New Orleans Republican.

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE UNITED STATES

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF NEW ORLEANS

THE DAILY REPUBLICAN

Is published every day (Mondays excepted) at No. 94 Camp street. Terms: $12 a year; $6 for six months; $3 for three months—payable invariably in advance. Single copies five cents.

Office—No. 94 Camp street.

RATES OF ADVERTISING:

Squares.	One month.	Two months	Three months	Six months	One year.
One	$12	$22	$30	$50	$75
Two	22	38	50	80	125
Three	30	53	70	110	175
Four	38	67	90	140	225
Five	46	80	105	170	275
Six	54	93	120	200	325
Seven	60	105	135	230	375
Eight	65	115	150	260	420
Nine	70	125	165	290	460
Ten	75	135	180	320	500
Eleven	80	145	195	350	540
Twelve	85	155	210	380	580
Thirteen	90	165	220	410	620
Fourteen	95	175	230	430	660
Fifteen	100	185	240	450	700
Thirty	175	330	450	750	1200

Monthly advertisements, inserted every other day, to be charged two-thirds of the above rates.

Second page monthly advertisements, each square, $20 per month.

Transient advertisements, having the run of the paper, first insertion $1 50 per square; each subsequent insertion seventy-five cents per square.

Second page transient advertisements, each insertion $1 50 per square.

Regular advertisers, who advertise largely, will be allowed such discount from above named transient rates as may be agreed upon; provided, that in no case shall such discount exceed twenty-five per cent.

THE WEEKLY REPUBLICAN

Is published every Saturday morning, and contains the news by telegraph, miscellaneous reading, editorials, local matters of general public interest, commercial and monetary reports, and everything that appears in the Daily, except such items as are of little or no public moment. The WEEKLY REPUBLICAN is an excellent family paper, valuable as well for instruction and amusement as information on the current topics of the day.

Terms of Subscription.

One year, $5; six months, $2 50.

Advertisements.

Transient advertisements same terms as in the Daily. Monthly advertisements inserted for one-fourth of the daily rates.

A liberal commission allowed to those who send us clubs of five or more.

PRESIDENTIAL POWERS

DE FACTO AND DE JURE

Reverdy Johnson's Reply to Mr. Charles O'Conor.

George Ticknor Curtis and Judge Black Answered.

We copy the following important letter, written by Hon. Reverdy Johnson, from the New York *Herald* of November 9:

BALTIMORE, October 28, 1874.

James Gordon Bennett, Esq., Editor of the Herald, New York:

DEAR SIR—I take the first leisure I have had since the publication of Mr. O'Conor's letter to you of the fifth of October to reply to it.

The single point in issue between us is, whether the President, having committed an error in recognizing Kellogg, was at liberty afterward to correct it, by refusing when applied to the second time.

Agreeing, as we do, that the recognition of Kellogg as Governor was legal and binding upon everybody in and out of the State, and, therefore, constituted him Governor de jure as well as de facto, we differ only as to its being conclusive upon the President himself. Mr. O'Conor holds that the President is at liberty to examine the matter and to recognize some one else as the Governor. According to Mr. O'Conor, that decision is law to everybody except the President—that, as to him, in such a case, he is a law unto himself; and, if upon further examination he shall think he has committed an error, it is his duty to correct it. In my view it is difficult to imagine a doctrine more full of mischief and more inconsistent with sound principle. No state of things can well be conceived more disastrous than that of leaving it to any person, however high may be his station and pure his motives, to make, by his single determination, one man a Governor of a State today and another man to-morrow.

It is no answer to say that these conflicting discussions are not to be apprehended as possible. Such a supposition, as Mr. O'Conor says, rests only upon the idea that there may be at the head of the nation a capricious or stupid and vacillating chief who might change his mind frequently and hurl State governments into power and out of it from day to day. The power of the President to change his opinion on such a matter, if Mr. O'Conor is right, makes it his duty to change it. This power and duty are independent of his actual character for ability and patriotism. He may be all that the President should be, or he may be such a man as Mr. O'Conor sketches. But, if there be danger in changing an opinion upon such a matter, the danger exists, and all its mischievous consequences will result, whatever may be the character of the President. The peril is found in the principle on which the power is claimed—the right and duty to change a first decision. The doctrine is dangerous; not because it will be abused by a President, but because it may be abused. No man is more willing to admit—certainly no one more strongly hopes—than I do, that the office of President will never be filled by any but a man of high character and great ability; but a man possessing both attributes, in such an exigency as this question involves, commit blunders, and these blunders he may innocently repeat. He may be wrong in his first decision from his not having thoroughly examined the question, or he may be led into error by the contrivance or fraud of others. The power and duty of the United States are prescribed by the fourth section of the fourth article of the constitution. The United States are to protect the State from domestic violence when called upon to do so by the Legislature, or, if not in session, by the Governor. The language of the clause, as far as necessary to quote it, is, "That the United States" "shall protect" each State "on application of the Legislature, or of the executive (when the Legislature can not be convened), against domestic violence." This provision, of itself, gives no power to the President. The obligation which it imposes is upon the United States, and, like all similar obligations, the mode of fulfilling them is to be prescribed by Congress. That department of the government is vested with all the granted or implied powers of legislation. Under this authority Congress passed two acts—one on the twenty-eighth of February, 1795, and the other on the third of March, 1807. By these laws the militia and army and navy of the United States are placed at the disposition of the President, to enable him, as the agent of the United States, to accomplish the object of the constitution.

