

GEORGE Q. CANNON,

EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

Friday, May 3, 1871.

GENERAL W. T. Sherman has the reputation of being a blunt, straightforward and good talker. He has lately been on a visit to the South, and while at New Orleans he made a speech before the members of the American Union Club, of which a report appears in the Memphis Avalanche. The General is reported to have said that:

"It has been remarked by some gentleman who has preceded me that it was generally conceded by the soldiers of both armies at the close of the late civil war, that if the questions and all matters of the settlement of the differences between the North and South were left to the armies it would be settled at once, and everything would become quiet and orderly. I do believe, and before signing the agreement with General Joe. Johnson I called together all the Generals under my command, and without a dissenting voice they agreed with me, saying that they were rendered in good faith, and would have lived up to the very letter of the agreement; and, in my opinion, if there had been no reconstruction acts of Congress, and the armies had been left at the time to settle all questions of difference between the different sections of the country, the people would have at once become quiet and peaceable. I probably have as good means of information as most persons in regard to what is called the Ku Klux, and am perfectly satisfied that the thing is entirely over-estimated; and if the Ku Klux bills were kept out of Congress, and the army kept at their legitimate duties, there are enough good and true men in all the Southern States to put down all Ku Klux or other bands of marauders."

There have been different opinions entertained respecting the agreement entered into by Generals Sherman and Johnson; some believing that it had been maintained the troubles from which the South is now suffering would never have occurred; and others asserting, with equal confidence, that it would have been the fruitful source of innumerable evils and a cause for the prolongation of the hatred and bitterness of feeling which have existed in the South since the outbreak of the rebellion. Impartial men, who view the difficulties which have been multiplying in the South from the time of the surrender until the present, without bias or prejudice, honestly entertain the opinion that had the politicians been kept off and been forbidden to meddle with the matter, and strict rule been kindly administered upon some fair and equitable basis, the South would have been pacified, its hostility subdued and a road been opened for a thorough union between the two sections. But this, it seems, was not to be. The agreement entered into by General Sherman and the rebel officers was too liberal to suit a certain influential class, and its members entered upon a policy which is perpetuating a feeling of undying hatred towards the Government, in the hearts of young and old—the women and the new generation. If report speak truly, cherishing the most bitterly hostile and unrelenting animosity against the North. The question as to what is to be the end of all this, is one of momentous consequence, and one that, sooner or later, will be enforced upon the attention of the people.

There is wide-spread dissatisfaction expressed by the press throughout the country at the recent Legal-Tender decision of the Supreme Court, and many severe criticisms upon it appear in the columns of different papers. While it is felt that so far as its direct effects upon the finances of the country are concerned, the new judgment is of little importance, it is of momentous consequence in other ways, in relation to the general question of the powers of Congress and the action of the Supreme Court itself. Not a few mourn over this decision as an evidence of the growing importance of that action which advocates the gradual centralization in the General Government of those powers which will make it as supreme as the Parliament in its Great Britain over the local laws and rights of the people.

It will be recollected, that something over a year ago the Supreme Court decided that the Legal-Tender note was not binding as to contracts made before its passage in 1862. That is where a contract was made upon a gold basis this decision held that it was payable in specie and not in greenbacks. There were at the time of that decision, eight members of that Court. The Chief-Justice and four of the Associate Justices agreed with him in the decision; the remaining three dissented from it. It is now asserted that this decision was unpalatable to certain parties, and that, in consequence, a bill was introduced into Congress to increase the number of Judges of the Supreme Bench with a view to reconstruct the court and obtain a reversal of the decision. At the time of the passage of the bill it was charged that its passage was partly due to lobby influence brought to bear by a combination of corporations, which had outstanding bonds issued on specie basis and about to mature. If they could obtain a reversal of the first decision, and pay in currency, it was said they would secure a profit of millions. These charges are now alleged to be having a probable foundation in truth, from the fact that the two new Judges added to the court were known to be opposed to Judge Chase and colleagues' decision upon the Legal-Tender Act. Some papers, in fact, do not hesitate to charge the bill for the "packed" for the purpose of securing a reversal of that decision.

Those, if true, are grave charges, and whether true or not the fact that within the brief period of a year a decision which had been arrived at after long discussion and study, has been suddenly reversed by the vote of five against four—the Chief-Justice and his colleagues who made the first decision still upholding it—after a brief statement, is sufficient to injure the authority and respect of the chief tribunal in the land. Such a reversal necessitates confidence and creates distrust and a feeling of insecurity. It is now asked if the dominant party can be allowed to make and unmake legal decisions to suit its purpose, which is to prevent another party which succeeds in obtaining the control from following its example and committing new agreements on the

law? And if this rule be adopted, what is to be the end?

MICHIGAN has been adopting a new liquor law, which is very stringent in its provisions, and if thoroughly enforced, will have the effect to restrain drunkenness. The law provides a fine of \$25 for the first conviction, \$50 for the second, and \$100 for the third, no matter what beverage is sold, so that it intoxicates, or comes under the head of intoxicating drinks. In case a man receives intoxicating drinks at a saloon, and goes away and does injury to a person, or to property, the saloon-keeper is not only held liable for all the damage, but the person from whom he rents his saloon can also be held. If a saloon-keeper is convicted of selling liquor, his lease of any place where it was sold is declared forfeited, although he may have just come into possession. If the wife of a drunkard or a drinking man can prove that she or the family has been damaged through reason or in consequence of such sale, she can sue and recover.

Will the law be respected or will it be evaded and be ineoperative? To make such a law practical and have it produce the desired results, there must be a strong public sentiment to sustain it and the officers in enforcing it. Michigan may have such a public sentiment; but if so, her case is a rare one in these days.

SPECIAL TO THE DESPATCH NEWS.

By Telegraph.

See WESTERN UNION Telegraph Line.

Afternoon Dispatches.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Receives.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 3, 1871.

Receives.

Lord Walsingham, a distinguished English diplomatist, left yesterday for California, and Lord Godolphin, son of Earl de Grey, is on an eve of starting in the same direction.

NEW YORK.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

Receives.

ILLINOIS.

Severe storm.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

Chicago.

KENTUCKY.

Democratic Convention.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

Frankfort.

CHEAP EGGS!

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.

BRED AT HALF-PRICE.