The New Orleans Bee.

OFFICE 73 CHARTRES STREET. NEW ORLEANS, SATURDAY MORNING, APRIL 20, 1872. YEAR—Vol. XLV.—Whole—16,660.

NEW ORLEANS DAILY BEE.

DUFOUR & LIMET, PUBLISHERS.

TERMS OF THE BEE.

Terms of Subscription—Daily, per annum, in advance, $10; Semi-weekly, $5; Weekly, $3. Price at the Office—Daily, 5 cents; Semi-weekly, 10 cents; Weekly, 15 cents. The Semi-Weekly is issued every Tuesday and Saturday morning.

Rates of Advertising—Daily, per square, first insertion, $1 per line; every subsequent insertion, 50 cents per line. Semi-Weekly, per square, first insertion, $1 per line; every subsequent insertion, 50 cents per line. Weekly, per square, first insertion, $1 per line; every subsequent insertion, 50 cents per line.

Advertisements, when advertised twenty times, charged for as fifteen.

First Page, or Editorial Page, double price of Inside Pages.

Advertisements inserted for any number of days, until forbid, will not be charged for after expiration.

All Advertisements not marked for any number of days will be published till forbid, and charged accordingly.

All bills with regular advertisements shall be rendered monthly.

Weekly Edition.

TERMS—ONE YEAR.

NEW ORLEANS:
SATURDAY MORNING, APRIL 20, 1872.

OPERA HOUSE—At noon, "Le Postillon d'Argelès," at night, "Le Bal Masqué."

ACADEMY OF MUSIC—At noon and night, "Black Crook."

ST. CHARLES THEATRE—At noon and night, "Cleaning Wool."

VARIETIES THEATRE—At noon, "Rosalie;" at night, "Marble Heart."

A SELECT COMMITTEE TO THE RESCUE.

The position assumed by the *Bee* on the question of the immediate consideration of State candidates by the Democratic State Convention has aroused the ire of the New Orleans *Times*, which, in two articles published in its morning and evening editions of yesterday, pours out its vials of wrath upon us. There is evidently a great flustering in the devoutest frequented by the conclusion of the *Times* also our observations upon the subject of postponing the selection of candidates by the Convention would have been suffered to pass by. We must have run directly counter to the wishes of the Warmoth ring touching a bargain proposed by the Governor to some of the Democratic leaders, also our denunciation of such a compact would not have provoked attacks so fierce as the *Times* makes upon our journal.

The *Times* insinuates that we have been actuated by improper motives in opposing the postponement of nominations, and indulges in a variety of vituperative epithets against the *Bee*, which we shall treat with the disdain they deserve. We should suffer the *Times* to rant and rave to its heart's content were it not that those who are ignorant of the character of the paper and the connection of its proprietor and editor with Gov. Warmoth and the ring of political tricksters by whom he is surrounded, might suppose that the accusations of the *Times* against us could not be repelled. Here where the *Times* is known and understood, it is entirely unnecessary to expose the cunning policy which directs its conduct. We are quite willing that the readers of both papers should judge of their respective claims to the confidence and regard of the public. If our readers are not as "numerous" as those of the *Times*, it is perhaps for the reason that the *Bee* is not willing to imitate the course of its cotemporary, preferring to suffer a loss of circulation rather than court the smiles of the plunderers of our people by deceiving and misleading those who put their confidence in the counsel we offer to them.

The *Times*, strange to say, assumes the character of a Democratic organ and addresses the members of that party as if it were one of their recognized advocates. It tells the members of the Convention, now in session, that we have "insulted" them by urging an immediate selection of candidates for the reason that a delay of a few weeks would leave them exposed to the seductive influence of that very plausible and winning individual who now controls the destinies of our State. The *Times* would excite the sensibilities of the delegates, by suggesting that the advocates of immediate action had no faith in the firmness and integrity of the country members, and therefore wished them to enter at once upon the work of nominating. It accused us of "calumniating" those who compose the majority of the Convention, by imputing "Warmothism" to all who counsel postponement and conciliation. Among the latter, it placed the venerable and estimable temporary President of the body, General Alexander Dechonet, in whose speech in the Convention there was no word said against immediate action.

