New Orleans Republican.
OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE UNITED STATES
OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF NEW ORLEANS

SUMNER'S LETTER IN FULL

HIS REPLY TO COLORED MEN

GREELEY AND GRANT

An abstract of Senator Sumner's reply to the letter of certain colored men in Washington was published in Associated Press dispatches to the REPUBLICAN two or three days since. The Memphis *Appeal* of Wednesday contains the full text of the correspondence, which we reproduce:

WASHINGTON, July 30.—The following correspondence has taken place between Hon. Charles Sumner and the colored citizens of the United States:

WASHINGTON, July 11, 1872.

SIR—We, the undersigned, citizens of color, regarding you as the purest and best friend of our race, and admiring your consistent course in the United States Senate and elsewhere as the special advocate of our rights, and believing your course at this critical juncture is the period of our citizenship would be free from personal feeling or partisan prejudice, have ventured to request your opinion as to what action the colored voters of note should take in the presidential contest now pending. The choice of our people is now narrowed down to General Grant or Horace Greeley. Your long acquaintance with both, and your observation have enabled you to arrive at a correct conclusion as to which of the candidates, judging from their antecedents as well as their present position, will, if elected, enforce the requirements of the constitution and laws respecting our civil and political rights with the most heartfelt sympathy and greatest vigor. We hope and trust you will favor us with such reply as will serve to enlighten our minds upon this subject and impel our people to go forward in the right direction. Our confidence in your judgment is so firm that, in our opinion, thousands of intelligent colored voters of the country will be guided in their action by your statement and advice. Hoping to receive a reply soon, we have the honor to be, with great respect, your obedient servants,

A. T. August, M. D.,	David Fisher, Sr.,
John H. Smith,	Edward Cruser,
William A. Wormley,	William Wilson,
R. W. Tompkins,	John H. Brown,
Henry Lace,	W. H. Bell,
J. L. N. Bowen, M. D.,	Jacob Dewitter,
Samuel Proctor,	J. J. Ketchum,
Charles N. Thomas,	William H. Shorter,
Henry Hill,	Thurman S. Shadd,
George D. Johnson,	Chris. A. Fleetwood,
Charles F. Bruce,	David Fisher, Jr.,
David King,	William Polkery.

To Hon. Charles Sumner.

SENATOR SUMNER'S LETTER.

WASHINGTON, July 29, 1872.

GENTLEMEN AND FELLOW CITIZENS—If I have delayed answering your communication of July 11, which was duly placed in my hands by your committee, it is not because the proper course for you seemed doubtful, but because I wished to reflect upon it, and to be able to add by information which time might supply. Since then I have carefully considered the inquiries you have addressed to me, and listened to much on both sides, but my best judgment is in harmony with my hearty conclusion. I am touched by the appeal you make. It is true I am a friend of your race, and I am glad to be assured that, in your opinion, I have held a consistent course in the Senate and elsewhere as the special advocate of your rights. That course, by the blessing of God, I mean to hold. I know your infinite wrongs, and feel for them as though they were my own.

You only do me simple justice when you add a belief that my counsel, at this critical juncture of your citizenship, would be free from personal feelings and partisan prejudice. In answering your inquiries, I can have no feeling except for your good, which I most anxiously seek; nor can any prejudice of any kind be allowed to interfere—the occasion is too solemn—and especially is there no room for personal feeling or for partisan prejudice.

No man or party can expect power except for general welfare, therefore they must be brought to the standard of truth, that they may be seen in life and act. You are right in saying that the choice for the Presidency is now narrowed down to President Grant or Horace Greeley. One of these is to be taken, and assuming my acquaintance with both, and my observation of their lives, you invite my judgment between them, asking me especially which of the two, judging from their antecedents, as well as present position, would enforce the constitution and laws, your civil and political rights, with the most heartfelt sympathy and greatest vigor. Here I remark that in this inquiry you naturally put your rights in the foreground. So do I; believing most sincerely that the best interests of the whole country are associated with the complete recognition of your rights, so that the two races shall live together in unbroken harmony. I also remark that you call attention to two things, the antecedents of the two candidates, and secondly, their present position. You wish to know from these which gives assurance of most heartfelt sympathy and greatest vigor in the maintenance of their rights; in other words, which, judging from the past, will be your truest friend. The communication with which you have honored me, is not alone.

Colored fellow-citizens in other parts of the country, I may say, in nearly every State of the Union, have made similar requests, and some complain that I have thus far kept silent. I am not insensible to this appeal; but, if my opinion is given, it must be candidly, according to my conscience. In this spirit I answer your inquiries, beginning with the antecedents of the two candidates.

