That convention chose for its chief the man who led the Republican armies to victory—that convention laid down in its platform that the great truths which Congress asserted in the reconstruction acts were made necessary by the conduct of the rebel States in refusing to ratify the amendment, under circumstances was the Congress of the United States to desert the newly enfranchised citizens of the South; and accordingly we have seen that when on a late occasion, in our own city, an attempt was made to defeat the will of the people here, Congress told the Commander General of the Department he could not be permitted to fight it out all summer on that line, and, coming to our rescue, the Congress of the United States has settled the question of the admission of the State of Louisiana; and soon, more bright and beautiful than before, appearing like a goddess adorned with the jewels of freedom, Louisiana will take her seat as an equal State in the councils of the nation. (Applause.) Louisiana, not as she was, founded with her riches on the sufferings of half of the people—Louisiana—not as she was with the liberties of one race springing from the enslavement of the other, but Louisiana, great, glorious, and free. She will send her representatives to those councils elected, as they have already been, by voters without distinction of race or color, and by this compact she will seal the prosperity of all her people. Her great sources of production will be renewed, and her march of happiness and plenty and peace will be more proud and more distinguished than it ever was before. Now, in opposition to a Congress guaranteeing the rights of the people without distinction, in opposition to the lead of such a chieftain as we have nominated, who is to be put forward by the other party?

If you set the question of principles aside, what man in the country can match with General Grant? There are no two men in the United States who combine in themselves greater elements of personal popularity than Ulysses S. Grant and Schuyler Colfax. Therefore if the contest is to be decided without reference to principle the battle is already fought and the victory won. And can we compare our principles with those of our adversaries? Who are the Democratic party? Let those who can look back for the last twenty years give the answer. If you look over the lists of the old Whigs you will find the greater part of them enrolled in the Democratic party. I have read that on one occasion a missionary to the Sandwich Islands, who was zealous in the service in which he was sent, had baptized a great many heathen natives, and converted them to the true faith. On one occasion he came into the hut of one of these converts, and although he had instructed him never to eat any meat on Friday, he found him cooking a beefsteak. "What is this?" said the holy man, "are you violating the precepts which I have lately taught you?" "Not at all, my master," said the convert, "I have just baptized him, and I have called him fish." (Laughter.) Now the old Whigs who have gone over to lead the Democrats, and who in a late political meeting in this city, taking the type for the whole body, they have been baptised, and lost their name of Whigs and become Democrats; but though names may change, parties do not change, for the party consists in its principles. That is the Democratic party in reality which favors legislation for classes. And the people of Louisiana and the people of the United States are not a class, but they are all the inhabitants of the States without distinction. These are the people, and nothing else is to be called by that name. And the party which guarantees the rights of the people without distinction, and proclaimed before the law, and declares it is justice shall be done to all men without regard to their origin, what country they came from, or under what sun their ancestors were born, that is the real Democratic party of this nation, by whatever name its adversaries may choose to style themselves. That party, fellow citizens, is the Republican party—the party of equality, of progress, of humanity; the party which has followed the great precepts on which is founded our republic; the party which has made America the hope of the world, and which will make her still more illustrious and do honor to itself by electing General Grant to the Presidency in November next. (Continued applause.)

Governor Warmoth, on introducing Captain George A. Sheridan, the next speaker, said:

FELLOW CITIZENS—Many years ago old Ireland gave a son to Great Britain, whose eloquence and whose patriotism has made his name illustrious. A few years ago a descendant of Ireland gave America another Sheridan. The former made splendid speeches, but could not fight; the latter made splendid fights, but could not speak. I have now the pleasure of introducing to you a Sheridan who can not only fight, but who can make splendid speeches—Captain George A. Sheridan, of Carroll parish.

Captain Sheridan made a very lengthy, amusing, and telling speech, which we reserve for publication on a future occasion.

Governor Warmoth in introducing General Bussey said:

When the first sound of hostility was heard at Fort Sumter, when the loyal people of the North arose as one man, with musket in hand, to vindicate the integrity of the government, the glorious State of Iowa was not behind her sister States. Among many thousands of gallant soldiers who buckled on their armor and marched triumphantly to the gulf was Major General Cyrus Bussey.

After helping to reconstruct Missouri and Arkansas he finally came to Louisiana, and has assisted in reconstructing our State. He is here to-night, and I have the pleasure of introducing him to you, that he may join his voice and his heart in the great triumph we have achieved.

Speech of General Bussey.

FELLOW CITIZENS: My name was on the list in advance of Captain Sheridan, and had I known that the young gentleman intended to make so good a speech, I certainly should have claimed the privilege of speaking in the order of the list. I find the position much harder to take now.

As Governor Warmoth has remarked, when the war first began I was opposed to a dissolution of the Union, and was one of the first to lend my feeble power toward sustaining the glorious cause in which I believe we were engaged. I had the honor of serving under General U. S. Grant during the long and bloody siege of Vicksburg, and for many months before, and it is with the utmost pleasure that I appear before you to-night to bear testimony in behalf of his fitness for the high position to which the American people have called him. I can reiterate the sentiment expressed by Judge Howe, that in my humble opinion there is not a man in the United States so well qualified to fill that high and noble position as General Grant. A man is not a great general who is simply a field marshal. General Grant possesses as much executive ability as any man who ever filled the Presidential chair, and one of the reasons why Andrew Jackson was so good a President was because he was a good general, and possessed of executive ability that would have enabled him to command a million of men had they been placed at his disposal. General Grant has this qualification, and yet there is a class of men who say that if he is elected President some other—a politician—will assume that function for him. It will be remembered that when the seige of Vicksburg had proved a failure he called a council of war and proposed running the batteries of Vicksburg with his boats and moving down upon Jackson, taking Vicksburg in the rear.

This his tried and trusted generals, Sherman, McPherson, and others, unanimously voted against, believing it was hazardous for the army to be placed in that position. After hearing their objections, when they declared in favor of moving back, and going down by way of Grenada, he remarked: "Your plan will take Vicksburg, but that is going backward. My plan will take Vicksburg by going forward." Such is the man who is now called upon to fill the office of President of the United States. He commanded the greatest army the world has ever seen. If you consult the files of the Democratic papers published during the war, and indeed up to a month or two ago, you will find the most glowing eulogies of General Grant. You will find him classed only second to Napoleon, and by many placed upon a par with him.

I am in favor of the principles of the Republican party because they mean something; because that party would leave behind the dead issues of the past and march on to things that are new and substantial.

I have always believed that it was not right for any nation or people to succeed to wealth and power and influence at the expense of the rights or liberties of any other people. I have always believe that the kind hearts which God has implanted in the human family will ever permit a nation to succeed at the expense of the life blood of those who have a right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The Democratic party, on the other hand, find a negative party. To find out what their principles are you must first find out what are the principles of the Republican party, and then they are opposed to them. I am not in favor of any such party; I am in favor of a party which marches to the music of the Union. The Democratic party for the last seven years opposed every effort put forth to save the country. Their last declaration of "principles" was made in 1864, when they declared the war a failure, and that they were in favor of a cessation of hostilities with a view to recognizing the independence of the Southern Confederacy, which would have fastened the chains more firmly upon every slave. And they ask those who fought with General Grant to unite