The language of the first act, as far as material to be quoted, is that "in case of an insurrection in any State against the government it shall be lawful for the President of the United States, on application of the Legislature of said State, or of the Executive (when the Legislature can not be convened), to call forth such number of the militia of any other State or States, as may be applied for, as he may judge sufficient to suppress such insurrection." By the second act, in the same exigency, the President is authorized to employ the army and navy of the United States. Since the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Luther vs. Borden, no doubt exists, if, indeed, any ever was seriously entertained, that when the President is so called upon, he is to decide two questions: First, whether the Legislature or the Governor, when he is solicited by either, is the Legislature or the Governor of the State, and, second, whether an insurrection against the State prevails. These questions being distinctly submitted to him, his authority to determine them is complete and imperative. When, therefore, he interferes on the call of the Governor he determines that the party calling upon him is the Governor and that there is an insurrection. Unless he finds both these facts to exist his interference would be altogether illegal. His interference, therefore (to repeat it), necessarily determines both facts. To apply these remarks to the Louisiana case. Mr. Kellogg, professing to be the Governor of the State, invokes the President to put down an existing insurrection and the President does interfere. Can the legality of that interference be questioned by anybody? If the President acts corruptly and with the view to sustain one whom he knows or believes is not a Governor or to march his troops into a State for some other purpose than to suppress an insurrection, he makes himself liable to impeachment, and would deserve it; but his acts, in point of law, are not the less valid. In Mr. O'Conor's view what the President did in such a case, in the first instance, although obligatory upon everybody else, is not obligatory upon him. And if, therefore, he is, within a day or a week or any other specified time, called upon by McEnery, professing to be the Governor, to suppress an insurrection headed by Kellogg himself, it is not only his right, but his duty, to recognize McEnery as the Governor, and to put down an insurrection headed by Kellogg, who he had just before recognized as Governor, and when he had previously interfered to suppress an insurrection against him headed by McEnery.

In my second letter I referred to several decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States—among them that of Virginia vs. West Virginia (11 Wallace). These decisions—particularly the one in Wallace—seemed to me to bear strongly upon the point upon which Mr. O'Conor and myself differ.

That gentleman, however, thinks that they are "scarcely relevant," and the only reason he gives for so thinking is that the courts were governed only by the well established doctrine "that when an executive officer, under a special authority conferred upon him for a precisely defined purpose, performs a particular act essentially ministerial, and which, in its nature, can be performed but once, the courts will not review his proceedings should they be collaterally questioned." In applying this view to the cases cited Mr. O'Conor is, with due deference to him, clearly mistaken. In the case of Knox county vs. Aspinwall (21 Howard), cited by me in my prior letter, and the one in 11 Wallace, just referred to, the decision which was held to be final was not the decision of a question submitted to those deciding it as mere ministerial agents, but involved examination and judgment, and such judgments were, on that account, held to be conclusive. In the first case the commissioners of the county were to decide whether the subscription to the stock of the railroad (there the subject of dispute) had been authorized by the people of the county. The commissioners, therefore, were to examine into every question involving the legality of the election by which it was supposed the subscription had been authorized. This was not a mere ministerial act, but the exercise of a quasi judicial function. The same remarks are applicable to the West Virginia case. The returns of the elections held in the two counties there mentioned were, by the law under which they were held, made returnable to the Governor of Virgina, and authority was given to him to decide whether they had, at such elections, by a majority of votes, determined in favor of annexation to West Virginia. The Governor of Virginia, therefore, before he could certify that such a determination had been made, was to investigate the facts which the law required to exist previous to the election, as well as the legality of the election in all other respects.

It is obvious that this, also, was not a mere ministerial, but a judicial duty, and, like every other judicial duty, when passed into judgment, can be reversed only on an authorized appeal. The cases in the Supreme Court are numerous in which it has been held that where an officer is invested with power which, in its exercise, requires judgment and discretion, such power is judicial and not ministerial. In the case of Decatur vs. Paulding (14 Peters) Chief Justice Taney, giving the opinion of the court, stated that the duty of Mr. Paulding, in the matter there in question, was a judicial duty which required judgment and discretion, and was, therefore, when performed, conclusive, and, though erroneous, could not be rectified by mandamus. The same doctrine has been held in regard to the accounting officers of the Treasury. Wherever their duties require judgment and discretion they can not be revised, however erroneous, by mandamus.

The other reasons assigned by Mr. O'Conor for taking the Louisiana case out of the doctrine referred to, viz: That there are no "parties" in that case, is equally untenable. First, because if parties are necessary to render the decision of a President final, they did exist. They were, on the one side, Kellogg and the people of Louisiana who are not in insurrection; and, on the other side, the insurrectionists. But no "parties," in the ordinary acceptation of the term, are requisite to the finality of a decision under a duty in its nature judicial. In such cases all parties interested are before and represented by the officer upon whom is devolved the duty. Mr. O'Conor's further idea that it is the United States, and not the President, who are to protect the State against domestic violence is, in words, true, for such is the constitutional clause. But how are they to perform the function?

They can only do it by means provided by legislation, and this they have done by the acts of 1795 and 1807. The President, therefore, is in this matter performing the duty vested in the United States by the constitution. He is made their agent for the purpose. To call such a decision as this (as Mr. O'Conor does) a decision falling within the principle he states is, in my view, palpably erroneous. This will be seen by referring to the opinion of the court, as delivered by Mr. Justice Miller in the West Virginia case, where, in referring to the authority of the Governor, he says that the questions involved were made to rest "on his judgment." The other attempt of Mr. O'Conor to distinguish these cases from the Louisiana case is that in the latter there were none of the antecedents made necessary to the exercise of a judicial power. There were not, to use his own words, any "citation, issue or trial. There are no parties in any sense of the term which are recognized in jurisprudence, nor is there any judgment." The answer to this is very obvious. If the function to be performed be in its nature judicial and the duty to perform it is provided by law that law is a substitute for summons, citation, etc. When the President approves, or refuses to approve, a law passed by Congress the only summons he has is the presentation of the law, and the only authority he has to pass upon the question is the constitution. If he approves, can he afterward reverse his approval? If he declines to approve, and the time has passed for approval, can he reverse that decision? And are not both his decisions as binding upon him as upon Congress and the country?

Therefore, upon the whole, with all possible deference for Mr. O'Conor, I conclude, as I concluded my letter in answer to his of the twenty-sixth September, that his view on the point as to which he and I differ has no support either in principle or on authority.

Since the letters of Mr. O'Conor and myself appeared in your paper you have published two communications from gentlemen of high legal authority, one George Ticknor Curtis, and the other Judge Black. I propose very briefly to consider the grounds taken by each of them. Mr. Curtis is of the opinion that the recognitions of Kellogg as Governor by the President in February, 1873, and in September, 1873, were not only unauthorized, but void, and his reason for this opinion is that they were founded upon his placing Kellogg in power in 1872 by enforcing the execution of Durell's decree. That that decree was wholly void no lawyer can doubt, and that the President's action in regard to it was equally void is perfectly clear. But the error of Mr. Curtis is in supposing that the public has a right to look behind the President's action in 1873 and 1874. What the President did at each of those periods, was in exact conformity with the act of Congress of February, 1795. He was called upon by Kellogg, as Governor, to put down an alleged existing insurrection, and he was, therefore, obliged to decide whether Kellogg was Governor. He had no right to interfere unless he decided that question affirmatively. And, if it be true, as Mr. Curtis admits, that a President, in judging such a question, is the authorized agent of Congress, and, therefore, of what Mr. Curtis correctly terms "the political part of the government," I am not aware of any principle which entitled any one to look behind his judgment and reverse it, because believing that his decision was erroneously made. These remarks are, of course, equally applicable to the President's action in 1874.

