

STEAMSHIPS.

STATE LINE STEAMSHIP COMPANY.

LIMITED. The following new first class, full-powered Clyde built steamships are intended to sail regularly between NEW ORLEANS and LIVERPOOL and GLASGOW and NEW YORK.

STATE OF LOUISIANA.

Will sail from New Orleans for Liverpool, direct, SUNDAY MORNING, June 14, 1874. From Liverpool for New Orleans, direct, will arrive on Wednesday, June 17, 1874.

LIVERPOOL AND NEW ORLEANS LINE OF STEAMERS.

BUILT EXPRESSLY FOR THE NEW ORLEANS TRADE. THE MISSISSIPPI AND DOMINION LINE. THE FIRST CLASS POWERFUL SCREW STEAMERS.

ST. LOUIS.

Will leave on or about June 5. From New Orleans for St. Louis, direct, will arrive on Wednesday, June 12, 1874.

MERCHANTS' STEAMSHIP LINE.

Comprising the first-class steamships: GENERAL KEARNEY, GENERAL WASHINGTON, GENERAL MONROE, GENERAL LINCOLN, GENERAL BUCHANAN.

THE CROMWELL LINE.

For New York Direct. This line is composed of the Steamships KNICKERBOCKER, GEORGE WASHINGTON, GEORGE BRONWELL, GEORGE WASHINGTON.

NEW ORLEANS.

Will leave for New York, direct, on SATURDAY, May 30, at 8 A. M.

PHILADELPHIA VIA HAVANA.

United States Mail Line. Steamships EMILIA, LAVACA, WASHINGTON, WASHINGTON.

THE FINE A1 STEAMSHIP.

Will leave for Havana, direct, on SATURDAY, May 30, at 8 A. M.

BRREMEN.

North German Lloyd. Steamships EMILIA, LAVACA, WASHINGTON, WASHINGTON.

PHILADELPHIA VIA HAVANA.

United States Mail Line. Steamships EMILIA, LAVACA, WASHINGTON, WASHINGTON.

THE FINE A1 STEAMSHIP.

Will leave for Havana, direct, on SATURDAY, May 30, at 8 A. M.

BRREMEN.

North German Lloyd. Steamships EMILIA, LAVACA, WASHINGTON, WASHINGTON.

PHILADELPHIA VIA HAVANA.

United States Mail Line. Steamships EMILIA, LAVACA, WASHINGTON, WASHINGTON.

LOTTERIES.

SPLENDID SCHEME.

ONLY 10,000 NUMBERS.

LOUISIANA STATE SINGLE NUMBER LOTTERY.

Capital Prize.....\$20,000.

LOUISIANA STATE LOTTERY COMPANY.

(Incorporated August 17, 1868.)

To be drawn in public at New Orleans.

On Saturday, May 30, 1874.

CLASS C.

10,000 Tickets.....Tickets only \$10.

Halves, Quarters and Eighths in proportion.

1 prize of \$20,000.....\$20,000.

1 prize of \$5,000.....5,000.

1 prize of \$2,000.....2,000.

40 prizes of \$500 each.....20,000.

500 prizes of \$100 each.....50,000.

APPROXIMATION PRIZES.

9 approximations of \$300 each for the nine remaining units of the same ten of the number drawing the \$300.....2,700.

9 approximations of \$200 each for the nine remaining units of the same ten of the number drawing the \$200.....1,800.

9 approximations of \$100 each for the nine remaining units of the same ten of the number drawing the \$100.....900.

270 prizes amounting to.....\$90,000.

EXPLANATION OF APPROXIMATION PRIZES.

The nine remaining units of the same ten of the numbers drawing the first three full prizes will be entitled to the twenty-seven approximation prizes.

For example: If ticket No. 1234 draws the \$20,000 prize, those tickets numbered 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129 and 130 will each be entitled to \$2,000.

If ticket No. 2345 draws the \$5,000 prize, those tickets numbered 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239 and 240 will each be entitled to \$500.

If ticket No. 3456 draws the \$2,000 prize, those tickets numbered 345, 346, 347, 348 and 349 will each be entitled to \$200.

Whole Tickets, \$10; Halves, \$5; Quarters, \$2.50; Eighths, \$1.25.

PRIZES PAYABLE IN FULL WITHOUT DEDUCTION.

Orders to be addressed to LOUISIANA STATE LOTTERY COMPANY, Lock Box No. 692, Postoffice New Orleans.