Greeley was born in poverty, and educated himself in a printing office. President Grant, fortunate in early patronage, became a cadet at West Point, and was educated at the public expense. One started with nothing but industry and a character; the other started with a military commission. One was trained as a civilian, the other as a soldier. Horace Greeley stood forth as a reformer and an Abolitionist. President Grant enlisted as a pro-slavery Democrat, and, at the election of James Buchanan, fortified by his vote all pretentions of slavery, including the Dred Scott decision. Horace Greeley, from early life, was earnest and constant against slavery, full of sympathy with the colored race and always foremost in the great battle for their rights. President Grant, except as a soldier, summoned by the terrible accident of war, never did anything against slavery, nor has he, at any time, shown any sympathy with the colored race. Horace Greeley earnestly desired that our colored fellow-citizens should vote, and ably championed impartial suffrage. President Grant was on the other side. Beyond these contrasts, which are marked, it can not be forgotten that Horace Greeley is a person of large heart and large understanding; trained to the support of human rights; always ready for any good cause, and never deterred by opposition or reproach, as when for long years he befriended your people. Add to these the qualities conspicuous in his life, his untiring industry, which leaves no moment without its fruits; abundant political knowledge and acquaintance with history, the instinct and grasp of statesmanship, an amiable nature, a magnanimous soul, and above all, an honesty which no suspicion has touched, and you have a brief portraiture. These are the antecedents of Horace Greeley. Few of these things appear in the President. His great success in war can not change the record of his conduct toward your people, especially in contrast with the lifetime fidelity of his competitor; while there are unhappy antecedents showing that in the prosecution of his plans, he cares nothing for the colored race. The story is painful but it must be told. I refer to the outrages perpetrated upon Hayti, [illegible] shades avenged in the [illegible] of self government. [illegible] instructive authority, revolting beyond question in their nature and which is attested by documentary evidence. Conceiving the idea of annexing Dominica, which is the Spanish part of the island, and shrinking at nothing, he began by seizing the government war powers, in flagrant violation of the constitution, and then, at a great expenditure of money, sent several armed ships of the navy, including monitors, to maintain the usurper Baez in power, that through him he might obtain the coveted prize. Not content with this audacious dictatorship, he proceeded to strike at the independence of the black republic in an open menace of war, and all without the sanction of Congress, to which is committed the war-making power. Sailing into the harbor of Port-au-Prince with the most powerful monitor, the Dictator—properly named for this service—also the frigate Severn, as consort, and other monitors in their train, the Admiral, acting under instructions from Washington, proceeded to the executive mansion, accompanied by the officers of his squadron, and then pointing to the great war ships in sight from the windows, dealt his menace of war, threatening to sink or capture the Haytien ships. The President was black, not white. The Admiral would have done no such thing to any white ruler, nor would our country have tolerated such a menace from any government in the world. Hence was an indignity not only to a black republic with its population of eight hundred thousand, but to the African race everywhere, and especially in our own country. Nor did it end here. For while this navy of the United States was hovering on the coast keeping that insulted people in constant anxiety, while President Grant was to them like a hawk sailing in the air, and ready to swoop upon his prey, this heartless, cruel proceeding found a victim among our white fellow-citizens. An excellent merchant of Connecticut, praised by all who knew him, was plunged into prison by Baez, where he was immured because it was feared he would write against the treaty annexation, and this captivity was prolonged with the connivance of two agents of the President—one of whom is found constantly with him, and is part of the military ring immediately about him. That such an outrage could go unpunished shows the little regard of the President for human rights, whether in white or black. I confess my trials, as I was called to witness these things, always a supporter of the administration, and sincerely desiring to labor with it, I had never uttered a word with regard to it, except in kindness. My early opposition to the treaty of annexation was reserved, so that for some time my opinions were unknown. It was only when I saw the breach of all law, human and divine, that I was aroused, and then began the anger of the President and his rings, military and senatorial. Devoted to the African race, I left for them, besides being humbled, this great republic, acting through its President, could set such an example, where the national constitution, international law and humanity were all sacrificed. Especially was I moved when I saw the indignity to the colored race which was accomplished by trampling upon the fundamental principles of international law declaring the equality of the nation as our Declaration of Independence declares the equality of men. This terrible transaction, which nobody can defend, is among the antecedents of President Grant, by which you can judge how much the colored race can rely upon his heartfelt sympathies. Nor can it be forgotten that shortly after the return of the commission from this island, Hon. Fred Douglass, the colored orator, accomplished in manners as in eloquence, was thrust away from the company of the commissioners at a common table of the mail packet on the Potomac, almost within sight of the executive mansion, simply on account of his color. But the President, at whose invitation he had joined the commission, never uttered a word in condemnation; and when entertaining the returned commissioners at dinner, carefully omitted Douglass, who was in Washington at the time, and thus repeated the indignity. Other things might be mentioned as showing the sympathy of the President, but I can not forget the civil rights bill, which is the capstone of that equality before the law to which all are entitled, without distinction of color. President Grant, who could lobby so assiduously for his San Domingo scheme, fell wrong to the colored race, could do nothing for this beneficent measure. During the long session of Congress it was constantly discussed, and the colored people everywhere hung upon the debate; but there was no heartfelt sympathy from the President. At least, just before the nominating convention, he addressed a letter to a meeting of colored fellow-citizens in Washington, called to advance this cause, where he avoided the question by declaring himself in favor of the full exercise of those rights to which every citizen should be entitled, leaving it uncertain whether the colored people are justly entitled to the rights secured by the pending bill. I understand that Mr. Greeley has been already assailed by an impracticable Democrat as being friendly to this bill, but nobody has hoped against President Grant on this account.

