NEW ORLEANS REPUBLICAN.

SINGLE COPIES: TEN CENTS. OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE STATE OF LOUISIANA. TERMS: $16 00 PER ANNUM.

VOLUME IV—NO. 52. NEW ORLEANS, SATURDAY, JUNE 11, 1870. WHOLE NUMBER 994.

AMUSEMENTS.

FETE CHAMPETRE
IN
CARROLLTON GARDENS.

The ladies of Emmanual Church, assisted by the ladies of the Sixth District and vicinity, who are now working to obtain a new Church on St. Charles street, have decided to give another

Festival at the Carrollton Gardens, Commencing on June 7.

The Grounds will be brilliantly illuminated, a new DANCING PLATFORM laid down and is lighted by the Puroline and Portable Gas Light Company. A splendid band of music engaged for the occasion.

The steamboats departing on the evening of the Fete will bring all who desire to visit the grounds.

The tables will be beautifully decorated with flowers and evergreens, and filled with the rarest viands and the coolest Champagne Punches, Lemonades and Creams.

The grounds will be open at five o'clock.

Tickets fifty cents, to be had at the Music Stores and at the gate of the Gardens, on the evenings of the seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth and eleventh of June.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

MRS. MORRISON,	MRS. COLEMAN,
MRS. GARNER	MRS. BRADFORD,
MRS. HODGES,	MRS. BODLEY,
MRS. HANNY,	MRS. BURBANK,
MRS. JACKSON,	MRS. FRYE,

jel And others

LOTTERIES.

DRAWING OF THE LOUISIANA STATE LOTTERY FOR JUNE 10, 1870
CLASS 137.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
24	33	40	35	67	52	31	66	41	72	25	—	—	—	—

The above drawings are published in all the principal papers, and are drawn in public daily at the rooms of the Company.
Information furnished and prizes cashed by
HOWARD, SIMMONS & CO., Contractors,
St. Charles street, corner Union, New Orleans.

Witness our hands at New Orleans, Louisiana, this tenth day of June, 1870.
H. PERALTA,
ADAM GIFFEN,
Commissioners.
BEWARE OF BOGUS LOTTERIES. ap28

LOUISIANA STATE LOTTERY COMPANY.
Incorporated August 17, 1868.
CHARLES T. HOWARD.....PRESIDENT.

SINGLE NUMBER LOTTERY.
GRAND SCHEME—ONLY 20,000 NUMBERS.
Capital Prize.....$50,000.

CLASS H,
TO BE DRAWN AT NEW ORLEANS ON Saturday, June 25, 1870.
HOWARD, SIMMONS & CO., Contractors.

SCHEME:
20,000 Numbers—Tickets Only $20.

1 Prize of $50,000 is		$50 000
1 Prize of 30,000 is		30 000
1 Prize of 20 000 is		20 000
1 Prize of 10,000 is		10 000
1 Prize of 9,000 is		9 000
1 Prize of 8,000 is		8,000
1 Prize of 7,000 is		7, 000
1 Prize of 6,000 is		6,000
1 Prize of 5,000 is		5,000
1 Prize of 4,000 is		4,000
1 Prize of 3,000 is		3,000
1 Prize of 2,000 is		2,000
1 Prize of 1,000		
1 Prize of 1,000		
1 Prize of 1,000		
1 Prize of 1,000		
1 Prize of 1,000		
1 Prize of 1,000		
1 Prize of 1,000		
1 Prize of 1,000		
1 Prize of 1,000		
1 Prize of 1,000		
1 Prize of 1,000		
1 Prize of 1,000		
1 Prize of 1,000	are	28,000
1 Prize of 1,000		
1 Prize of 1,000		
1 Prize of 1,000		
1 Prize of 1,000		
1 Prize of 1,000		
1 Prize of 1,000		
1 Prize of 1,000		
1 Prize of 1,000		
1 Prize of 1,000		
9 Prizes of 500 are		25,000
9 Prizes of 200 are		63,400
9 Prizes, amounting to		$280,400

Whole Tickets, $20; shares in proportion.
Prizes payable without deduction.
Orders to be addressed to
CHAS. T. HOWARD,
Lock box 692, Postoffice, New Orleans.
Send postoffice money order, or register your letter. fe

REMOVALS.

REMOVAL.....REMOVAL.

The undersigned has removed his STONE YARD from the old stand, on Customhouse street, to the

ARTIFICIAL FREAR STONE YARD,

on Poydras street, between Locust and Freret streets, and the office to No. 36 Natchez street.

In extending and consolidating his business with the Frear Artificial Stone Company, he would express his thanks to a generous public, the patrons and friends of a business of thirty-eight years standing in this city, and would solicit a continuance of the same to the Louisiana Frear Stone Manufacturing Company. NEWTON RICHARDS.