Send postoffice money order, or register your letter.

DRAWING OF THE LOUISIANA STATE LOTTERY FOR MAY 28, 1874.

CLASS 126.

The above drawings are published in the principal papers and are drawn in public daily at the room of the company.

Witness our hands at New Orleans, Louisiana, this twenty-eighth day of May, 1874.

A. PREALTA, Commissioner.

BREWARD OF ROGERS LOTTERIES.

GIFT CONCERT.

\$5,000.000.

ENDOWMENT SCHEME.

FIFTH AND LAST CONCERT.

IN AID OF THE PUBLIC LIBRARY OF KENTUCKY.

JULY 31, 1874.

In announcing the fifth and last of the series of Gift Concerts given for the benefit of the Public Library of Kentucky, the trustees and managers refer with pride and pleasure to the four which have already been given, the first, December 11, 1871, the second, December 2, 1872, the third, July 8, 1873, and the fourth, March 31, 1874.

Under their charter, granted March 18, 1871, the trustees are authorized to give ONE MORE, and ONLY ONE MORE, Gift Concert, with the money arising from this fifth and last concert, the Library, Museum and other departments are to be enlarged and improved, and a certain annual income, such an endowment fund is desired as will secure beyond peradventure the maintenance of a permanent and magnificent establishment, but its constant growth.

THE FIFTH GIFT CONCERT.

For the purposes mentioned, and which is positively and unequivocally announced as THE LAST which will ever be given under this charter and by the present management, will take place in the Public Library Hall, Louisville, Kentucky.

Friday, July 31, 1874.

At this final concert everything will be upon a scale corresponding with its increased importance. The music will be rendered by an orchestra composed of 100 performers selected for their fame in different lands, and the unprecedented sum of \$5,000.000.

divided into 20,000 gifts, will be distributed among the ticket holders.

LIST OF GIFTS.

1 Grand Cash Gift.....\$250,000.

1 Grand Cash Gift.....75,000.

1 Grand Cash Gift.....25,000.

1 Grand Cash Gift.....10,000.

5 Cash Gifts \$2,000 each.....100,000.

10 Cash Gifts 1,000 each.....100,000.

20 Cash Gifts 500 each.....100,000.

30 Cash Gifts 200 each.....60,000.

40 Cash Gifts 100 each.....40,000.

50 Cash Gifts 50 each.....25,000.

100 Cash Gifts 25 each.....25,000.

150 Cash Gifts 15 each.....22,500.

200 Cash Gifts 10 each.....20,000.

300 Cash Gifts 5 each.....15,000.

Grand total 20,000 gifts, all cash.....\$2,500,000.

PRICE OF TICKETS.

Whole tickets.....\$50.

Halves.....25.

Tenths, each one tenth of \$50.....5.

Fiftieths, each one fiftieth of \$50.....1.

Twenty-two and one-half tickets for.....500.

Tickets are not valid for sale, and orders accompanied by cash will be promptly filled.

Liberal commissions will be allowed to satisfaction.

Circulars containing full particulars furnished on application.

THOMAS E. BRAMLETTE, Agent and Manager, Public Library Building, Louisville, Kentucky.

MISCELLANEOUS.

NOTICE TO TAXPAYERS.

STATE AND CITY TAXES.

For past years settled at LOWEST POSSIBLE RATES BY

BARNETT & CAMMACK, my 10 lm Brokers, No. 12 Carondelet street.

MINERAL WATERS ON DRAUGHT.

ICE COLD AND PURE.

The following waters at FIVE CENTS a glass: YICKY, KISSINGER, BUTLER, KISSINGER, BLUE-LICK and BLADON WATERS.

Druggist and Chemist, No. 165 Canal street, between Bourbon and Dauphin.

BUSINESS CARDS.

P. A. MURRAY, No. 191 Magazine street, between Julia and St. Joseph streets.

COURT RECORD.

THURSDAY, MAY 28, 1874.

United States Circuit Court.

United States vs. William J. Cronkbank et al.—Conspiracy and murder. On trial. Supreme Court.

Present—All the judges.

The following decisions were rendered: REHEARING GRANTED.

No. 3428. Kennett & Bell vs. Union Insurance Company.

No. 3485. Factors and Traders Bank vs. De Saisne.

REHEARING REFUSED.