It may be, and probably is true, that the constitution never contemplated such a state of things as existed in Louisiana, from the President's first interference in 1872 to his ultimate interference in 1874. But that in no way, in my judgment, impairs the legality of the acts done by him in 1873 and 1874. In 1873 Kellogg was, in fact, Governor, and recognized as such without regard to the inquiry how he became so. There was no other recognized Governor. McEnery had not been declared one, nor trusted as one, nor considered as one by any legal authority under the State or under the United States. Kellogg, then, was the only Governor who could invoke the aid of the President to put down an insurrection intended to remove him and to subvert the government of which he was the actual head.

Was the President authorized to refuse such aid? If he was, then the very purpose of the constitution and the act of 1795, as far as this State was concerned, would have been defeated and the State have been left to decide by battle who was her Governor and government. Violence of this kind it was the avowed object of the constitution to prevent, and yet it seems to me to be perfectly obvious that the President, under the circumstances of the Louisiana case, possessed no power to prevent it, if Mr. Curtis be right.

A word or two in regard to the view taken by Judge Black. He holds, as I do, that the President was bound, upon the application of Kellogg, in 1873, to interfere. He places it, however, upon the ground that Kellogg was at that time the de facto Governor, and then holds that Kellogg's right to call upon the President was solely because he was the de facto Governor. He agrees with me (and in this differs with Mr. O'Conor) that the President could not change his decision. But he maintains that the state of things existing in 1874 was entirely different from that upon which the President acted in 1873, as Kellogg had then ceased to be the de facto Governor, his official existence having become extinct by force of successful insurrection which placed McEnery in power. The judge is of opinion that Kellogg was never legally elected by the people, but that McEnery was, and he assumes this upon the authority of the report made by Mr. Carpenter, of the special committee of the Senate, to whom the subject had been referred. According to my recollection that report asserted that neither Kellogg nor McEnery was elected, and therefore advised a new election. In truth, if this was the case, as far as this point is concerned, neither had any legal right to the office by choice of the people. Now, the Judge's proposition is, that, although the President was bound in 1873, on application of Kellogg, as Governor, to interfere—because at that time he, *in fact*, held the office—yet that, having been removed by force, he ceased to hold or to have any legal claim to it. In this, with due submission to the Judge, I think he is in error. A Governor who is authorized to do so, and does call for the President's interference to put down an insurrection aimed at the subversion of the State government, has a right to have the insurrection frustrated, whatever may be the stage which it has reached. If it be an insurrection when it began it is not less an insurrection because of its success. If Kellogg had a right to be protected against it at its commencement, he had none the less right to be restored to his office when the insurrectionists had succeeded in driving him from it. The man placed in power by the insurrection is there without legal authority, because the insurrection itself was wholly illegal. There is, in my view, no distinction in a case of this kind between a call made upon the President under the act of 1795 by a Governor de jure and a Governor de facto.

The President is bound to prevent the success of the insurrection, and to drive the insurrectionists from power if they have achieved their purpose. Suppose the President when he marched his army, as Judge Black admits he was obliged to do, had found, when they reached the limit of the State, that the insurrectionists had triumped; was he to recall them? Or suppose his troops had marched into the State and had been defeated by the insurrectionists and driven out of it, and they had overthrown the existing government; was the President bound to acquiesce in the result, or, on the contrary, would he not be bound to send as many more troops there as might be necessary to put down the insurrection? Otherwise, an insurrection begun may be defeated, but an insurrection which progresses to success is beyond the power of the United States, and the people of the State have no means of relief except by continued resort to arms. If the judge be right, therefore, in his view of this point, a State in the condition in which Louisiana now is is without the remedy for which the constitution provides: a remedy, too, for which Hamilton, in the twenty-first number of the *Federalist*, truly represented as vital to the success of the governments, federal as well as State. In closing, all that I have to say on this subject I say with perfect sincerity—that I differ, with all possible respect and some diffidence, with the three gentlemen, Messrs. O'Conor, Curtis and Black, whose legal ability is known to the country.

I remain, with much regard, your obedient servant, REVERDY JOHNSON.

Regenerating Louisiana.

A man named White, of New Iberia, Louisiana, has broached a new and altogether plausible proposition for regenerating the State of Louisiana. It is well known that the State is, in a business sense, hopelessly demoralized. Its rich plantations are to a large extent neglected and overrun with weeds. Many of its best farms are attached for taxes, and the buildings and machinery are going to decay. Mr. White owns a section of land favorably situated, and proposes to give each alternate fifty acres of his plantation to any white married man from another State who will occupy and cultivate the property and build thereon a house as good as a "Carre cabin" costing $100. "Now," says Mr. White, "if every man in the State owning lands will do this, and seek for white settlers, we can, in two years, have an overwhelming majority in every parish in the State. We will do no charity, either; for the lands thus settled by honest, white yeomen will so enhance the remaining portion of each farm as to make it worth more than the whole is now. This is, however, our smallest profit. Society of all kinds will be better, and our State in the hands of our own race."

It will be seen that one principal purpose of this move is a political one, to avoid the chance of a colored majority in Louisiana. It is this consideration which more than any desire to improve the value of their lands will secure for Mr. White's proposition whatever favorable consideration it may receive. That it would succeed in adding greatly to the population and prosperity of the State there can be no reasonable doubt. The North is filled with men, largely farmers, who would jump at the chance of taking fifty acres of the rich soil of Louisiana as a gift on condition that they live on and cultivate it. That amount of land closely and intelligently farmed would yield a return which would seem princely to a husbandman accustomed to the small, careful farming of Germany or England. Whether it would make Mr. White's party as absolute in power as he now thinks, might prove a matter of some question. Every white man from another State who should emigrate thither under these circumstances might not necessarily be a Democrat. The industrious farmer of small means is very likely to be a Republican. However, Louisiana can not do better than to try some such plan as the one proposed. Her own people are incapable of restoring her agricultural prosperity. The white men there are too proud and indolent to work, and the only salvation of Louisiana must come through steady, hard labor, economical living and attention to some other pursuits than office-holding and politics.—*Cleveland Leader.*

"Olivia" writes to the Philadelphia *Press* about "the great throbbing heart of the republic, whose right hand grasps the beard of the stormy Atlantic, while the left is held out for the Pacific to kiss."