Referring to the above, the FREAR ARTIFICIAL STONE COMPANY will furnish their STONE, also, Granite and Marble for all purposes of building, fronts of stores and dwellings, steps, window sills, lintels, tombs, monuments, flagging for banquets, yards, garden walks, etc.

Particular attention of property holders, architects and builders is called to the Artificial Frear Stone, now offered as a beautiful and economical substitute for brick and plastered fronts of buildings, and suitable for cornices, window trimmings, wall copings, front fences, etc

NEWTON RICHARDS, President.
JAMES CLARK, Secretary.
Depot for the sale of RICHARDS' CAPE LIME. ap13

EDUCATIONAL.

JEFFERSON ACADEMY,
No. 123 Conti street, between Dauphine and Burgundy streets.
CONDUCTED BY G. J. LORD.

This establishment, long known to the public as one of the leading institutions of the South, is again open and ready to receive students, either as day scholars or boarders. ap19 2m

DOLBEAR COMMERCIAL COLLEGE,
Corner Camp and Common Streets, New Orleans.

The oldest and most efficient and successful Commercial College in the United States. There is a full faculty. Citizens and strangers who wish a business education for themselves or sons, are invited to call. Students can enter in any or all the departments of the College and at any time.

N. B. NOT ONE of all the numerous GRADUATES of this College, for the past THIRTY-SEVEN YEARS, is now out of profitable employment so far as known. A word to the WISE is sufficient.

For catalogues, etc., address
de5 1y RUFUS DOLBEAR, President.

BANKS AND BANKING.

ST. CHARLES LOAN OFFICE.
15 ST. CHARLES STREET,
ST. L. DESTEZ,
SUCCESSOR OF A. MARCHAND.
Money loaned on furniture, clothing, jewelry, diamonds, etc. ap2 1y

SPECIE AND EXCHANGE OFFICE
OF
BRUNO & WARNER,
146 Gravier Street, near St. Charles.

Pay the highest prices for all kinds of American and Foreign GOLD, SILVER, BULLION and PAPER MONEY.

Buy and sell GOVERNMENT SECURITIES, STOCKS and COMMERCIAL NOTES. Draw SIGHT and TIME DRAFTS on New York, and all the principal cities of Europe, in sums to suit. de19 1y

RICHARD C. BOND,
(F. F. FISHER),
STOCK AND NOTE BROKER,
No. 162 Common Street,

THE SLAUGHTERHOUSE CASE

JUDGE BRADLEY'S DECISION

MOTION FOR INJUNCTION ON BILL AND ANSWER

The Live Stock Dealers and Butchers' Association of New Orleans et al. vs. the Crescent City Live Stock Landing and Slaughterhouse Company and the Board of Metropolitan Police for the Metropolitan District of New Orleans.

In the United States Circuit Court yesterday Judge Bradley delivered the following decision:

The complainants in this case who are engaged in the Live Stock Landing and Slaughterhouse business pray for an injunction against the defendants, commanding them to suspend all proceedings against the complainants under and by virtue of an act of the Legislature of Louisiana, passed eighth March, 1869, giving to the corporation, defendants, the exclusive right to erect and have live stock landings and slaughterhouses in and about New Orleans, which act the complainants allege to be in violation of the civil rights bill, passed ninth April, 1866, and the first section of the fourteenth amendment of the constitution of the United States; also, that the complainants may be protected in their rights to perform whatever may be lawful and proper in this behalf for any citizen of the State to do, including the defendants, and that their right to slaughter, land, keep, maintain and sell animals for food, and, when prepared for market, to sell and dispose of their meat, subject to no condition more severe than that of any other party, including the defendants, and that they be maintained in their rights to construct all suitable buildings, structures for landing, keeping and preserving animals for sale or use that are allowed to any other citizen of the State, including the defendants.

The application brings up the question whether the civil rights bill applies to such a case as the present, and whether the fourteenth amendment to the constitution is intended to secure to the citizens of the United States of all classes merely equal rights; or whether it is intended to secure to them any absolute rights? And if the latter, whether the rights claimed by the complainants in this bill are among the number of such absolute rights?

As to the civil rights bill, we are clearly of opinion that it does not apply; that it was intended merely to secure to citizens of every race and color the same civil rights and privileges as are enjoyed by white citizens; and not to enlarge or modify the rights or privileges of white citizens themselves.

The fourteenth amendment is much broader in its terms, and must be examined with more attention and care.

The constitution of the United States before the adoption of the recent amendments, contained several provisions for the protection of the people in the enjoyment of their civil rights, liberties and privileges, some of which were binding upon the government of the United States, and others upon the several States. Of the former kind were those which declared, that the privilege of the writ of *habeas corpus* should not be suspended, unless when in cases of rebellion and invasion, the public safety should require it; that no bill of attainder or *ex post facto* law should be passed; that no capitation or other direct tax shall be laid, unless in proportion to the census; that the trial of all crimes shall be by jury, and shall be held in the State where committed; that no person shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act or confession in open court; that no attainder of treason shall work corruption of blood or forfeiture, except during the life of the person attainted, etc.