Among the antecedents I deem it my duty to mention is the little capacity of industry of the President in protecting the colored people and assuring peace at the South.

Nobody can doubt that a small portion of effort and earnest will, even without the lobbying so freely given to the San Domingo scheme, would have averted those Ku Klux outrages which we deplore, so that there would have been no pretense for further legislation by Congress. But as he was disabled, both by the character and the drawback of his own conduct, after violating the constitution and international law to insult the black republic, and setting an example of insubordination, he was not in a condition to rebuke the law breakers.

Second—Passing from antecedents, I now come to the present position of the two candidates, which is the subject of your next inquiry. If in any former particulars the two are on an equality, yet in all substantial respects the obvious advantage is with Horace Greeley. Each was nominated by Republican conventions, one at Cincinnati and the other at Philadelphia. In this respect they may seem to be on an equality, but it will not fail to be observed that the convention at Cincinnati was composed of able and acknowledged Republicans, many of whom have acted with the party from its first formation, and who, without previous organization, came together voluntarily for the sake of reform and purity in the government, while on the other hand the convention at Philadelphia was composed of delegates chosen largely under the influence of office-holders, who assembled to sustain what is known as Grantism. Seeing the personal government and personal pretensions of President Grant, involving nepotism, repayment of gifts by official patronage, neglect of public duty, absenteeism, military rule, disregard of the constitution and laws, with general unfitness, and indignity to the colored race, all of which is so unrepublican as to make his support impossible by true Republicans, therefore the convention held at Philadelphia, calling itself Republican, was less Republican than that held at Cincinnati. The two platforms, so far as concerns especially the colored race, are alike in substance, but that of Cincinnati is expressed in terms of the most worth of equal rights. It states and claims that we recognize the equality of all men before the law, and holds that it is the duty of the government in its dealings with the people to mete out equal and exact justice to all, whatever nativity, race, color or persuasion, religious or political. In other respects the Cincinnati platform is the most Republican inasmuch as it sets itself against those unrepublican abuses which have been nursed by the President into pernicious activity.

From the two nominations and the two platforms, I come to the supporters of the candidates. And here I look first at those immediately about them, and secondly at the popular support behind. Horace Greeley has among his immediate supporters, in all parts of the country, devoted and consistent Republicans, always earnest for reform and purity in the government, and upon whose lives there is no shadow of suspicion, being a contrast in the character of those rings which play such a part in the present administration. The country knows less well of the military ring, the senatorial ring and the Custom-house ring, through which the President acts. Such supporters are a very poor recommendation. Dealing still with Horace Greeley. President Grant has at his back a diversified army of office-holders, drilled to obey the word of command. All speeches praising him are by office-holders and members of rings.

Horace Greeley finds flocking to his support large numbers of Republicans unwilling to continue the existing misrule and as allies with them; a regenerated party, which comes forward to unite in the liberal movement. The Democrats, in joining Horace Greeley, have changed simply as President Grant changed when he joined the Republicans, except that he was rewarded at once with high office. The change is open, adopting the Republican platform, which places equal rights of all under a safeguard of irreversible guarantees, and at the same time accepting the nomination of a life-long Abolitionist, who represents, pre-eminently, the sentiment of duty to the colored race. They have set their corporate seal to the sacred covenant. They may continue Democrats in name, but they are in reality Republicans, by the same title that those who sustain Republican principles are Republicans; or rather they are Democrats according to the original signification of that word—dedicated to the rights of the people.

It is idle to say that Horace Greeley and the Republicans that nominated him are less Republicans because the Democrats unite with them in support of cherished principles and the candidate who represents them. Conversions are always welcome, and not less so because the change is in the multitude other than an individual. A political party cannot if it would, and should not if it could, shut the door against converts, whether converted by the score, hundreds or thousands. So we find that the supporters of President Grant announce with partisan triumph the adhesion of a single Democratic newspaper. With equal reason and with higher pride may supporters of Horace Greeley announce the adhesion of one who, turning from things that are behind, presses on to those that are before. It is also idle to say that the election of Horace Greeley as President, with Gritz Brown as Vice President, will be the return of the Democratic party to power.

On the contrary, it will be an inauguration of Republican principles, under which the safeguard of a Republican President and Republican Vice President, with Democrats as avowed supporters. In the organization of his administration and in the conduct of affairs, Horace Greeley will naturally lean upon those who represent best the greatest promises made of equal rights and reconciliation of Cincinnati. If Democrats are taken, it will be as Republicans in heart, recognizing the associate terms of settlement as an irreversible finality. The hardihood of political falsehood reaches its extreme point when it is asserted that under Horace Greeley the freedmen will be enslaved, or that colored people will in any way suffer in their equal rights. On the contrary, they have in his election not only the promises made in the Cincinnati platform, but also a splendid example of a full generation, during which he has never wavered in the assertion of their rights. To suppose that Horace Greeley, when placed where he can do them most good, will depart from the rule of his honest life, is an insult to reason.