PARTINGS.

Sad is all parting. E'en of passing ships,
Met for a moment in the silence wide
Of middle ocean. Words from strangest lips
A sudden dearness take in such betide.

And double sadness in the parting lies
Of friends whose friendship with life's dawn begun,
Yet in the noon-glare pales, and faints, and dies,
When later years turn colder in the sun.

And sadness beyond words the parting hath
Of hearts that, by endearing passion torn,
Yet can not tread one self-same mortal path;
They live to love, and love, alas! to mourn.

But of all partings whereto man must come—
And who but knows how many they may be!—
Just two there are to pity's hearing dumb,
Though "loud" enough to move us pieteously.

The first of these divisions past compare
Is mainly seen on skulls extremely numb,
To wit: the parting of untem'nine hair
Along the middle of the cranium.

A worse than that, you think, no tongue reports;
And yet there's one to put it quite to shame;
When H. John-Smith an extra hyphen sports,
And in the middle parts his honest name.

Survey of Free Masonry.

The writer of a recent article in the German periodical *Unsere Zeit* gives a survey of the existing conditions of Free Masonry which is worth partial epitomizing. The Jesuits, tolerating no secret society but their own, have always denounced Free Masonry as especially antagonistic to the influence of the papacy and pernicious to the interests of religion in general. It has suited them, in fact, to describe it as a powerful league, worked, like their own order, from a central pivot, and aiming at revolutionary efforts in Church and State. The truth is that the general association of Free Masons consists of a congeries of clubs in different countries, having in common certain usages, ceremonials and signs of recognition, but differing widely in outward details, in general tendency, in special aims, and even in conception of their own existence. Some of these societies scarcely know the name or being of others; some are antagonistic in their fundamental principles, while between others an affinity more or less close may exist.

Free Masonry, in its present general form, had its beginning in Great Britain, whence it was gradually propagated in other countries subsequently to the year 1720. The original idea of the Masonic league evolved itself no doubt from the guilds of the middle ages. Sober antiquarianism can not consent to place it farther back, though some enthusiasts have tried to make out its derivation from the Knight Templars, the Eleusinian mysteries, the builders of Solomon's Temple, or the Hierophants of ancient Egypt. It seems to have been about the beginning of the eighteenth century that a mystic and moral meaning came to be attached by the Guild of Masons to the craft which their association represented. To "build" was interpreted as signifying to "edify" in a spiritual sense; and the idea took possession of the brotherhood that their mission was to erect a new state of things on the broad basis of humanity, overriding all barriers of religion, nation, and society. Free Masonry was to be cosmopolitan. But in the imperfect state of the world's civilization it has always turned out that cosmopolitanism has had insurmountable obstacles to encounter; and so it came to pass that Free Masonry, instead of being the same in all realms and for all races, took different colors and pursued different ends not only in Great Britain, France, Germany, America and other regions, but in divers parts of the same country. There are societies of Free Masons whose *raison d'etre* is ritualism; a constitution of multitarious grades and ceremonies. There are societies which make very little count of formal observances, and whose avowed aim is simply the moral improvement of themselves and mankind in general. There are, again, societies which adopt some definite external sphere of action; "practical" Free Masons they may be called, their energies being directed to some object of material or intellectual achievement. But none of these societies have necessary geographical or ethnological limitations. The "Swedish system" has a large following in Germany; the "Old Scottish system" flourishes in France. The "Scottish system," of which these two are offshoots, has fewer partisans in Scotland itself than in any other country.

This "Scottish system" and the "English system" are the two leading types of constitutional framework between which all Free Masonry is divided. The English system recognizes merely the three fundamental orders of apprentice, comrade and master, on which the original Masonic guilds rested. These orders or degrees are recognized in all other systems, but numerous others have been added to them in organizations of more ritualistic tendency. Of the more ritualist organizations the Scottish system is the parent stem. Its main offshoots are the Swedish, French, Irish, Old Scottish and Egyptian varieties. It originated among the adherents of the Stuarts at the time of the rebellion under Charles Edward, and was propagated in France by the Jacobites, who after the suppression of the rebellion took refuge in that country. From France it made its way into other lands. Its most ritualist development is the old Scottish system, which counts no fewer than thirty-three "degrees" among its members, endowing them with such titles as "Sovereign Prince of the Rosy Cross," "Prince of Lebanon," "Head of the Tabernacle," "High and Mighty Prince of the Royal Secret," "Knight of the Brazen Serpent," etc. The Irish system, prevalent in Ireland only, has fifteen degrees; the Swedish, nine. The French, which no longer exists as a separate system, had seven. It may be said, indeed, that still more ritualist forms than the old Scottish system were the Egyptian forms of Mizriam and Memphis, which counted scarcely less than a hundred degrees; but these organizations have come to nothing, and in general it is said that the Masonic societies which rest on numerous degrees and elaborate ceremonial are on the decline in the present day.

The Swedish system occupies a somewhat exceptional position in Free Masonry. It was introduced into Sweden from France in the year 1760, and became the dominant organization in its new home. From Sweden it made its way to Germany and Denmark. It rests on the assumption that Free Masonry was derived directly from the Knights Templars; consequently it possesses an exclusively Christian character, while at the same time it attaches a mysterious meaning to the history and tendencies of the order. It made considerable way in Germany, where at present it is represented by the so-called "Grosse Landesloge von Deutchland," having its seat in Berlin. It holds a position of antagonism to the Radical or Fortschritt party, and indeed, to Liberalism in general; and when the Imperial Crown Prince laid down his office of Grand Master of the "Grosse Grandsloge" in January last the step was considered as a proof that the reactionary mysticism of his Masonic brethren was repugnant to his own convictions. Two other grand lodges have their seats at Berlin—the "Grosse Nationalmutter Loge zu den drei Weltkugeln" and the "Grosseloge von Preussen," or "Royal York zur Freundschaft." The first of these has, like the Swedish Grand Lodge, a specially Christian character, and excludes all Jews from membership. The second makes no such restrictions. Beside the Berlin grand lodges there are five others in different parts of Germany, and there are likewise five independent lodges, owing no allegiance to any grand lodge.

