The New Orleans Ber.

OFFICE 73 CHARTRES STREET. NEW ORLEANS, TUESDAY MORNING, JULY 3, 1866. Vol. XXVII.—New Series. Vol. XVII.—Whole—13,842.

THE PROPOSED NATIONAL CONVENTION AND EXISTING PARTIES.

In a party organization as in a government, there seems to be some kind or vital principle which resists dissolution when all and its constituents immediately, although the term of its mortal existence may have been reached. The New York Times, which wishes to its rather slim and devious way, to both conserve and conservatives the Republican party, supports the call for a National Convention on the 14th of August at Philadelphia, but does so in the hopeful making the occasion the initiative of the reconstruction of its party. The New York World, like the Times, approves the propositions to which delegates will be required to subscribe, but, from its standpoint as a Democratic organ, it objects to the movement in that as "it looks like the initial step towards the formation of new political party." Then the journal repeatedly in this matter the subject of its particular party organization. The offered opportunity of uniting upon common principles which both acknowledge, for a common object which both admit to be vital to constitutional health and integrity of the Union, they refuse to accept without reservation in favor of their respective parties. They are perfectly willing to employ any proposed method of accomplishing the object which both profess to ardently desire so long as it shall not endanger existing political organizations whose inability or impracticability in regard to that object is lamentably patent and manifest. Without have presented upon the merits of the arguments employed on either side, we may remark that patriotism may well move slow when, it has to ride behind such arrangements whose steady wonder seem to be, not how to go on, but how to block the road to each other.

The address accompanying the call for the Philadelphia Convention is signed by A. W. Randall, in his capacity as President of the Executive Committee of the Union Club, headed by Senators Doolittle, and Cowan and others, members of the Committee. It is endorsed by several Senators and Representatives who are not members. Mr. Randall stands in congressional classification as a Republican, and Messrs. Hendricks and Nesmith, who endorse the call are Democrats. It may with the truth and confidence be doubt be regarded as a joint emanation from Republican Republicans and Johnson Democrats having in view, at a present juncture, the support of the Administration, as against the Radical majority in Congress, and the triumph of the President's plan of restoration. How far the basis laid down for the proposed Convention will admit of a similar junction of all Democrats and all Republicans who oppose the Radicals and desire the success of the President's policy in reference to the Constitution and the Union, may be judged from the following extract, which comprises the essential declarations of the address:

Such delegates will be chosen by the electors of the several States who sustain the administration in maintaining unbroken the union of the States under the Constitution as it is, and as it was established and who agree on the following propositions, viz:

The union of the States is in every case indissoluble and is perpetual; and the Constitution of the United States and the laws passed by Congress in pursuance thereof are supreme, and should control the own domestic concerns of the States, to the own judgment exclusively, subject only to the Constitution of the United States, essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depends, and the overthrow of that system by usurpation in centralization of power, in violation would be a revolution, dangerous to our institutions, government and destructive of liberty. Each House of Congress is made, by the Constitution, the sole judge of its election, returns and qualifications of its members, but the admission of loyal Senators and Representatives properly chosen and qualified under the Constitution and laws, is unjust and revolutionary.

Great Washington special says that Thaddeus Stevens and Henry J. Raymond are arranging the movers in the project, and that it will be proposed to meet the views of President Johnson. We can well understand Mr. Raymond's alacrity in supporting a movement designed to defeat the Radicals which has deserted his party. But, if Mr Raymond will his paper, the New York Times, are to be considered as politically identical, it looks rather disingenuous for him, at Washington, to aid in devising a scheme whose face is turned to no existing party, and his paper, at New York, argues it upon the acceptance of Republicans as a means of putting their party on national ground and saving it from perishing in the chasm of chronic sectionalism. "Shall it," (the Republican or "Union Party,") asks the Times, "be the governing party of the future, or shall it struggle and linger, like the Whig party, with glorious traditions indeed, but lacking power to resist more sinful compositions. Words more expressive than those of a sentiment of party, independent of promptings of patriotism and considerations of comprehensive statesmanship, could not well be employed in a like relation. It is obvious that by Mr. Raymond and the Times the sectional party of their party is not put as a supposed necessity, but as a means to prevent their party from perishing in the future.