It is none the less idle to suppose that Democrats supporting Horace Greeley expect or desire that he should depart from those principles which are the glory of his character. They have accepted the Cincinnati platform with its two-fold promises, and intend in good faith to maintain it. Democrats can not turn back who, at the convention adopting this platform, sang Greeley songs to the tune of "Old John Brown, his soul is marching on." Seeking especially an establishment of character in the national government, they will expect their President to be always true to himself, therefore I put aside partisan allegations that Greeley has gone to the Democrats, or that he will be controlled by Democrats. Each is without foundation or reason. According to my judgment they are attempts to avoid what you recognize as the true issue, being a question between the two candidates, or perhaps they may be considered as scare crows to deter the timid.

Nobody who votes for Horace Greeley will go to the Democrats; nor do I believe that when elected Horace Greeley will be under any influence except that of an enlightened conscience, which will keep him ever true to the principles he presents.

Gentlemen, in thus answering your two inquiries, I have shown why you, as colored fellow-citizens, and also who would uphold your rights and save the colored race from indignity, should refuse to sanction the re-election of President Grant, and put your trust in Mr. Greeley. I ought to add, that with him will be associated, as Vice President, B. Grätz Brown, whom I have known for years as a most determined Abolitionist. The two together will carry into the national government an unswerving devotion to your rights, not to be disturbed by partisan dictation or sectional prejudice. Besides all this, which may fitly guide you in determining between the two candidates, it is my duty to remind you that, as citizens of the United States and a part of the country, your welfare is indissolubly associated with that of the whole country. Where all are prosperous and free, you will be gainers. Therefore, while justly careful of your own rights, you can not be indifferent to the blessing of good government. It is for you to consider whether the time has not come for something better than the sword, and whether characters like Horace Greeley do not give stronger assurance of good government than can be found in the insulter of the colored race, already famous from the rings about him, and his plain inaptitude for civil life.

The supporters of President Grant compel us to observe his offenses and shortcomings. Their challenge to comparison can not be declined. It will be for others in the present canvass to hold it before the American people. Speaking now for myself, I have to say that my vote will be given for Horace Greeley, but in giving it I do not go to the Democratic party, nor am I any less a Republican. On the contrary, I am so much a Republican that I can not support a candidate whose conduct in civil life shows an incapacity to appreciate Republican principles, and whose administration is marked by acts of delinquency, especially toward the colored race, by the side of which the allegations in the impeachment of Andrew Johnson were technical and trivial. Unquestionably, gentlemen, President Grant deserves impeachment for high crimes and misdemeanors rather than a reprimand; and on trial it would have been enough to exhibit his seizure of the war power and his indignity to a black republic, with its population of eight hundred thousand, in violation of the national constitution and of international law. And here a contrast arises between him and Abraham Lincoln. The latter, in his first annual message, recommended a recognition of what he called the independence and sovereignty of Hayti; but it is at these that President Grant has struck. One of Abraham Lincoln's first acts was to put the black republic on an equality with other powers; one of President Grant's acts, to degrade it.

I am such a Republican that I wish to see in the presidential chair a lifetime Abolitionist. I wish the President sincerely devoted to civil service reform, beginning with the one term principle, which General Grant once accepted, but now disowns. I also wish a President who sets an example of industry and unselfish dedication to the public good; and I wish to see a President through whom we may expect peace and harmony, instead of discord. President Grant seems to delight in strife. If he finds no enemy he falls upon his friends, as when he struck at the black republic, insulted Russia in his annual message, offended both France and Germany, and then, in personal relations, quarreled generally. My own personal experience teaches how futile is the charge that when Horace Greeley receives Democratic votes therefore he becomes a Democrat or lapses into Democratic control. I was the first choice to the Senate by the coalition of Free Soilers and Democrats.

Democratic votes helped to make me a Senator from Massachusetts, as they also helped to make my excellent friend, Mr. Chase, Senator from Ohio, and will help make Horace Greeley President. But neither my friend Mr. Chase nor myself were less faithful as Free Soilers; and, answering for myself, I know I never became a Democrat, or lapsed under Democratic control. I do not doubt that Horace Greeley will be equally consistent. The charge to the contrary, so vehemently repeated, seems to reflect the character of those who make it, except that many regret it so much. There is a common saying, principles not men, and on this ground an appeal is made for President Grant, feeling that in any personal comparison with Horace Greeley he must fail. But the better saying is principles, not men. I am in favor of the principles of the Republican party in contradiction to Grantism, and I am for the man who truly represents them. By these principles I shall stand; for them I shall labor, and in their triumph I shall always rejoice. If any valued friend separates from me now, it will be because he places men above principles.