Those binding on the States were, that no State should make anything but gold and silver coin a tender for payment of debts; nor pass any bill of attainder, *ex post facto* law, or law impairing the obligation of contracts; or lay any imposts or duties on imports or exports except as provided in the constitution; and that the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States.

The latter class of provisions could not be carried into effect by congressional legislation, and depended for their vindication upon the voluntary action of the State Legislature and such jurisdiction as the courts of the United States might have when a case arose in which one of these rights was violated.

Since the breaking out of the late war several amendments to the constitution have been adopted, intended to protect the citizen from oppression by means of State legislation, and to confer upon Congress the power, by appropriate legislation, to carry the amendments into effect. Among these, amendment fourteen declares that all persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to its jurisdiction are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside, and that no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

The new prohibition that "no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States," is not identical with the clause in the constitution which declared that "the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States."

It is possible that those who framed the article were not themselves aware of the far reaching character of its terms. They may have had in mind but one particular phase of social and political wrong, which they desired to redress. Yet, if the amendment, as framed and expressed does, in fact, bear a broader meaning, and does extend its protecting shield over those who were never thought of when it was conceived and put in form, and does reach such social evils which were never before prohibited by constitutional enactment, it is to be presumed that the American people, in giving it their imprimatur, understood what they were doing, and meant to decree what has, in fact, been done.

It embraces much more: The "privileges and immunities," secured by the original constitution, were only such as each State gave to its own citizens. Each was prohibited from discriminating in favor of its own citizens, and against the citizens of other States.

But the fourteenth amendment prohibits any State from abridging the privileges or immunities of the citizens of the United States, whether its own citizens or any others. It not merely requires equality of privileges, but it demands that the privileges and immunities of all citizens shall be absolutely unabridged, unimpaired.

What, then, are the essential privileges which belong to a citizen of the United States as such, and which a State can not by its laws invade? It may be difficult to enumerate or define them. The Supreme Court on one occasion, thought it unwise to do so, (18 Howard, 50). But so far as relates to the question in hand, we may safely say that it is one of the privileges of every American citizen to adopt and follow such lawful industrial pursuit—not injurious to the community—as he may see fit, without unreasonable regulation or molestation, and without being restricted by any of those unjust, oppressive and odious monopolies, or exclusive privileges which have been condemned by all free governments; it is also his privilege to be protected in the possession and enjoyment of his property so long as such possession and enjoyment are not injurious to the community; and not to be deprived thereof without due process of law; it is also his privilege to have, with all other citizens, the equal protection of the laws. Indeed the fourth section

ileges are specified by the words of the amendment.

These privileges can not be invaded without sapping the very foundations of republican government. A republican government is not merely a government of the people, but it is a free government. Without being free, it is republican only in name, and not republican in truth, and any government which deprives its citizens of the right to engage in any lawful pursuit, subject only to reasonable restrictions, or at least subject only to such restrictions as are reasonably within the power of government to impose is tyrannical and unrepublican. And if to force arbitrary restrictions made for the benefit of a favored few, it takes away and destroys the citizens' property without trial or condemnation, it is guilty of violating all the fundamental privileges to which I have referred, and one of the fundamental principles of free government.

There is no more sacred right of citizenship than the right to pursue unmolested a lawful employment in a lawful manner. It is nothing more nor less than the sacred right of labor.

This right is not inconsistent with any of those wholesome regulations which have been found to be beneficial and necessary in every State.

It is not inconsistent with the exclusive right to make, use and vend to others for a limited period a new and useful invention which the grantee or patentee has produced from his own brain or ingenuity. Society only gives to him the temporary use of that which, without him, it would not have had the benefit of, as a consideration of that benefit, and to encourage others to make like use of their powers.

It is not inconsistent with the exclusive right to use a franchise; that is, a right to do what the Legislature alone can authorize to be done, and which no private citizen has a right to do without such authority, such as to build and operate a railroad, to make a canal or turnpike, to establish a ferry, and other such public rights which involve a charge upon the public, and in most cases an exercise of the right of eminent domain. These franchises may be conferred upon a limited number of persons, natural or corporate, with power, and even exclusive power, to exercise them in certain localities, on certain terms and under certain restrictions. Society obtains a consideration for the grant of these franchises in the investment of large amounts of capital in public improvements, which are required for the development of the country and its resources. They are franchises which can only be exercised as they are conferred by public authority, and can not be exercised and enjoyed by all. They are far different from those ordinary pursuits and employments of mankind which all citizens may properly and lawfully follow as their inclination leads them, and as the laws of demand and supply will allow.