The union of the States is in every case indissoluble and is perpetual; and the Constitution of the United States and the laws passed by Congress in pursuance thereof are supreme, and should control the own domestic concerns of the States, to the own judgment exclusively, subject only to the Constitution of the United States, essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depends, and the overthrow of that system by usurpation in centralization of power, in violation would be a revolution, dangerous to our institutions, government and destructive of liberty. Each House of Congress is made, by the Constitution, the sole judge of its election returns and qualifications of its members, but the admission of loyal Senators and Representatives properly chosen and qualified under the Constitution and laws, is unjust and revolutionary.

Great Washington special says that Thaddeus Stevens and Henry J. Raymond are arranging the movers in the project, and that it will be proposed to meet the views of President Johnson. We can well understand Mr. Raymond's alacrity in supporting a movement designed to defeat the Radicals which has deserted his party. But, if Mr Raymond will his paper, the New York Times, are to be considered as politically identical, it looks rather disingenuous for him, at Washington, to aid in devising a scheme whose face is turned to no existing party, and his paper, at New York, argues it upon the acceptance of Republicans as a means of putting their party on national ground and saving it from perishing in the chasm of chronic sectionalism. "Shall it," (the Republican or "Union Party,") asks the Times, "be the governing party of the future, or shall it struggle and linger, like the Whig party, with glorious traditions indeed, but lacking power to resist more sinful compositions. Words more expressive than those of a sentiment of party, independent of promptings of patriotism and considerations of comprehensive statesmanship, could not well be employed in a like relation. It is obvious that by Mr. Raymond and the Times the sectional party of their party is not put as a supposed necessity, but as a means to prevent their party from perishing in the future.

The Union is abolished, and neither can nor ought to be re-established in any State or Territory within our jurisdiction.

Each State has the undoubted right to prescribe the qualifications of its own electors, and no general power rightfully can or ought to claim control or influence the free and voluntary action of these States in the exercise of that right.

The maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, and especially of the right of each State to order and control its own domestic concerns, is essential to the integrity of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depends, and the overthrow of that system by usurpation in centralization of power, in violation would be a revolution, dangerous to our institutions, government and destructive of liberty. Each House of Congress is made, by the Constitution, the sole judge of its election returns and qualifications of its members, but the admission of loyal Senators and Representatives properly chosen and qualified under the Constitution and laws, is unjust and revolutionary.

Great Washington special says that Thaddeus Stevens and Henry J. Raymond are arranging the movers in the project, and that it will be proposed to meet the views of President Johnson. We can well understand Mr. Raymond's alacrity in supporting a movement designed to defeat the Radicals which has deserted his party. But, if Mr Raymond will his paper, the New York Times, are to be considered as politically identical, it looks rather disingenuous for him, at Washington, to aid in devising a scheme whose face is turned to no existing party, and his paper, at New York, argues it upon the acceptance of Republicans as a means of putting their party on national ground and saving it from perishing in the chasm of chronic sectionalism. "Shall it," (the Republican or "Union Party,") asks the Times, "be the governing party of the future, or shall it struggle and linger, like the Whig party, with glorious traditions indeed, but lacking power to resist more sinful compositions. Words more expressive than those of a sentiment of party, independent of promptings of patriotism and considerations of comprehensive statesmanship, could not well be employed in a like relation. It is obvious that by Mr. Raymond and the Times the sectional party of their party is not put as a supposed necessity, but as a means to prevent their party from perishing in the future.

The union of the States is in every case indissoluble and is perpetual; and the Constitution of the United States and the laws passed by Congress in pursuance thereof are supreme, and should control the own domestic concerns of the States, to the own judgment exclusively, subject only to the Constitution of the United States, essential to that balance