Early in public life I declared my little heed for party, and my indifference to the name by which I am called; and now I confess my want of sympathy with those who would cling to the form after its spirit has fled.

SHERIFF'S SALES.

Louis Breton vs. Mrs. Eugenie Laizer, wife separated in property of A. Devron.

FOURTH DISTRICT COURT FOR THE PARISH OF Orleans, No. 29,343.—By virtue of a writ of seizure and sale to me directed by the honorable the Fourth District Court for the parish of Orleans, in the above entitled cause, I will proceed to sell at public auction, at the St. Louis Auction Exchange, in the basement rotunda of the St. Louis Hotel, St. Louis street, between Chartres and Royal streets, in the Second District of this city, on FRIDAY, August 30, 1872, at twelve o'clock M., the following described property, to wit—

1. FOUR LOTS OF GROUND, situated in the Third District of this city, near the intersection of Bacon and Gentilly roads, designated by the numbers twenty-nine, thirty, thirty one and thirty-two, on a plan made by L. Bringier, surveyor, under date of twenty-second of June, 1836, and deposited in the office of Amedee Bunatel, notary public in this city, and each lot measuring thirty-four feet front on Broad street on a depth of one hundred and nine feet eleven inches four lines, English measure, between parallel lines.

Being the same property acquired by the defendants herein from A. A. Pardo, per act passed before Octave de Armas, a notary public in this city, on the twenty third day of April, 1857.

2. AND SIX OTHER LOTS OF GROUND, situated in the same locality, designated by the numbers seven, eight, nine, ten, sixteen and seventeen of square number twenty-one, comprised between Dorgenois, Lapeyrouse, Ouzaga and Grand rue or Broad streets, the whole according to a plan made by L. Surgi, architect, on the twenty-second of August, 1836, and deposited in the office of T. Seghers, notary, under number twenty-one, which numbers seven and eight measure each thirty one feet seven inches five lines front on Broad street by one hundred and twenty eight feet eleven inches two lines in depth; the numbers nine and ten measure each thirty one feet seven inches five lines front on said Broad street by one hundred and twenty-eight feet eleven inches two lines in depth, number ten forming the corner of Ouzaga street; the lots numbers sixteen and seventeen measure each thirty feet front on Ouzaga street by one hundred and twenty-five feet eleven inches four lines in depth, together with the buildings and improvements which are on the said ten lots of ground, and the rights, privileges and servitudes thereon.

Being the same property acquired by the defendants herein from F. Sambola and M. Fernandez, per act passed before Joseph Liabody, late a notary public in this city, on the twenty-fifth of April, 1859.

Seized in the above suit.
Terms—Cash on the spot.

C. S. SAUVINET,
jy30 au15 30 Sheriff of the Parish of Orleans.

Pierre Francois Tarberg vs. Jacob Ott.

FIFTH DISTRICT COURT FOR THE PARISH OF Orleans, No. 3066.—By virtue of a writ of seizure and sale to me directed by the honorable the Fifth District Court for the parish of Orleans, in the above entitled cause, I will proceed to sell at public auction, at the Merchants and Auctioneers' Exchange, Royal street, between Canal and Customhouse streets, in the Second District of this city, on TUESDAY, August 27, 1872, at twelve o'clock M., the following described property, to wit—

A CERTAIN LOT OF GROUND, together with all the buildings and improvements thereon, and all the rights, ways, privileges, servitudes and advantages thereunto belonging or in anywise appertaining situated in the First District of this city, in the square bounded by Delord, Carondelet, Calliope and St. Charles streets, which said lot of ground is designated on a plan drawn by L. Surgi, City Surveyor, on the twenty-fifth of July, 1869, and deposited in the office of T. J. Beck, late a notary public in this city, on the twenty-second of December, 1869, as plan number six, as lot letter A, and measures forty-one feet nine inches two lines front on Delord street, by a depth on the side line nearest to Carondelet street of one hundred feet, by a depth on the side line dividing it from the lot designated on said plan by the letter B of eighty-two feet two inches two lines, and in the rear forty one feet ten inches on a line running from said line, dividing it from said lot B to a line running thence twelve feet seven inches six lines to the side line nearest Carondelet street.

Being the same property acquired by defendant herein, by purchase from John G. Wire, as per act passed before T. J. Beck, notary public in this city, on the thirtieth day of July, 1870.

Seized in the above suit.
Terms—Cash on the spot.

C. S. SAUVINET,
jy27 au13 27 Sheriff of the Parish of Orleans.

Honore Labasse, Jean Derete, subrogated, vs. Mrs. Fanny Guion and Charles F. Guion.