Again: This fundamental right of labor is not inconsistent with that large class of cases, in which the laws require a license or a certificate of requisite qualifications for admission to a particular employment or profession. No doubt there are many such, as to which the interests of society require that due preparation should be made and due qualifications should be possessed, before a person shall be allowed to enter them. But then they are open to all alike. None are excluded from the race of honorable competition, by which to enter those employments, or by which to attain their honors. There is no corporate and exclusive guild of privileged individuals to which they are confined, and beyond the sacred pale of which there is no hope of admittance or promotion.

Nor is it inconsistent with the granting of a limited number of municipal licenses to follow certain pursuits, such as vending of intoxicating drinks, selling of drugs, or even selling of meats, and keeping a market therefor. Public policy may require that these pursuits should be regulated and supervised by the local authorities, in order to promote the public health, the public order, and the general well being. But they are open to all proper applicants, and none are rejected except those who fail to exhibit the requisite qualifications and guarantees, or who, after proper selections are made, would increase the number beyond what the interests and good order of society would bear. In those cases none are excluded for the purpose of sustaining a monopoly. But each avocation is, or at least is supposed to be, examined on its own merits.

All these systems of regulation are useful and entirely competent to the governing power, and are not at all inconsistent with the great right of *liberty of pursuit*, which is one of the fundamental principles of a free government, as well as one of the fundamental privileges of an American citizen.

The next question is—Do the law complained of, and the proceedings under it, conflict with the enjoyment of this fundamental privilege of the complainants? Or is it only such a political and police regulation as it is competent for a State Legislature to make?

The Legislature has an undoubted right to make all police regulations which they may deem necessary (not inconsistent with constitutional restrictions) for the preservation of the public health, good order, morals and intelligence—but they can not interfere with liberty of conscience, nor with the entire equality of all creeds and religions before the law. Nor can they, under pretense of a police regulation, interfere with the fundamental privileges and immunities of American citizens. The question has its limits in both directions; and while we are to be specially careful not to do anything that may trench upon the vast and almost limitless field of legislation, where the will of the people is supposed to be most freely and powerfully expressed; it is, nevertheless, our duty, with a firm and unflinching hand, to prevent the invasion of any clear and undoubted individual rights of the citizen which are secured to him by the constitution.

The law in question, under which the acts complained of were comitted, is one of a remarkable character. It was passed March 8, 1869, and is entitled "An act to protect the health of the city of New Orleans, to locate stock landings and slaughterhouses, and to incorporate the 'Crescent City Live Stock Landing and Slaughterhouse Company.'" It enacts that after the first of June, 1869, it shall not be lawful to land, keep or slaughter any cattle, beeves, calves, sheep, swine or other animals, or to have, keep or establish any stock landing, yards, pens, slaughterhouses or *abattoirs*, at any point or place within the city of New Orleans, or the parishes of Orleans, Jefferson and St. Bernard, or at any point or place on the east bank of the Mississippi river within the corporate limits of New Orleans, or at any point on the west bank of the Mississippi, above the present depot of the New Orleans, Opelousas and Great Western Railroad Company, except that the Crescent City Live Stock Landing and Slaughterhouse Company may establish themselves at any point or place as hereinafter provided. A penalty of two hundred and fifty dollars is imposed for every violation of this section. Thus far, the act, barring the exception at the close, is a mere police regulation, and, no doubt, a very proper one. The territory named extends some eight or ten miles on each side of the river Mississippi, and includes the entire city of New Orleans, and a large extent of surrounding country.

The next section incorporates William D. Sanger and others, seventeen persons in all, and their successors, into a body politic and corporate, to be called "The Crescent City Live Stock Landing and Slaughterhouse Company."

The third section enacts that said corporation may establish and erect, at its own expense, at any point or place on the east bank of the Mississippi river, within the parish of St. Bernard, or the corporate limits of the city of New Orleans, below the United States Barracks, or at any point or place on the west bank of the river, below the present depot of the Opelousas Railroad, wharves, stables, sheds, yards and buildings necessary to land, stable, shelter, protect and preserve all kinds of horses, mules, cattle, and other animals; and that said company shall have the sole and exclusive privilege of [illegible] and carrying

on the live stock landing and slaughterhouse business within the limits and privileges granted by the provisions of this act. The section then enacts that all cattle and other animals destined for sale or slaughter in New Orleans, or its environs, shall be landed and kept at these landings and yards, for which the company are to be paid certain fees named in the act; and in default of payment are to have the privilege of selling the cattle therefor; and every violation of these privileges by landing or yarding elsewhere is to be subject to a penalty of $250. The section goes on to require the company, by the first of June, 1869, to build a grand slaughterhouse of sufficient capacity to accommodate all butchers, and in which to slaughter five hundred animals per day; also sheds, stables, etc., to accommodate all the stock received at this port, under penalty of forfeiting their charter.