No. 3257. Charles Case vs. Spencer Field.

No. 3296. H. B. Macaulay vs. Spaulding & Bidwell.

No. 3294. Rosenthal vs. Rosenthal.

No. 3471. State ex rel. Wasmoth vs. Graham.

CLASS C.

No. 4374. Hoar vs. Clancy.

No. 4383. Wolf vs. Dagan.

No. 4006. Daly vs. Duffy.

No. 4222. Succession of Sarraquet.

No. 5184. Roy vs. Halliday.

No. 3476. Lyons vs. Dobbins.

No. 4886. Merz vs. Peyroux.

No. 4316. Newman vs. Levy.

No. 3308. African Methodist Episcopal Church vs. Norega.

No. 4856. City vs. Klein.

No. 4922. City vs. Burns.

No. 4920. City vs. Russell.

No. 4909. City vs. Kennard.

No. 4833. City vs. Mitchell.

No. 4834. City vs. Leeds.

No. 4835. City vs. Leeds.

No. 4881. City vs. Kozick.

No. 4791. City vs. Lawrence.

No. 4911. City vs. May.

No. 4922. Succession of Sarraquet.

No. 3324. Morgan vs. Lombard.

No. 4916. Succession of Barnett.

No. 4929. Irby vs. Ker.

No. 4831. Richardson vs. Chevalley.

No. 4832. Succession of Par.

No. 4756. Evans vs. Sauveterre.

No. 3460. Durac vs. Duckert.

No. 4874. Soye vs. Corrier.

No. 5084. Fiumet vs. Par.

No. 3317. Mithoff vs. Bohn.

No. 5076. Gardner vs. McDaniel.

No. 5009. Malady vs. Malady.

No. 5317. Washington vs. Niles.

No. 4874. Soye vs. Corrier.

No. 5174. Pickens vs. Friend.

No. 3296. McCarty vs. Spaulding & Bidwell.

No. 3394. Ebert vs. Duran.

No. 3461. Corkery vs. Work.

No. 5164. State vs. Timey.

No. 4922. City vs. Louisiana Mutual Insurance Company.

No. 3410. Tronier vs. Bianco.

No. 5006. Trener vs. Duvas.

No. 5283. Rochereau vs. Caton.

No. 3445. Spetzer vs. Par.

No. 3413. Wood vs. Phoenix Insurance Company.

BY CHIEF JUSTICE LUDDELING.

No. 4619. State vs. Charles Clinton et al. Intervention of G. A. Sheridan as holder of reversionary interest in the property.

The question is the validity of the bonds under act No. 32 of February 25, 1870.

There is no conflict between the act and articles 110 and 118 of the constitution. The act is not a contract, and the property without just compensation. The Legislature is to determine whether the tax is to be levied on all the lands in the State or on particular localities. Judgment dissolving the injunction affirmed.

On rehearing, the law is not affected by the constitutional limit of the State debt, as it was passed before it was adopted. Levees are not public works. They are too gigantic for even the State to maintain. Their regulation is in the legislative discretion. In its sphere it is supreme. State vs. Volkman; State vs. Fagan; No. 4359. Degree adhered to.

BY JUSTICE TALLEREAU.