It will be time enough for us to answer these charges when the gentlemen alluded to call us to an account. In the meantime we doubt very much whether the *Times* has been employed or authorized to speak for them. If we know the views and sentiments of the majority of the members of the Convention, we should judge that they would exclaim, on reading the defence which their self constituted champion makes on their behalf, *non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis; tempus equi.*

That we were justified in warning the Democracy of Louisiana against the Machiavellian wiles of Gov. Warmoth; there can be no doubt. The *Times* does not because it cannot deny that he has made overtures to the party looking to further control of the State Government, and that some prominent and influential Democrats are disposed to accept his proposals. We have indubitable evidence of it in the votes of some of the members of the Convention on the resolution repelling from the body Mr. Thomas Green Davidson, and in the disposition made of the resolution introduced yesterday by Mr. Hunt declaratory of the sense of the Convention with regard to a political connection between the Democratic party and Gov. Warmoth. After all that has passed it was strange that in a Democratic Convention such a resolution was not promptly and unanimously adopted. The reluctance of it to a committee was regarded by everybody as equivalent to a rejection of the resolution, and we shall be agreeably surprised if it shall ever be heard of again. We wish to believe that those members who voted against the expulsion of Mr. Davidson and for the reference of Mr. Hunt's resolution did so for reasons entirely confident with Democratic principles and usages. We shall hope that a willingness to sit in the same Convention with a notorious political blackleg who on the floor of the House openly and boldly avowed himself a friend of Gov. Warmoth, does not mean an approval of the conduct of that individual as a member of the Legislature. We prefer to believe that it was only out of respect to the people of Livingston that their representative was recognized as a member of the Convention.

It is known to us also that prominent citizens hitherto regarded as Democratic chiefs, gentlemen who have enjoyed in past times the confidence and the honors of the people, have been busy for many months in familiarizing them with the idea of managing the aid of Gov. Warmoth in redeeming the State and even the leadership of the party. The favorite expression of these citizens, in speaking of such a combination with Governor Warmoth, is "let us utilize him," if he is willing to exercise his powers in our behalf. The idea of "utilizing" Governor Warmoth, a man who generally demands and receives the full value for any service he renders, is to our minds supremely ridiculous, and we doubt very much whether Governor Warmoth has had money a laugh over the simplicity of those who have fattened him with the hope of recognition by the people of Louisiana as a friend and leader.

We believe that the *Bee* has a secure place in the regard of the people of Louisiana, who have given it many proofs of the confidence reposed in our fidelity to their interests. And with these remarks shall therefore leave to them, to deal with as they see fit, the impudent charges made against us by the *Times* in their behalf.

The Motion to Expel Mr. Davidson.

The *Times* censures those members of the Convention who voted to expel Mr. Davidson, and says:

"Not the slightest support for right, reason or principle was evinced by the majority of the members of the Convention. The majority, we regret to say, acted in political unity, yet to their shame, as a party."

It is a very unfortunate thing to this new doctrine of political unity, that in spite of Mr. Davidson himself, notwithstanding his sins on the floor of the Convention, that the body had no political ends to spend him after he had been expelled in a decent, fair, and just manner. Indeed, it is a fact, that the majority of the members of both the Democratic and Republican factions in the Convention voted against the motion to expel Mr. Davidson. Mr. Davidson himself, however, voted against his expulsion, and he only was the author of the resolution. Yet the *Times* would have the people believe that the Democratic party, as a party, was guilty of the act, and that the Democratic party, as a party, should be held responsible for it. Such is the character of the reasoning of the *Times* when it undertakes to defend the Democratic party from the charge of being a party to the expulsion of Mr. Davidson. The truth is, that the Democratic party had no more to do with the expulsion of Mr. Davidson than it had with the expulsion of Mr. Pinchback, or any other member of the Legislature who was expelled for his conduct in that body. The Democratic party, as a party,