FOURTH DISTRICT COURT FOR THE PARISH of Orleans, No. 24,354.—By virtue of a writ of fieri facias against Mrs. Fanny Guion and Charles F. Guion, her husband, to me directed by the honorable the Fourth District Court for the parish of Orleans, in the above entitled cause, I will proceed to sell at public auction, at the Merchants and Auctioneers' Exchange, on Royal street, between Canal and Customhouse streets, in the Second District of this city, on TUESDAY, August 6, 1872, at twelve o'clock M., the following described property, to wit—

A CERTAIN LOT OF GROUND, together with all the buildings and improvements thereon, and the appurtenances thereof, situated in the First District of this city, in the square bounded by Clio, Tonti, Locust and Magnolia streets, designated by the number fourteen on a plan in possession of the former owners thereof, George May and Patrick Irwin, which lot forms the corner of Clio and Magnolia streets, and measures twenty-five feet three inches two lines front on Clio street, by one hundred and seventeen feet five inches six lines front and depth on Magnolia street, between parallel lines.

Being the same property acquired by defendant herein, by purchase from Moritz Gretzner and Max Gretzner, per act passed before Theodore Giraud, notary public in this city, on the twenty-ninth day of September, 1871.

Seized in the above suit.
Terms—Cash on the spot.

C. S. SAUVINET,
jy6 25 au6 Sheriff of the Parish of Orleans.

B. J. Berkery vs. Olmstead & Rickey.

SEVENTH DISTRICT COURT FOR THE PARISH of Orleans No. 3639.—By virtue of a writ of fieri facias against L. J. Olmstead to me directed by the honorable the Seventh District Court for the parish of Orleans in the above entitled cause, I will proceed to sell at public auction on the premises hereinafter designated, on SATURDAY, August 10, 1872, at five o'clock P. M. the following described property, to wit—

ALL THE FURNITURE AND MOVABLE PROPERTY contained in the premises No. 211 Franklin street, between Frenchmen and Thalia streets, in the First District of this city, as per inventory which may be seen in my office.

Seized in the above suit.
Terms—Cash on the spot.

C. S. SAUVINET,
jy11 27 au11 Sheriff of the Parish of Orleans.

Arthur Deals vs. Leopold Bodenheimer.

SIXTH DISTRICT COURT FOR THE PARISH of Orleans, No. 3439.—By virtue of a writ of seizure and sale, and also by virtue of an order of date July 2, 1872, both to me directed by the honorable the Sixth District Court for the parish of Orleans, in the above entitled cause, I will proceed to sell at public auction, at the Merchants and Auctioneers' Exchange, on Royal street, between Canal and Customhouse streets, in the Second District of this city, on TUESDAY, August 6, 1872, at twelve o'clock M., the following described property, to wit—

A CERTAIN LOT OF GROUND, together with all the buildings and improvements thereon, and the appurtenances thereof, situated in the First District of this city, in the square bounded by Clio, Dorgenois and Broad streets, and measuring thirty-two feet one inch five lines front on Poydras street, and thirty-one feet eight inches six lines front on Julia street, by a depth of one hundred and fifty-five feet six lines on the line of lot number nine; which said lot of ground is designated by the number ten, on a plan drawn by Buisson, surveyor, dated February 13, 1850, and is also figured on a plan exhibited at an auction sale of said property by Nicholas J. Hoey, deposited in his office for reference.

Being the same property which the said defendant, Henry Guion, acquired by purchase from the succession of H. J. Ranney, per act passed before M. Gernon, notary public, in this city, on the sixth of March, 1866.

Seized in the above suit.
Terms—Cash on the spot.

C. S. SAUVINET,
jy30 au14 31 Sheriff of the Parish of Orleans.

State of Louisiana vs. John Armstrong.

FOURTH DISTRICT COURT FOR THE PARISH of Orleans, No. 27,215.—By virtue of a writ of fieri facias to me directed by the honorable the Fourth District Court for the parish of Orleans, in the above entitled cause, I will proceed to sell at public auction, at the St. Louis Auction Exchange, in the basement rotunda of the St. Louis Hotel, St. Louis street, between Chartres and Royal streets, in the Second District of this city, on MONDAY, August 12, 1872, at twelve o'clock M., the following described property, to wit—

SEVEN LOTS OF GROUND, situated in the Second District, in square number four hundred and twenty-three, bounded by Canal, Customhouse, Lopez and Rendon streets, and facing and measuring as follows:

One piece facing on Customhouse street, measuring thirty feet front by one hundred and five feet deep.

One piece facing on Customhouse street, measuring forty-eight feet front by eighty-nine feet deep.

One piece facing on Customhouse and Rendon streets, measuring sixty four feet front by fifty-one feet deep.

One piece facing on Lopez and Canal streets, measuring sixty feet front by one hundred and five feet deep.

One piece facing on Lopez and Canal streets, measuring eighty-nine feet front by one hundred and thirty four feet deep.

One piece facing on Lopez and Canal streets, measuring one hundred and eighty feet front by one hundred and five feet deep.

One piece facing on Rendon street, measuring one hundred and thirty feet front by one hundred and fifty-six feet deep.

Seized in the above suit.
Terms—Cash on the spot.

C. S. SAUVINET,
jy11 27 au11 Sheriff of the Parish of Orleans.

SHERIFF'S SALES.