Since the year 1868 the masters of the eight German grand lodges have held annual meetings, and in 1872 they founded the German League or union of grand lodges, in the view of building together the scattered elements of German FreeMasonry. The following is their official declaration of the aims and tendencies of this Masonic league:

"Free Masonry aims at promoting, under a symbolical form borrowed chiefly from the usages of the working masons congregated in their building huts, the moral improvement of man and human happiness in general.

"While Free Masonry prepossesses in its members faith in God as the Supreme Architect of the universe, in a moral order of the world, and in the immortality of the soul, it requires from them the satisfaction of the highest law—'Love God above all things, and thy neighbor as thyself.'

"The Free Mason bond is no secret alliance; its object, history, legislation, are no mystery, and can at any time be laid before government when required. The oath of secrecy demanded of every Free Mason on his reception has reference only to the forms of Masonic ritual and to customary observances."

In the Austro-Hungarian empire the dual character of the constitution has influenced the status of Free Masonry. After the settlement of 1867 a Grand Lodge was established in Hungary without any political restrictions, but in the Cis-Leithanian provinces it was some time before the old State distrust could be overcome, and it is only quite recently that the members of the association have been able to obtain more than the permitted existence of a non-political club, which is subject to police inspection.

French Free Masonry has followed the political vicissitudes of the country. Prince Lucien Murat, appointed Grand Master after his cousin's *coup d'etat*, strove to make it the subservient tool to the Second Empire. But the increasing clericalism of his sympathies raised an opposition to him in the lodges of the Grand Orient, which in 1861 chose Prince Napoleon Jerome for their Grand Master. Thence came a variety of dissensions and intrigues. Since the fall of the empire the name and title of grand master have been abolished, and a "president" appointed instead, in harmony with the republican forms of the national government.

In Italy, since the consolidation of the monarchy, Free Masonry has sprung up and extended ramifications everywhere. Two offshoots from the Italian lodges have been lately established; one in Greece and one in Egypt itself, the old land of mystery.

In Spain, Free Masonry has gained a footing since the expulsion of Queen Isabella, but has had sundry obstacles to contend with. In Russia it was suppressed fifty years ago, after the insurrection with which it was held to be in connection, and has not since raised its head in that country. It exists under various "systems" in Turkey; but in the United States of America it counts more adherents than in all the other countries of the whole world together.

In England, Scotland, and Ireland, Holland and Belgium, Denmark and Sweden, the grand Masonic lodges, says our German authority, "either sleep for the most part the sleep of the just or lead an edifying life of peace and quiet."—*Pall Mall Gazette.*

Sherman.

The newspapers, says a correspondent in Washington of the New York *Republic*, are again reviving the rumor that the chief purpose of the removal of the army headquarters to St. Louis is that General Sherman may enter the field as presidential candidate from the Mississippi valley. If General Sherman himself does not entertain this idea, if the presidential bee is not in his bonnet, he certainly has some very indiscreet friends. General Sherman himself has in public given two reasons for desiring the removal of headquarters. The reason which has seemed to have the most force is that, as the bulk of the army is generally stationed west of the Mississippi river, the location of the headquarters at St. Louis would bring the General of the army nearer the more important scene of his activity. His friends have said that he has the yearnings of an old soldier for an active life, and had rather—

Live in the midst of alarms,
Than dwell in this desolate place.

It is not surprising that General Sherman, who is a bundle of nerves and a man of great natural energy, should prefer to have a more active occupation than has been afforded by the anomalous position he has held in Washington; but it is to be doubted whether he will find a broader field for his energies, at least within the scope of army duty, at St. Louis than in Washington. The only other reason which General Sherman has publicly assigned for the removal is a regard for the future of his children. He began his own career in life as a business man, and he has expressed the determined purpose to educate his children to the pursuits of peace. There is something that Americans can be proud of in this trait in the character of General Sherman. The country is full of croakers who predict the downfall of the republic, and declare that republican government in America is a failure; but the spirit of republicanism has not entirely died out from our people when one of the greatest military leaders of the age refuses to permit his sons to enter West Point or the Naval Academy, and educates them for the occupations of commercial life. General Sherman has frequently said to those who are intimate with him that his sons, with his consent, shall never become soldiers. There is still another reason, connected with the future of his children, why General Sherman should choose St. Louis for his permanent home. We have all been told that the recent marriage of Miss Minnie Sherman to young Lieutenant Fitch of the navy was one of the old school romances, in which dollars and cents did not enter as an element. Young Fitch, who is poor, has resigned his position in the navy, and after the customary leave of absence of a year, will enter into business in St. Louis in one of the large iron establishments there.

General Sherman's own business career commenced a quarter of a century ago as a partner in the house of Lucas, Turner & Co., of San Francisco. He was there generally commended for his business qualifications, and has often said that the happiest period of his life was spent in San Francisco. He considered his California experience the most valuable of his career. General Sherman has said that he could not afford to live in Washington, and did not desire to remain in a city, which, in his opinion, had no commercial future. The salary and perquisites of the General of the army are about $25,000 annually; if this income is not sufficient for Washington, the same resources would scarcely be adequate for St. Louis, notwithstanding it is a city of the West.

Ex-United States Senator Foote in one of his recollections states that General Sherman never voted at a political election in his life.

General Sherman is determined that the world shall know his theories about the war, and have the benefit of his personal experience of the different battles in which he was engaged. Unfortunately he has so decided that his memoirs shall not be given to the world until after his death. His personal "Reminiscences of the War of the Rebellion" are completed, and fill three large ledger folio volumes, written in manuscript on both sides of the page. He has been engaged in this work about two years. His practice was to write the rough notes as opportunity offered. These notes, which were then delivered to an officer of his staff, and, under the most solemn injunctions, are to be kept secret and sacred until his own death. One reason why the decision was made to withhold the memoirs from publication was that General Sherman desired to avoid the personal controversies which, perhaps, might follow from the publication of the book.

General Sherman, before his recent trip to Europe, frequently said that he never knew what it was to be tired. He says now that he has learned that lesson, having made that experience in ascending and descending Mount Vesuvius in one afternoon.