The fourth section authorizes the company to erect landing places for live stock at any points or places consistent with the act, and to have the exclusive privilege of having landed thereon all animals intended for sale or slaughter in the parishes of Orleans and Jefferson; and to erect one or more slaughterhouses at any points or places consistent with the act, and to have the exclusive privilege of having slaughtered therein all animals the meat of which is destined for sale in the parishes of Orleans and Jefferson.

Section five directs the closing of all other stock landings and slaughterhouses after the completion of the company's, in the parishes of Orleans, Jefferson and St. Bernard, and forbids any slaughtering therein under a penalty of $100 for every offense, and enacts that all animals to be slaughtered in the parishes of Orleans or Jefferson, must be slaughtered in the slaughterhouses erected by the company, and the company, on refusal to permit the same, will be subject to fine.

Section six provides for an inspector of cattle, to be appointed by the Governor, to inspect all cattle to be slaughtered.

Section seven fixes the fees to be paid to the company for slaughtering in their houses, namely: One dollar apiece for all beeves, etc., besides the head, feet, gore and entrails.

Section nine authorizes the company to lay railroads from their buildings to the city, and to establish ferries across the Mississippi river.

Section ten limits the charter to twenty-five years.

These are the provisions of the law. The complainants allege that they have been injured by its operation, and by the acts and proceedings of the defendants under it.

They state in their bill that for a long time past they have been engaged in the lawful prosecution of the live stock landing and slaughterhouse business, and in procuring, preparing, dressing and vending of animal food for the markets of New Orleans and the parishes of Jefferson and St. Bernard, and the steamers and other vessels engaged in the commerce of the same; and that more than a thousand persons were connected with the trade aforesaid, and that the corporation complainant was formed to prosecute the trade and to provide suitable houses and conveniences therefor, and that the said corporation and its members, to the number of two hundred and fifty persons, and others in their employ, to the number of two hundred persons, have been hitherto engaged in the said trade and business.

They complain that their rights are invaded by the act in question; that the Crescent City Company have brought several hundred suits against them, or some of them, have obtained injunctions, and in other ways vexed and harrassed the complainants under color of the said act; that the decisions and judgments of the State Supreme Court have been adverse to the complainants; and that although the said decision and judgments have been removed to the Supreme Court of the United States by writs of error, in such manner that said writs operated as a supersedeas, yet that the defendants have disregarded the same, and have applied to the Eighth District Court of the parish of Orleans, and have obtained a writ which they call an injunction, directed to the Metropolitan Police Board, without making the complainants or any of them parties to the proceeding, by which writ said Metropolitan Police Board were commanded and enjoined to prevent all persons from landing, keeping or slaughtering any cattle, beeves, calves, sheep, swine, or other animals, and from keeping or establishing any stock landings, yards, pens, slaughterhouses, or abattoirs, at any point or place within the city of New Orleans, or the parishes of Orleans, Jefferson and St. Bernard, and to prevent any and all persons from selling or offering for sale in the city of New Orleans any animal for human food not slaughtered and inspected at the slaughterhouse of said company; and that the said Metropolitan Police Board did thereupon seize and possess themselves of meat, to the value of $20,000, which was in carts and vehicles on their way to the markets, and have kept the same open and exposed until it has spoiled. The bill contains other allegations showing that the complainants are exposed to multiplicity of suits, to vexatious litigation, and to irreparable mischief and damage by the unjust acts and proceedings of the defendants, the Crescent City Company.

To this bill the defendants have filed an answer in the nature of the demurrer, objecting, first, to the jurisdiction of this court because the parties all reside in Louisiana, and the Circuit Court of the United States can not enjoin proceedings in a State court. Secondly, that the bills set up the same matters which are set forth in a petition filed by the complainants in the State court, and decided by the Supreme Court of Louisiana, and from which decision a writ of error has been granted to remove the same to the Supreme Court of the United States. Thirdly, because the statute referred to is constitutional and valid, containing only police regulations, in no manner conflicting with the constitution of the United States, or the amendments thereof.

Before proceeding to examine the technichal points raised by the defendants, we will conclude the discussion of the main question arising upon the act of the Legislature and the fourteenth amendment.

