The New Orleans Bee.

OFFICE 73 CHARTRES STREET. NEW ORLEANS, TUESDAY MORNING, JULY 18, 1871. 44th YEAR—Vol. XLIV.—Whole—15,423.

NEW ORLEANS DAILY BEE

DUDUIT & LIMET, PUBLISHERS,
No. 73 Chartres street.

TERMS OF THE BEE.

Terms of subscription—Daily, per annum, in advance, $10; half-yearly, $6; quarterly, $4. Price of the paper—Single copies, 10 cents.

The Bee Weekly is published every Tuesday and Saturday. Subscription, $5 per annum, invariably in advance.

Rates of Advertising—Transient advertisements having the run of the paper, first insertion, $1 50 per square; each subsequent insertion, 75 cents per square.

Front or Editorial Page, transient advertisements, each insertion, $1 50 per square.

Advertisements inserted at intervals to be charged as new, each insertion.

Front or Editorial Page, monthly advertisements, each square, $20 net per month.

Regular advertisers who advertise largely, shall be allowed such discount from the above published transient rates as may be agreed upon; in no case shall such discount exceed 25 per cent.

Business Notices of A Advertisements to be charged 20 cents net per line, each insertion.

All transient advertisements must be paid for in advance.

Advertisements not marked for any number of insertions will be published six times.

All bills with regular advertisers shall be rendered monthly.

Weekly Edition.

TERMS—PER YEAR ..... $5.

NEW ORLEANS:
TUESDAY MORNING, JULY 18, 1871.

The Northern and Western Press on the New York Riot.

The Northern and Western journals are taken up almost entirely with the details of the riot in New York city on Wednesday last and they are nearly unanimous in attributing Gov. Hoffman for his very timely proclamation promising protection to any and all bodies of men desiring to assemble and march in peaceable procession. We say "nearly unanimous" because there are a few journals which have not suffered themselves to be influenced by the hasty judgment of the public which was unmistakably in favor of the Orangemen being permitted to parade in second order with their intention. It will be observed that the Governor promised protection only to "peaceable processions." Here lies the gist of the discussion. Was the Orangemen's procession a "peaceable one?" Can it be said that a procession carrying banners and devices and mottoes signifying insult to a large portion of the population is a "peaceable procession?" Does any one believe for a moment that a body of men carrying for instance the Confederate flag and banners emblematic of the late war having inscribed on them mottoes indicative of Confederate sympathies, would be permitted to march unmolested through the streets of any Northern city? Yet to be consistent, those who take the side of the Orangemen and advocate their right to parade, must also accord the same right to a Confederate society. If they do not, then it depends altogether upon the object which an organization of men may have in view whether they will be permitted to parade or not. We make a distinction, one claim the right to judge as to the character and purposes of the body of men proposing to hold a procession, and away goes the principle upon which rest the advocates of this right of any and every body of men to march through the streets of a city without let or hindrance of the public authorities. Here in New Orleans, more than one since the war closed, have the public authorities been compelled to succeed the right to prohibit at times of election, political clubs from marching through the streets. And doubt the authorities claim and exercise every day the right to prevent individual citizens from committing a breach of the peace, in the streets or elsewhere, by engaging in personal combat? Why then should not the public authorities have the right to prevent bodies of men from coming most obnoxious in the streets of a city, thus endangering the lives and the property of innocent persons?

The Philadelphia *Ledger* thinks that in a proper case, the municipal authorities have a legal right to prohibit processions which from their character and purposes are likely to provoke a breach of the public peace. That is also our opinion, and we do not think Gov. Hoffman has any reason to boast of his success in vindicating public liberty on the occasion of the Orangemen's procession. His measures were not of the proper description and they have just narrowly escaped a great calamity. Had the Orangemen been allowed to assemble as a peaceable procession, no special constabulary for the occasion. Such a force would have been sufficient to overawe the riotous element. It is true, the Orangemen had their procession, but it was the mere skeleton of one. Only two hundred men out of several thousand, and nearly two hundred men, women and children have been permitted to march in peaceable procession. We say "nearly unanimous" because there are a few journals which have not suffered themselves to be influenced by the hasty judgment of the public which was unmistakably in favor of the Orangemen being permitted to parade in second order with their intention. It will be observed that the Governor promised protection only to "peaceable processions." Here lies the gist of the discussion. Was the Orangemen's procession a "peaceable one?" Can it be said that a procession carrying banners and devices and mottoes signifying insult to a large portion of the population is a "peaceable procession?" Does any one believe for a moment that a body of men carrying for instance the Confederate flag and banners emblematic of the late war having inscribed on them mottoes indicative of Confederate sympathies, would be permitted to march unmolested through the streets of any Northern city? Yet to be consistent, those who take the side of the Orangemen and advocate their right to parade, must also accord the same right to a Confederate society. If they do not, then it depends altogether upon the object which an organization of men may have in view whether they will be permitted to parade or not. We make a distinction, one claim the right to judge as to the character and purposes of the body of men proposing to hold a procession, and away goes the principle upon which rest the advocates of this right of any and every body of men to march through the streets of a city without let or hindrance of the public authorities. Here in New Orleans, more than one since the war closed, have the public authorities been compelled to succeed the right to prohibit at times of election, political clubs from marching through the streets. And doubt the authorities claim and exercise every day the right to prevent individual citizens from committing a breach of the peace, in the streets or elsewhere, by engaging in personal combat? Why then should not the public authorities have the right to prohibit bodies of men from coming most obnoxious in the streets of a city, thus endangering the lives and the property of innocent persons?

The Philadelphia *Ledger* thinks that in a proper case, the municipal authorities have a legal right to prohibit processions which from their character and purposes are likely to provoke a breach of the public peace. That is also our opinion, and we do not think Gov. Hoffman has any reason to boast of his success in vindicating public liberty on the occasion of the Orangemen's procession. His measures were not of the proper description and they have just narrowly escaped a great calamity. He might have summoned the citizens to assemble as a committee of