General Sherman during all his residence in Washington has never permitted any officer of his staff to draw mileage. The staff officers are always required to pay their own traveling expenses.

It has been charged in the opposition press that General Sherman did not act rightly in the disposition he made of the house here which was given him by the merchants of several Eastern cities. This statement is false and scandalous. General Sherman tried on three different occasions to induce the donors to take back their gift, but was refused.

One of the characteristics of General Sherman is his remarkably tenacious memory. He seems to be able to perfectly recall all the details of the battles in which he was engaged, and to this day he will discuss with brigade commanders the respective positions of their commands at the different stages of the most complicated battles. His conversational powers, for which he is noted, are on such occasions especially fascinating. He has little imagination, but wonderful powers of observation. He speaks with great fluency and vigor. His conversation is characterized by great nervous energy. He is never quiet. He frequently reminds the listener, by the vivacity and incisiveness of his speech, of an intelligent Frenchman.

A story is going the rounds of the press, according to which General Sherman is said to have recently defined his religious creed. I know nothing of the truth of this story, but the creed mentioned might satisfy the most easy-going religious epicurean. It has been the impression that General Sherman has left the piety of his family to the care of his wife, who is a most devoted Roman Catholic. She is so devoted to her faith that whenever any of the Roman Catholic sisterhood desire to obtain control of one of the government hospitals, Mrs. Sherman is the person whose influence is first sought. There is a true story of General Sherman when on the Atlantic campaign, which has grown so old as to have become new again. At a very important and critical time, pending the siege of Atlanta, when all the supernumeraries of the army had been sent to the rear, in the anticipation of a decisive movement, some representatives of the Christian commission desired to go to the front with Bibles and tracts, and to have transportation furnished them for that purpose. General Sherman, after hearing their applications, answered, "Certainly not; crackers and meat are now more necessary for my army than any moral or religious agency."

However insignificant the removal of the army headquarters may prove in a political sense, it has brought desolation to the social world. The staff officers have long been conspicuous figures at the gala receptions. Although they were never known to turn their heels upon an enemy, they have made most excellent use of their heels here. General Sherman, although sometimes loose and careless in his dress, has been very prominent in social circles. Indeed, in this, as in all other respects, he has led his staff in becoming

A captive in Augusta's bowers
To beauty and her train.

A Wonderful House.

In the city of London there is a mansion of ordinary exterior, the dwelling of Mr. Alfred Morrison, having an interior so unique and costly that we condense an account of it from a recent description by a visitor. It is a square, lead colored building, externally unnoticeable; "but pass through the doorway, and in an instant every fair clime surrounds you." Entering a room for reading and writing we are conscious of a certain warmth of reception even from the walls. They are of silk, made in Lyons, after designs by Owen Jones, an Englishman of great reputation for interior decoration. The design suggests an endless series of *amphoræ* (oval-shaped vases), whose outlines have suddenly budded off into little branches. The surface is Persian, and the sentiment of the room is oriental, without presenting a single instance where oriental work has been copied. The carpet is Persian, also designated by Jones, the most noticeable figure being the crossed squares in star shape to match a similar one on the coffered ceiling.

There is also a blue room, a yellow room and a pink room, but in none of these are there any loud or garish tints. The ceiling of the reading room is after the fashion of Italian work of the fifteenth century, which ceased to be used on account of its great weight and consequent liability to fall. It was composed of heavy mouldings in deep relief, but Jones revived it and rendered it safe by inventing a material called fibrous plaster. He made the mouldings of wood, covered them with canvas, to which he applied many coats of plaster well rubbed down in any shape he wished, and afterward painted. The coffers in this house are star shaped, and in each is a convoluted shell of gold. But neither the wonderful hangings nor the elaborate ceilings are comparable with the manner in which rare and precious woods are used. In the dado, jambs and chair boarding we find no carving, but simply ebonized and natural colored woods. Some of these are so fine that the closest inspection fails to detect any grain. All the rosettes on the chimney pieces, featherings about the doors, and cappings for the dados are formed in white, golden, red, cream colored and brown, of all shades, in the natural wood, not stained or painted in any way. Even the chairs and tables are made of precious woods.

In the library the book shelves do duty as dados around the room, and have doors of alternate glass and wood. The latter are adorned with a foliation over two feet high, growing from the bottom of the panel and leading out at the top, which can not be surpassed by any ancient marquetry. Above these the green and gold lustres of the walls rise to a cone, above which is an early Tudor ceiling of checker pattern, between reliefs of a large star with four shadings of different colors, or a star within a star, golden, dark and white. The chimney piece gives the impression of a large arched cabinet, with fire grate beneath, having two wings, in which are contained specimens of porcelain from Persia and Cashmere. Old as these are they have the appearance of having been designed for the room; the decorator never saw them until they were brought in by the owner of the mansion. The drawing room has a fretted ceiling, frieze of damask, picked out with gold; inlaid cabinet work dado surrounding the room like a necklace. The chimney pieces are by Lebec of Paris, one of them occupying two years to finish.

In the matter of metal work, Mr. Morrison being on a tour in Spain, found in a humble village a workman named Zouloaga, who he felt sure was capable of great things if he had a chance, so he gave him a commission of $5000 to execute something, and the result was a coffer or chest, nine feet by three, which Zouloaga worked on for years. When Morrison received it he acknowledged at once that he had paid only an installment of the value of this marve'ous work. It is simply described as being covered with all manner of scrolls and figures in iron, with so wonderful a finish that it must be seen to be appreciated. Morrison found the best metal workers in Spain, the best ornamenters in Paris, and silks in Lyons, but for cabinet and wood workers he had no occasion to go out of England. There is nothing in the house inharmonious with its purpose. Even the chairs are works of art constructed of precious woods, and nearly all differing from each other, some suggesting the perforated chairs of the Delhi palaces, others of the Saxon throne in Westminister Abbey.

Above all, there is no sham in this house; no wood pretending to be metal, no iron affecting to be marble. Each part of the house has its proper relation to the whole, and each detail exhibits the same harmony and matchless art, the table leg as truly as the Lebec mantelpiece. Ascend the magnificent stairway, past the globes of light upheld by bronze candelabra seven feet high, and you will find the same painstaking, careful workmanship everywhere, even in the closets and the nursery. Some of the best ornamentation in the house is a pale blue and gold scroll surrounding the skylight at the top.