So far as the act of the Legislature of Louisiana is a police regulation, it is, of course, entirely within its power to enact it. It is claimed to be nothing more. But this pretence is too bald for a moment's consideration. It certainly does confer on the defendant corporation a monopoly of a very odious character. If it be not fairly and fully within the definition of a monopoly given in the great case of monopolies, 11 Coke's Rep. 85, it is difficult to conceive of a case which would be within it. But it is not sufficient to show that it is a monopoly and void at common law, for the Legislature may alter the common law and may establish a monopoly, unless that monopoly be one which contravenes the fundamental rights of the citizen protected by the constitution. We have already seen that some monopolies are legal, if not politic. But is this such an one as will be endured in a free country, under a constitution which guarantees to the citizen his fundamental privileges and immunities? This is the precise question for us to decide. And we admit that the question is one of great delicacy and embarrassment. When the question was first presented, our impressions were decidedly against the claim put forward by the plaintiffs. But the more we have reflected on the subject the more we are satisfied that the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution was intended to protect the citizens of the United States in some fundamental privileges and immunities of an absolute and not merely of a relative character. And it seems to us that it would be difficult to conceive of a more flagrant case of violation of the fundamental rights of labor than the one before us.

It was very ably contended, on the part of the defendants, that the fourteenth amendment was intended only to secure to all citizens equal capacities before the law. That was at first our view of it. But it does not so read. The language is: "No State shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States." What are the privileges and immunities of citizens of

the United States? Are they capacities merely? Are they not also rights?

In the case before us the citizen has chosen a lawful and useful employment. He has been brought up to it and educated in it. He has invested property in it. He is willing to comply with all police regulations, properly such, in the exercises of it. He will not offend in any particular the regulations which the legislative or the municipal authorities may adopt. He will observe times, seasons, places, localities. But all is not enough. He is required to land his cattle on a privileged person's landing; to keep them in that person's yard or pen; to slaughter them in that person's house, and to pay a burdensome toll for these restrictions. He may construct a landing, a yard, a slaughterhouse equally as good within the prescribed limits of locality, and subject to all the necessary regulations, but that will not do. He must go to the privileged person and use his premises, and pay for their use.

This is not because the privileged person is the inventor of such accommodation, nor because the use of them is a franchise lying only in the public grant, nor because the privileged person is qualified by superior education and license, nor because he has received a municipal license as a herdsman or a butcher, but because he has obtained the exclusive privilege granted by the act.

The *ipse dixit* of the Legislature assigns a lawful and ordinary employment to one set of men, and denies and forbids it to another. The injustice perpetrated under acts of irresponsible legislation, has become a crying evil in our country. And while it must generally be without redress, except through the action of the elective body or the local courts, yet in those instances where the Federal constitution has provided a remedy, we ought not to shrink from granting the appropriate relief. We do not give any weight to imputations upon the honesty or integrity of the Legislature, the courts or the Executive of the State.

We are not authorized to do so. We are bound to presume, and do presume, that they have severally acted in good faith, and with an honest purpose not to transcend the limits of their constitutional powers. They have their duties to perform; we have ours. And while we feel it due to them to examine their acts with great caution and due respect, we nevertheless feel bound to exercise an independent judgment.

Unless this be done by all who have public duties to perform, there will be no certain foundation to stand upon.

In the exercise of that judgment, we feel compelled to decide that the act in question is a violation of one of the fundamental privileges of the citizen, and that an injunction would have to be granted substantially as prayed for, but for one of the technical objections raised by the answer of the defendants.

The defendants to the bill had filed an answer, in the form of a demurrer, objecting first to the jurisdiction of the court, because all the parties resided in Louisiana, and the Circuit Court of the United States could not enjoin proceedings in the State courts.

Secondly, That the bill sets up the same matter which was set forth in the petition filed by the plaintiffs, in the State court, upon which a decision was rendered, and from which a writ of error had been granted.

Thirdly, Because the statute referred to was constitutional and valid, containing only police regulations, in no manner conflicting with the constitution of the United States and the fourteenth amendment.

The objection that the Circuit Court of the United States could not enjoin proceedings in the State court, was an objection which could not be surmounted.

The fourteenth amendment authorized Congress by appropriate legislation to carry the provisions of the amendment into effect. Congress, in the exercise of the power thus given, would undoubtedly have the right to authorize the Federal courts to take jurisdiction of cases of this sort and to enjoin proceedings in the State courts, as well as proceedings in the Federal courts.

But Congress had not as yet assumed that jurisdiction; Congress had not as yet passed any such law, and therefore the courts were left to the provisions regulating the proceedings of the United States courts passed seventy or eighty years ago. The third section of the act of 1793 declares that no writ of injunction shall be granted to stay proceedings in any court of a State.

This act had never been repealed. The court, therefore, felt compelled by the want of the ordinary power to issue the requisite process to refuse the injunction prayed for, to restrain the defendants from proceeding with the legal remedy which they had instituted in the State courts.

The court could not interfere with those proceedings.

The remedy of the parties was to allow the proceedings to pass to judgment, and if the highest court of the State should decree against the construction of the fourteenth amendment, which was claimed by them, and which this court had assented to, then they could carry the case up by writ of error to the Supreme Court of the United States, and have the whole case reviewed.