James Graham vs. Estate of Edwin W. Ivies.

FIFTH DISTRICT COURT FOR THE PARISH OF Orleans, No 3068.—By virtue of a writ of seizure and sale to me directed by the honorable the Fifth District Court for the parish of Orleans, in the above entitled cause, I will proceed to sell at public auction, at the Merchants and Auctioneers' Exchange, Royal street, between Canal and Customhouse streets, in the Second District of this city, on SATURDAY, August 10, 1872, at twelve o'clock M., the following described property, to wit—

FIVE CERTAIN LOTS OF GROUND, together with all the buildings and improvements thereon, and all the rights, ways, servitudes, privileges and advantages thereunto belonging or in anywise appertaining, situated in the First District of this city, in the square bounded by Gravier, Franklin (late St. Peter), Liberty (late St. Paul) and Common streets, designated by the numbers one to five inclusive, on a sketch annexed to an act of the ninth of August, 1857, in the office of A. Boudousquie, late a notary public in this city, which lots measure as follows, to wit: Lot number one measures thirty-nine feet one inch five lines front on Liberty street, by one hundred and twenty-seven feet one inch one line in depth and front on an alley eleven feet three inches wide. Lot number two measures thirty feet ten inches front on Franklin street, by one hundred and twenty seven feet one inch one line in depth and front on an alley eleven feet three inches wide and thirty-one feet six inches in width in the rear. Lot number three measures thirty feet one inch front on Franklin street, by one hundred and twenty-seven feet one inch one line in depth and thirty feet three inches in width in the rear. Lot number four measures thirty feet one inch front on Franklin street, by a depth of one hundred and twenty-seven feet one inch one line on the side adjoining lot number three, and of one hundred and twenty six feet eleven inches two lines on the side adjoining lot number five, and thirty feet three inches in width in the rear. Lot number five measures twenty-six feet two inches four lines front on Franklin street, by a depth of one hundred and twenty six feet eleven inches two lines on the side adjoining lot number four, and also one hundred and twenty-eight feet six inches on the other side, and thirty-three feet three inches three lines in the rear.

Which property was acquired by the defendant herein, conjointly with Thomas Askew, in the proportion of one half each, from Julien Pemberton, as per act of sale before Edward Lacoste and James Graham, a notary public in this city, on the fourteenth day of March, 1862; and said Askew sold all his part and interest therein to the said defendant, by act before W. H. Peters, late a notary public in this city, on the twenty-sixth day of May, 1864.

Seized in the above suit.
Terms—Cash on the spot.

C. S. SAUVINET,
jy9 23 au10 Sheriff of the Parish of Orleans.

State of Louisiana vs. D. C. Azarotto.

FOURTH DISTRICT COURT FOR THE PARISH of Orleans, No. 27,219.—By virtue of a writ of fieri facias to me directed by the honorable the Fourth District Court for the parish of Orleans, in the above entitled cause, I will proceed to sell at public auction, at the St. Louis Auction Exchange, in the basement rotunda of the St. Louis Hotel, St. Louis street, between Chartres and Royal streets, in the Second District of this city, on MONDAY, August 12, 1872, at twelve o'clock M., the following described property, to wit—

A LOT OF GROUND, situated in the Second District in square number one hundred and seventy-four, bounded by Bienville, Robertson, Esplanade streets and Bayou road, measuring twenty-nine feet front on Barracks street by one hundred and sixty-five feet in depth.

Seized in the above suit.
Terms—Cash on the spot.

C. S. SAUVINET,
jul1 26 au11 Sheriff of the Parish of Orleans.

State of Louisiana vs. H. R. Arbo.

EIGHTH DISTRICT COURT FOR THE PARISH of Orleans, No. 2622.—By virtue of a writ of fieri facias to me directed by the honorable the Eighth District Court for the parish of Orleans, in the above entitled cause, I will proceed to sell at public auction, at the Merchants and Auctioneers' Exchange, Royal street, between Canal and Customhouse streets, in the Second District of this city, on TUESDAY, August 13, 1872, at twelve o'clock M., the following described property, to wit—

A LOT OF GROUND, situated in the faubourg Avart, in the Sixth District of this city, designated as number nineteen.

Seized in the above suit.
Terms—Cash on the spot.

C. S. SAUVINET,
jy11 26 au13 Sheriff of the Parish of Orleans.

Mrs. M. E. Schiller vs. Mrs. Jane Lilienkron et als.