No. 5293. City of New Orleans, appellant, vs. James Stafford.—From Superior District Court. The court reviews the act of 1870 authorizing private markets; that of 1870, extending the limits of the city and giving power to establish markets, and the ordinance of December 2, 1873, fixing the license at \$300. Defendant took one as a whole dealer, and another as a table one as a private market keeper from the city, but relies on one from the State under the act of 1876. Taken in connection with the ordinance, his claim is questionable. Because the city has leased the markets for 1874 it does not follow it has no interest. The act of 1874 requires the city to carry out its provisions. The Legislature has no power to take away that which private markets shall not be kept open within twelve squares of a public one, *subtus precepta ex lege*. Defendant's private market is not within the right of the sovereign to examine the police power to regulate peace and good order, and maintain cleanliness and salubrity. In the danger of epidemics the city must have the right to regulate. As a sanitary measure markets may be abolished. The lessee could not claim the right to keep open. The act of 1874 does not violate the right of private property. Defendant's right of the sovereign to examine the police power to regulate peace and good order, and maintain cleanliness and salubrity. In the danger of epidemics the city must have the right to regulate. As a sanitary measure markets may be abolished. The lessee could not claim the right to keep open. The act of 1874 does not violate the right of private property. Defendant's right of the sovereign to examine the police power to regulate peace and good order, and maintain cleanliness and salubrity. In the danger of epidemics the city must have the right to regulate. As a sanitary measure markets may be abolished. The lessee could not claim the right to keep open. The act of 1874 does not violate the right of private property. Defendant's right of the sovereign to examine the police power to regulate peace and good order, and maintain cleanliness and salubrity. In the danger of epidemics the city must have the right to regulate. As a sanitary measure markets may be abolished. The lessee could not claim the right to keep open. The act of 1874 does not violate the right of private property. Defendant's right of the sovereign to examine the police power to regulate peace and good order, and maintain cleanliness and salubrity. In the danger of epidemics the city must have the right to regulate. As a sanitary measure markets may be abolished. The lessee could not claim the right to keep open. The act of 1874 does not violate the right of private property. Defendant's right of the sovereign to examine the police power to regulate peace and good order, and maintain cleanliness and salubrity. In the danger of epidemics the city must have the right to regulate. As a sanitary measure markets may be abolished. The lessee could not claim the right to keep open. The act of 1874 does not violate the right of private property. Defendant's right of the sovereign to examine the police power to regulate peace and good order, and maintain cleanliness and salubrity. In the danger of epidemics the city must have the right to regulate. As a sanitary measure markets may be abolished. The lessee could not claim the right to keep open. The act of 1874 does not violate the right of private property. Defendant's right of the sovereign to examine the police power to regulate peace and good order, and maintain cleanliness and salubrity. In the danger of epidemics the city must have the right to regulate. As a sanitary measure markets may be abolished. The lessee could not claim the right to keep open. The act of 1874 does not violate the right of private property. Defendant's right of the sovereign to examine the police power to regulate peace and good order, and maintain cleanliness and salubrity. In the danger of epidemics the city must have the right to regulate. As a sanitary measure markets may be abolished. The lessee could not claim the right to keep open. The act of 1874 does not violate the right of private property. Defendant's right of the sovereign to examine the police power to regulate peace and good order, and maintain cleanliness and salubrity. In the danger of epidemics the city must have the right to regulate. As a sanitary measure markets may be abolished. The lessee could not claim the right to keep open. The act of 1874 does not violate the right of private property. Defendant's right of the sovereign to examine the police power to regulate peace and good order, and maintain cleanliness and salubrity. In the danger of epidemics the city must have the right to regulate. As a sanitary measure markets may be abolished. The lessee could not claim the right to keep open. The act of 1874 does not violate the right of private property. Defendant's right of the sovereign to examine the police power to regulate peace and good order, and maintain cleanliness and salubrity. In the danger of epidemics the city must have the right to regulate. As a sanitary measure markets may be abolished. The lessee could not claim the right to keep open. The act of 1874 does not violate the right of private property. Defendant's right of the sovereign to examine the police power to regulate peace and good order, and maintain cleanliness and salubrity. In the danger of epidemics the city must have the right to regulate. As a sanitary measure markets may be abolished. The lessee could not claim the right to keep open. The act of 1874 does not violate the right of private property. Defendant's right of the sovereign to examine the police power to regulate peace and good order, and maintain cleanliness and salubrity. In the danger of epidemics the city must have the right to regulate. As a sanitary measure markets may be abolished. The lessee could not claim the right to keep open. The act of 1874 does not violate the right of private property. Defendant's right of the sovereign to examine the police power to regulate peace and good order, and maintain cleanliness and salubrity. In the danger of epidemics the city must have the right to regulate. As a sanitary measure markets may be abolished. The lessee could not claim the right to keep open. The act of 1874 does not violate the right of private property. Defendant's right of the sovereign to examine the police power to regulate peace and good order, and maintain cleanliness