For reasons orally assigned, considering that this court is without power to enjoin process from the State court and other objections raised to the jurisdiction, it is ordered and decreed that the injunction applied for by the complainants be denied with costs.

Weekly Coffee Statement.

Messrs. Lonsdale, Marks & Co., coffee brokers, furnish us the following report:

	Bags.
Imports from Rio de Janeiro from July 1, 1868, to July 1, 1869	169,841
Imports from July 1, to date	139,742
Stock in first hands	1,000
Stock made up as follows—Lacey, Terry & Co.	1,000

Market—Gold duty paid:

Prime	17¼@17⅝
Good	16¼@16¾
Fair	15¼@16

Remarks—Dealers hold, say 6500 bags.

Assessments Nos. fourteen, fifteen, sixteen and seventeen—see special notice column. Death of Lawrence Schaeffer, Smith Broas, Eusebius Franz and Jacob Klein, payable at the office of the Mutual Aid and Benevolent Life Insurance Association of Louisiana, No. 120 Carondelet street.

To-night closes the Fete Champetre at the Carrollton garden. Of course it will be thronged. The steamers Natchez, Belle Lee, St. John and Wagner, will convey their crowds, while every facility will be afforded by the car company for the return of visitors. The most interesting features have been reserved for the finale. To-night will be determined to which popular ladies shall be awarded the sewing machine, the diamond ring, the Natchez cake and the St. John cake, and to which popular base ball club shall be awarded the bat, and to which most popular minister (without reference to denomination) shall be awarded the immense elephant cake, which is surmounted by a perfect imitation of an elephant. These contests have been sources of great fun. Miss Lizzie Kickok is in the lead for the sewing machine, closely followed by Mrs. Hodges and Mrs. Frey. Miss Jennie Leak, whose lunch table is so popular, is the favorite for the ring. Miss Martha Lindop promises to win both the Natchez and St. John cakes. The "bat" is being closely contested. Mr. Morrison, it is believed, will receive the elephant cake. The articles remaining on hand will be auctioned off at the close of the entertainment. The lady managers express the profoundest gratitude to Captain Hickok and his family, for their untiring kindness and assistance to them during the fete. This is, as is well known, perfectly characteristic of that veteran host.

BY TELEGRAPH.

LATEST NEWS FROM ALL POINTS

Red Cloud Reiterates a Demand

DISCUSSIONS ABOUT A CORRESPONDENT

THE DEATH OF CHARLES DICKENS

Cotton Transactions for the Week

DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN MARKETS

WASHINGTON.

Over a Million Internal Revenue Receipts—Clean Sweep by Oregon Democrats—Red Cloud Demands Removal of a Fort—Spurious stamps on North Carolina Tobacco—Army Officers Authorized to Insure their Lives—Deficiency Bill.

WASHINGTON, June 10.—Internal revenue receipts to-day over $1,000,000.

Secretary Boutwell has gone North, and will be absent a week. The President will also be absent a week.

"A masterly inactivity" seems to be the policy of the executive.

Private dispatches from Oregon indicate that the member of Congress, heretofore claimed as a Republican, is a Democrat. The Democrats made a clean sweep of the State.

Red Cloud and his party had a final interview to-day with the Secretary of the Interior, when Red Cloud reiterated his demand, previously made, for the removal of Fort Fetterman, and was informed, much to his dissatisfaction, that the fort would not be removed.

He received the news that arrangements had been made for the departure of himself and party for their homes on Monday next.

Spurious stamps on North Carolina tobacco have been seized in Baltimore. The counterfeits are slightly longer, and the tinted lines of the genuine are absent.

The House has ordered a special committee on the alleged false statements made by a correspondent of the New York *Post*.

During the discussion General Butler said there was no question of veracity between himself and the correspondent.

[Note.—It is due to the craft to say that there is.]

Senate—The book publishers have presented a petition for the modification of the copyright laws.

A bill was introduced authorizing army officers to insure their lives in the life insurance offices of the United States.

The central branch of the Pacific railroad, and the franking privilege were discussed to recess. Senate is in session to-night.

House.—The greater part of the day was consumed in the investigation of the alleged falsity of the dispatch charging Congressional corruption in Cuban affairs. During the discussion, which was very warm, it was shown that newspaper men, as well as preachers and lawyers, had a right to withhold their sources of information. The correspondent in this case was brought to the bar of the House. A motion was made by the aggrieved party that he be expelled from the reporter's gallery, which was amended by the reference to the committee, with power to send for persons and papers.