SIXTH DISTRICT COURT FOR THE PARISH OF Orleans, No. 3329.—By virtue of a writ of seizure and sale to me directed by the honorable the Sixth District Court for the parish of Orleans in the above entitled cause, I will proceed to sell at public auction, at the Merchants and Auctioneers' Exchange, Royal street, between Canal and Customhouse streets, in the Second District of this city, on SATURDAY, August 24, 1872, at twelve o'clock M., the following described property, to wit—

A CERTAIN LOT OF GROUND, with the buildings and improvements thereon, situated in the First District of this city, in the square bounded by Rampart, late Hercules, Basin, late White, Thalia and Melpomene streets, measuring, in American measure, forty-two feet eight inches five lines front on Rampart street, ninety-eight feet three inches seven lines in depth on the side toward Melpomene street, ninety-six feet eleven inches six lines in depth on the side toward Thalia street, and twenty-three feet three inches three lines in width on the rear line; being the same lot designated by the number one of square number four, on a plan drawn by S. Phillips, surveyor, dated February 5, 1846, deposited in the office of Jules Mossy, notary public, in this city. Which property was purchased by the late Augustus Lilienkron from Louis Janin, per act passed before said notary Jules Mossy, on the twenty first of August, 1846.

Seized in the above suit.
Terms—Cash on the spot.

C. S. SAUVINET,
jy23 au9 24 Sheriff of the parish of Orleans.

Witherby, Rugg & Richardson vs. E. M. Pecot & Co.

SIXTH DISTRICT COURT FOR THE PARISH of Orleans, No 3036.—By virtue a writ of fieri facias to me directed by the honorable the Sixth District Court for the parish of Orleans, in the above entitled cause, I will proceed to sell at public auction, on the premises hereinafter designated, on TUESDAY, August 13, 1872 at half past ten o'clock A. M., the following described property, to wit—

THE MACHINERY AND MOVABLES in the office and salesroom No 11 Union street, in the First District of this city, as per inventory, which may be seen in my office.

Seized in the above suit.
Terms—Cash on the spot.

C. S. SAUVINET,
au1 7 13 Sheriff of the Parish of Orleans.

Mrs. Rose Mansfield vs. Walter Heffron.

FOURTH DISTRICT COURT FOR THE PARISH of Orleans, No. 33,231—By virtue of a writ of seizure and sale to me directed by the honorable the Fourth District Court for the parish of Orleans, in the above entitled cause, I will proceed to sell at public auction, at the Merchants and Auctioneers' Exchange, Royal street, between Canal and Customhouse streets, in the Second District of this city, on MONDAY, September 2, 1872, at twelve o'clock M., the following described property, to wit—

A CERTAIN LOT OF GROUND, together with all the buildings and improvements thereon, situated in the First District of this city, in the square bounded by Johnson, Priestly, Common and Palmyra streets, which said lot of ground is designated by the number seventeen in square number twenty-nine, as per plan of Joseph Pilie, late surveyor, on the first of May, 1840, and deposited in the office of D. L. McCay, late notary public in this city, said lot forms the corner of Palmyra and Johnson streets, and measures, in American measure, twenty seven feet four inches front on Palmyra street, by one hundred and two feet eight inches two lines in depth, between parallel lines, and front on Johnson street; and was acquired by said Walter Heffron, defendant herein, from the heirs of McDonald, by act passed before A. E. Bierwert, notary public in this city, on the eighteenth day of June, 1869.

Seized in the above suit.
Terms—Cash on the spot.

C. S. SAUVINET,
au1 17 sel Sheriff of the parish of Orleans.

A. J. Demarest vs. A. J. Oliver et als.

SIXTH DISTRICT COURT FOR THE PARISH O S. No. 3216.—By virtue of a writ of fieri facias against A. J. Oliver, and Charles Lester to me directed by the honorable the Sixth District Court for the parish of Orleans, in the above entitled cause, I will proceed to sell at public auction, at the Merchants and Auctioneers' Exchange, Royal street, between Canal and Customhouse streets, in the Second District of this city, on TUESDAY, August 27, 1872, at twelve o'clock M., the following described property, to wit—

A CERTAIN LOT OF GROUND, with the improvements thereon, situated in the First District of this city, designated as lot number six, in square bounded by Triton Walk, Apollo, or Carondelet, Bacchus, or Baronne, and Calliope streets, as per plan of J. Pilie, late surveyor, dated twentieth December 1828, annexed to an act passed before Felix de Armas, then a notary public in this city, on the third of January, 1829.

Said lot measuring, in French measure, fifty-one feet front on Triton Walk, one hundred and fifteen feet eleven inches on the line of Apollo street, and one hundred and eighteen feet ten inches on the line of lot number seven, and fifty one feet one inch in the rear.

The improvements comprise a cottage house, number two hundred and eight, Triton Walk and its dependencies.

Seized in the above suit as belonging to defendant Leefe.

Terms—Cash on the spot.

C. S. SAUVINET,
jy25 au12 27 Sheriff of the Parish of Orleans.

Alfred Hennen, Mrs. A. M. Hennen, subrogated, vs. Forget & Guillotet.

SIXTH DISTRICT COURT FOR THE PARISH OF Orleans, No. 20,532.—By virtue of a writ of fieri facias to me directed by the honorable the Sixth District Court for the parish of Orleans, in the above entitled cause, I will proceed to sell at public auction, at the Merchants and Auctioneers' Exchange, Royal street, between Canal and Customhouse street, in the Second District of this city, on SATURDAY,