

be complained of, *these cases will be reported to these headquarters, when such orders will be made as shall be deemed necessary.*

"While the General thus indicates his purpose to respect the liberties of the people, he wishes all to understand that armed insurrection or forcible resistance to the laws *will be instantly suppressed by arms.*"

This order was issued more than two years after the war had closed. The merit claimed for it is, that it recognizes the civil authority of the State of Louisiana as the lawful governing authority of that State. *And for this reason, and on this account,* the Democratic party has avowedly given General Hancock the nomination for the presidency. Yet it is perfectly plain that the order, in every part of it, contemplates the *supremacy of his headquarters over the civil authority of the State of Louisiana.*

Imagine for a moment such an order at this time (1880) in Louisiana, or any other State! Imagine General Hancock now saying to the people of New York (his headquarters now being in that State) that if the civil courts of New York fail to administer justice, complaint can be made at his headquarters and he will issue such orders as the case may require!

This suggests to the mind the patent fact that what is appropriate for one time may not be appropriate for another time. A distinguished soldier is nominated for the presidency for doing in 1867 that which, if done to-day, would be regarded as the act of a demented person.

In the same way that it was proper and laudable for General Hancock in 1867 to hold the army *in terrorem* over the civil courts of Louisiana for the humane protection of the citizens of that State, so it was right and just and humane to try the assassins of President Lincoln by a military court in 1865.

No one doubts that President Lincoln was assassinated by Wilkes Booth. No one doubts the guilt of his male accomplices. No one complains of the punishment they received. But there is a sentimental idea that there was some sort of injustice done to the woman, Mrs. Surratt. It is creditable to the chivalric feelings of the American people that they recoil at the idea of hanging a woman. Yet it is perfectly true that all the crimes in the calendar have at one time or another been perpetrated by females. It was Jezebel who stirred up Ahab and incited him to the foulest murders. Only recently in the State of Indiana, a woman has been found guilty of the murder of her husband, and is now under sentence of death by hanging. It is needless to cite examples, however.

There was an additional guaranty of the fairness of the proceedings against the assassins of the President, in the fact that *General Hancock, a disciplined, trained and accomplished soldier, was in command at Washington at the time.* His calmness and equipoise.