and salubrity. In the danger of epidemics the city must have the right to regulate. As a sanitary measure markets may be abolished. The lessee could not claim the right to keep open. The act of 1874 does not violate the right of private property. Defendant's right of the sovereign to examine the police power to regulate peace and good order, and maintain cleanliness and salubrity. In the danger of epidemics the city must have the right to regulate. As a sanitary measure markets may be abolished. The lessee could not claim the right to keep open. The act of 1874 does not violate the right of private property. Defendant's right of the sovereign to examine the police power to regulate peace and good order, and maintain cleanliness and salubrity. In the danger of epidemics the city must have the right to regulate. As a sanitary measure markets may be abolished. The lessee could not claim the right to keep open. The act of 1874 does not violate the right of private property. Defendant's right of the sovereign to examine the police power to regulate peace and good order, and maintain cleanliness and salubrity. In the danger of epidemics the city must have the right to regulate. As a sanitary measure markets may be abolished. The lessee could not claim the right to keep open. The act of 1874 does not violate the right of private property. Defendant's right of the sovereign to examine the police power to regulate peace and good order, and maintain cleanliness and salubrity. In the danger of epidemics the city must have the right to regulate. As a sanitary measure markets may be abolished. The lessee could not claim the right to keep open. The act of 1874 does not violate the right of private property. Defendant's right of the sovereign to examine the police power to regulate peace and good order, and maintain cleanliness and salubrity. In the danger of epidemics the city must have the right to regulate. As a sanitary measure markets may be abolished. The lessee could not claim the right to keep open. The act of 1874 does not violate the right of private property. Defendant's right of the sovereign to examine the police power to regulate peace and good order, and maintain cleanliness and salubrity. In the danger of epidemics the city must have the right to regulate. As a sanitary measure markets may be abolished. The lessee could not claim the right to keep open. The act of 1874 does not violate the right of private property. Defendant's right of the sovereign to examine the police power to regulate peace and good order, and maintain cleanliness and salubrity. In the danger of epidemics the city must have the right to regulate. As a sanitary measure markets may be abolished. The lessee could not claim the right to keep open. The act of 1874 does not violate the right of private property. Defendant's right of the sovereign to examine the police power to regulate peace and good order, and maintain cleanliness and salubrity. In the danger of epidemics the city must have the right to regulate. As a sanitary measure markets may be abolished. The lessee could not claim the right to keep open. The act of 1874 does not violate the right of private property. Defendant's right of the sovereign to examine the police power to regulate peace and good order, and maintain cleanliness and salubrity. In the danger of epidemics the city must have the right to regulate. As a sanitary measure markets may be abolished. The lessee could not claim the right to keep open. The act of 1874 does not violate the right of private property. Defendant's right of the sovereign to examine the police power to regulate peace and good order, and maintain cleanliness and salubrity. In the danger of epidemics the city must have the right to regulate. As a sanitary measure markets may be abolished. The lessee could not claim the right to keep open. The act of 1874 does not violate the right of private property. Defendant's right of the sovereign to examine the police power to regulate peace and good order, and maintain cleanliness and salubrity. In the danger of epidemics the city must have the right to regulate. As a sanitary measure markets may be abolished. The lessee could not claim the right to keep open. The act of 1874 does not violate the right of private property. Defendant's right of the sovereign to examine the police power to regulate peace and good order, and maintain cleanliness and salubrity. In the danger of epidemics the city must have the right to regulate. As a sanitary measure markets may be abolished. The lessee could not claim the right to keep open. The act of 1874 does not violate the right of private property. Defendant's right of the sovereign to examine the police power to regulate peace and good order, and maintain cleanliness and salubrity. In the danger of epidemics the city must have the right to regulate. As a sanitary measure markets may be abolished. The lessee could not claim the right to keep open. The act of 1874 does not violate the right of private property. Defendant's right of the sovereign to examine the police power to regulate peace and good order, and maintain cleanliness and salubrity. In the danger of epidemics the city must have the right to regulate. As a sanitary measure markets may be abolished. The lessee could not claim the right to keep open. The act of 1874 does not violate the right of private property. Defendant's right of the sovereign to examine the police power to regulate peace and good order, and maintain cleanliness and salubrity. In the danger of epidemics the city must have the right to regulate. As a sanitary measure markets may be abolished. The lessee could not claim the right to keep open. The act of 1874 does not violate the right of private property. Defendant's right of the sovereign to examine the police power to regulate peace and good order, and maintain cleanliness and salubrity. In the danger of epidemics the city must have the right to regulate. As a sanitary measure markets may be abolished. The lessee could not claim the right to keep open. The act of 1874 does not violate the right of private property. Defendant's right of the sovereign to examine the police power to regulate peace and good order, and maintain cleanliness and salubrity. In the danger of epidemics the city must have the right to regulate. As a sanitary measure markets may be abolished. The lessee could not claim the right to keep open. The act of 1874 does not violate the right of private property. Defendant's