The Troops in Louisiana.

The Chicago *Tribune* of the eleventh instant says:

There is an appeal, put forth in the language and tone of a demand by some self-constituted committee in New Orleans, that the troops be removed from Louisiana. For what purpose should they be removed? Six weeks ago there were no troops in Louisiana, and the State was as free from military interference as is Illinois. An armed rebellion suddenly seized the government of that State, deposed all the general and local officers, and installed a new force in all the departments. Troops were sent to the State and the government restored. Admitting that Kellogg was never legally elected, and that his installation in January, 1873, was a usurpation, it will not be questioned by any person that the President could do anything else than to restore him and suppress the insurrection. Upon that point there is now no difference of opinion. The fact that there are troops in Louisiana at all at this time is due to that rebellion, to the overthrow of the State government by the armed and organized mob of Louisiana. Now that the troops are there, they had better stay there until such time as the peace of the State is established. According to the reports, the Democrats have elected a majority of the Legislature and of the local officers, and are substantially in control of the government. The troops will not hurt them, unless they undertake to take things that don't belong to them.

According to a Pittsburg newspaper the gray squirrels in the Alleghany valley are engaged in a general migration. They draw their recruits from all points, and may be seen daily swimming the river in large numbers and pursuing an easterly course. Old farmers say that such a migration has not taken place before since 1846, and regard it as a forerunner of an extremely severe winter.

OFFICIAL NOTICES.

PROPOSALS FOR CARRYING MAILS.

POSTOFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, October 1, 1874.

PROPOSALS WILL BE RECEIVED AT THE Contract Office of this Department until 3 P. M. of February 1, 1875, (to be decided by March 8, 1875,) for carrying the mails of the United States from July 1, 1875, to June 30, 1878, on the following routes in the State of

LOUISIANA,

and by the schedule of departures and arrivals herein specified, viz:

30096 From Vicksburg, Mississippi, by Delta, Louisiana; Carrville, Warrenton, Mississippi; New Town Landing, Leo, New Carthage, Louisiana (n. o.); Hurricane, Mississippi; Ashwood, Louisiana, (n. o.); Buck Ridge, Grand Gulf, Mississippi; Hard Times Landing, St. Joseph, Louisiana; Waterproof, Rifle Point (n. o.); Natchez, Mississippi; Shamrock, Louisiana; Bullitt's Bayou, River's Landing, Fairview (n. o.), Jackson Point, Mississippi, (n. o.); Correna Landing, Kienstra's Store, Black Hawk, Louisiana; Fort Adams, Mississippi; Riverside, Clarksville (n. o.); Red River Landing, Louisiana, Bayou Tunica, New Texas, Point Coupee, St. Francisville, PortHudson, Baton Rouge, Plaquemine, and Donaldsonville, to New Orleans, 403 miles and back, three times a week, in steamboats.
Leave Vicksburg Monday, Tuesday and Friday at 9 P. M.;
Arrive at New Orleans Monday, Thursday and Friday by 10 A. M.;
Leave New Orleans Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday at 5 P. M.;
Arrive at Vicksburg Monday by 9 P. M. and Thursday and Saturday by 5 P. M.;
Bond required with bid, $30,000. Check, $1490.
Present pay, $29,980 per annum.

30097 From Brashear, by Berwick (n. o.), Pattersonville, Centreville, Franklin, Baldwin, Clarenton (n. o.), Cypre Mort and Jeanerett's, to New Iberia, seventy-two miles and back, six times a week, in steamboats.
Leave Brashear daily, except Sunday, at 11:30 P. M.;
Arrive at New Iberia next day by 6 A. M.;
Leave New Iberia daily, except Sunday, at 3 P. M.;
Arrive at Brashear by twelve midnight;
Bond required with bid, $12,500. Check, $625.
Present pay, $12,500 per annum.

30098 From New Orleans, by McCutcheon's Landing (n. o.), St. Charles, Gassin's Landing (n. o.), Edgard, Bonnet Carre, Longview, St. Patrick's, Grand Point (n. o.), Convent, Welcome, Donaldsonville, New River, Bayou Goula, St. Gabriel, Plaquemine, Bruly Landing, Baton Rouge, West Baton Rouge, Lobdell's Store (n. o.), Belle Vale, Port Hudson, Glenwood, Hermitage, Waterloo, and St. Francisville, to Red River Landing, 216 miles and back, three times a week, in steamboats.
Leave New Orleans Monday, Wednesday and Friday at 5 P. M.;
Arrive at Red River Landing next days by 10 P. M.;
Leave Red River Landing Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday at 2 P. M.;
Arrive at New Orleans next day by 3 P. M.
Bond required with bid, $33,400. Check, $1670.

30099 From New Orleans, by Mandeville and Madisonville, to Covington, forty-eight miles and back, three times a week, in steamboats.
Leave New Orleans Monday, Thursday and Saturday at 2 P. M.;
Arrive at Covington Monday and Thursday by 6 P. M. and Saturday by 9 P. M.;
Leave Covington Tuesday and Friday at 5 A. M. and Monday at 2 A. M.
Arrive at New Orleans Tuesday and Friday by 3 P. M. and Monday by 12 M.
Bond required with bid, $4500.

30100 From New Orleans, by Ducros Station (n. o.), Drew's Station, St. Bernard, Moss Grove, Jesuit's Bend, Beausejour (n. o.), St. Sophia, Point-a-la-Hache, Point Michael, Grand Prairie, Home Place, Buras and Pilot Town, to Pass-a-l'Outre (n. o.), 141 miles and back, three times a week, in steamboats.
Leave New Orleans Monday, Wednesday and Friday at 9 A. M.;
Arrive at Pass-a-l'Outre next days by 3 P. M.;
Leave Pass-a-l'Outre Monday, Wednesday and Friday at 9 A. M.;
Arrive at New Orleans next days by 3 P. M.
Bond required with bid, $13,200. Check, $660.

30101 From New Orleans, by Jefferson (n. o.), to Carrollton, six miles and back, twelve times a week.
Leave New Orleans daily, except Sunday, at 10 A. M. and 4 P. M.;
Arrive at Carrollton by 11 A. M. and 5:30 P. M.;
Leave Carrollton daily, except Sunday, at 8 A. M. and 1 P. M.;
Arrive at New Orleans by 9:30 A. M. and 2:30 P. M.
Bond required with bid, $1540.