The deficiency bill as it was returned from the Senate was considered. The Senate made 256 amendments. The first, regarding the court of claims, was adopted, provided that no pardon or amnesty had been granted by the President, whether general or special, by proclamation or otherwise, nor any acceptance of such pardon or amnesty, nor oath taken, or other act performed in pursuance of or as a condition thereof, shall be admissable on the part of any claimants in the court of claims as evidence in support of any claim against the United States or to establish the standing of any claimant in said court, or his right to bring or maintain suit therein, except where such pardon and amnesty were granted, and oath of allegiance and amnesty taken in good faith during the continuance of active operations of the late rebellion, under the proclamation of President Lincoln, issued in pursuance of the thirteenth section of the act of Congress, known as the confiscation act, approved July 17, 1862, pledging the public faith for a restoration of the rights of property. Where all the requirements and conditions named in said act and proclamation have been faithfully complied with, and said oath of amnesty and allegiance kept and maintained inviolate, and this is hereby declared to be the true intent and meaning in this regard of the several acts conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims, and of the said act of July 17, 1862, and the said proclamation of President Lincoln founded thereon.

Without further progress on deficiency bill, the Senate adjourned.

The persistent wet weather interferes with outdoor sports.

NEW YORK.

Governments Lower—Southerns Quiet and Steady—Scheme of a National Lodge Abandoned—Elevated Railroad a Success—Northern Pacific Railroad Contracts.

NEW YORK, June 10, Evening.—Money closed at 3@5. Sterling 9¾@9⅞. Gold 113¼. Governments ¼ lower. Southern securities closed quiet and steady.

The Grand Lodge to day abandoned the scheme establishing a National Lodge.

The elevated railroad is in successful operation—patronage limited.

Money closed easy; discounts 6@7. Exchange dull and steady. Gold dull and heavy. Governments closed dull and weak, about ¼ off since noon; 81s, 118; 5-20 of 1862, 112; 64s, 111¾; 65s, 112¼; new, 113¾; 67s, 113¾; 68s, 113¾; 10-40s, 108½.

Southern securities opened with principal dealings in new Tennessees, during the afternoon quiet and steady. Closing sales: Tennessees 63; new 61¾. Virginias 68; new 67. Louisianas 75; new 71; levee sixes 75; eights 92. Alabama eights 101; fives 76. Georgia sixes 88; sevens 95. North Carolinas 47; new 24¼. South Carolinas 93; new 82¼.

Contracts were completed to-day for fully equipped completion of the Minnesota section of the Northern Pacific railroad, which comprises 230 miles.

Sub-treasury balance $88,220,000, of which $10,500,000 is currency.

FOREIGN.

Another Yacht Race—General Amnesty for Political Offenses—Monipensier Asks a Passport to England—Death of Charles Dickens—Obituary Articles of the Press—Abolition of Cuban Slavery Advocated.

LONDON, June 10.—The Egeria won Wednesday's yacht race by one minute and forty seconds, though the Gloriana was housed first. The Egeria had tonnage allowances.

The *Globe*, in its edition of last evening, startled the community with the announcement that Charles Dickens had been seized with paralysis, and was lying insensible at his residence at Gads Hill, near Rochester, in Kent. The news spread rapidly, creating the most profound regret, but worse was still to come.

Telegrams have since been received, which announce the death of the great novelist at a quarter to six this evening. Mr. Dickens was at dinner on Wednesday, when he was seized with the fit. Dr. Steele, of the village of Stroud, who was in former years the family physician of Mr. Dickens, was immediately called in and remained until nearly midnight.

The condition of the patient becoming worse and worse, it was deemed advisable to summon physicians from London, and telegrams were promptly dispatched, and this morning several London physicians arrived at Gad's Hill. A consultation was held and the case was at once pronounced hopeless. The patient sank gradually, and died at fifteen minutes after six this evening.

Mr. Dickens had been ill for several days, but not seriously. He had even visited Rochester and other points during the present week.

The death of Mr. Dickens has plunged the nation into mourning. This morning's *Times* says the ordinary expressions of regret are now cold, and a convectional million of people feel a personal bereavement. Statesmen, savans and benfactors of their race, when they die, can leave no such void. They can not, like this great novelist, be an inmate of every house.

The *Daily Telegraph* says: "Without an intellectual pedigree, his writings form an era in English literature. He was generous, loving and universally beloved. He leaves, like Thackery, an unfinished story."

The *Post* says Mr. Dickens did more than any contemporary to make English literature loved and admired.

The *Telegraph* regards the distinguished dead as a public servant, whose task is nobly fulfilled.

All the morning papers published obituary articles.

The *Times* says John S. Fiske, who has been arrested in Scotland, was connected with the Boulton masquerade. Bail has been refused him.

To-day was observed as a holiday at Manchester.

MADRID, June 10.—The Duke Montpensier has asked for a passport to England.

A deputy to the Cortes from Porto Rico, advocated the abolition of slavery.

LISBON, June 10.—Amnesty has been decreed for all political offenses since the first of March.

PARI