30102 From New Orleans to St. Bernard, fifteen miles and back, twice a week.
Leave New Orleans Monday and Thursday at 9 A. M.;
Arrive at St. Bernard by 12 M.;
Leave St. Bernard Monday and Thursday at 1 P. M.;
Arrive at New Orleans by 6 P. M.
Bond required with bid, $800.

30103 From New Orleans to Grand Isle, ninety-six miles and back, twice a week from June 1 to September 30, and once a week the residue of the year.
Schedule from first June to thirtieth September:
Leave New Orleans Monday and Thursday at 6 A. M.;
Arrive at Grand Isle next days by 6 P. M.;
Leave Grand Isle Wednesday and Saturday at 6 A. M.;
Arrive at New Orleans next days by 6 P. M.
Schedule from first October to thirty-first May.
Leave New Orleans Monday at 6 A. M.;
Arrive at Grand Isle next day by 6 P. M.
Leave Grand Isle Wednesday at 6 A. M.;
Arrive at New Orleans next day by 6 P. M.
Bond required with bid, $2300.

30104 From Mandeville, by Bayou Lacombe (n. o.) and Bon Fouca (n. o.), to Indian Village (n. o.), thirty five miles and back, once a week.
Leave Mandeville Tuesday at 6 A. M.;
Arrive at Indian Village by 6 P. M.
Leave Indian Village Wednesday at 6 A. M.;
Arrive at Mandeville by 6 P. M.
Bond required with bid, $600.

30105 From Thibodaux to Terrebonne, three and a half miles and back, six times a week.
Leave Thibodaux daily, except Sunday, at 9 A. M.;
Arrive at Terrebone by 10 A. M.;
Leave Terrebonne daily, except Sunday, at 11 A. M.;
Arrive at Thibodeaux by 12 M.
Bond required with bid, $400.

30106 From Raceland, by Lockport (n. o.) and Valjous (n. o.), to Orange City (n. o.), thirty-eight miles and back, once a week.
Leave Raceland Wednesday at 2 P. M.;
Arrive at Orange City next day by 2 P. M.;
Leave Orange City Tuesday at 10 A. M.;
Arrive at Raceland next day by 10 A. M.
Bond required with bid, $600.

30107 From Covington, by Parkersburg (n. o.), and Luna (n. o.), to Indian Village (n. o.), forty seven miles and back once a week.
Leave Covington Tuesday at 7 A. M.;
Arrive at Indian Village next day by 12 M.;
Leave Indian Village Wednesday at 1 P. M.;
Arrive at Covington next day by 6 P. M.
Bond required with bid, $600.

30108 From Ponchatoula to Springfield, eight miles and back, six times a week.
Leave Pontchatoula daily, except Sunday, at 8:40 A. M.;
Arrive at Springfield at 12 M.;
Leave Springfield daily, except Sunday, at 1 P. M.;
Arrive at Ponchatoula by 3:20 P. M.
Bond required with bid, $600.

30109 From Springfield, by Bayou Barbary and French Settlement, to Port Vincent, forty-one miles and back, once a week.
Leave Springfield Tuesday at 6 A. M.;
Arrive at Port Vincent by 7 P. M.;
Leave Port Vincent Wednesday at 6 A. M.;
Arrive at Springfield by 7 P. M.;
Bond required with bid, $500.

30110 From Port Vincent, by Walker's (n. o.), Otts Mills (n. o.), and Hog Branch, to Independence, fifty miles and back, once a week.
Leave Port Vincent Monday at 7 A. M.;
Arrive at Independence next day by 12 M.;
Leave Independence Tuesday at 1 P. M.;
Arrive at Port Vincent next day by 6 P. M.
Bond required with bid, $700.

30111 From Amite City, by Welche's Bridge, to Franklinton, twenty-five miles and back, twice a week.
Leave Amite City Monday and Friday at 8 A. M.;
Arrive at Franklinton by 4 P. M.;
Leave Franklinton Tuesday and Saturday at 8 A. M.;
Arrive at Amite City by 4 P. M.
Bond required with bid, $500.

30112 From Amite City, by Greensburg, Darlington and Kent's Store, to Clinton, forty miles and back, six times a week.
Leave Amite City daily, except Sunday, at 6 A. M.;
Arrive at Clinton by 6 P. M.;
Leave Clinton daily, except Sunday, at 6 A. M.;
Arrive at Amite City by 6 P. M.
Bond required with bid, $2000.

30113 From Tangipahoa, by Sunny Hill, to Palestine, twenty-one miles and back, once a week.
Leave Tangipahoa Monday at 8 A. M.;
Arrive at Palestine by 6 P. M.;
Leave Palestine Tuesday at 6 A. M.;
Arrive at Tangipahoa by 6 P. M.
Bond required with bid, $300.

30114 From Franklinton to Shady Grove, twenty-five miles and back, once a week.
Leave Franklinton Wednesday at 8 A. M.;
Arrive at Shady Grove by 5 P. M.;
Leave Shady Grove Thursday at 8 A. M.;
Arrive at Franklinton by 5 P. M.
Bond required with bid, $200.

30115 From Franklinton to Palestine, ten miles and back, once a week.
Leave Franklinton Monday at 8 A. M.;
Arrive at Palestine by 11 A. M.;
Leave Palestine Monday at 12 M.;
Arrive at Franklinton by 3 P. M.
Bond required with bid, $100.

30116 From Greensburgh by Pine Grove and Dennis Mills to Stony Point, twenty-three miles and back, twice a week.
Leave Greensburgh Monday and Thursday at 8 A. M.;
Arrive at Stony Point by 4 P. M.;
Leave Stony Point Tuesday and Friday at 8 A. M.;
Arrive at Greensburgh by 4 P. M.;
Bond required with bid, $500.

30117 From Stony Point, by Oldfield, to Hog Branch, sixteen miles and back, once a week.
Leave Stony Point Monday at 1 P. M.;
Arrive at Hog Branch by 6 P. M.;
Leave Hog Branch Monday at 7 A. M.;
Arrive at Stony Point by 12 M.
Bond required with bid, $200.

30118 From Stony Point, by Magnolia and Magnolia Springs (n. o.), to Baton Rouge, thirty-one miles and back, twice a week.
Leave Stony Point Tuesday and Friday at 3 A. M.;