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

AUCTION SALES THIS DAY.

BY A. GERARD, at 11 o'clock, at Phœnix stables, horses, mules, carriages, etc.

Local Intelligence.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS CLOSED.—All the public schools will be closed until next Monday. The reason for this is that our distinguished visitors, the Knights Templar, will make a grand parade to-day, and of course all the children wish to see the uncommon sight, and the two following days being regular holidays, the doors will not be opened.

AUCTION SALE OF CITY PROPERTY.—Mr. J. B. Walton, auctioneer, yesterday put up at public sale several parcels of city property, as per advertisement, and the following is the result:

Four lots of ground, fronting on Erato street, between Dryades and Baronne streets, sold each for $1175, Mr. G. T. Schilling being the purchaser. This property has been used by the city for years as a kind of depot for the Department of Improvements, and is well filled. The buildings do not amount to much, and if they did not the purchaser has a splendid bargain in any event. The lots measure twenty-seven feet front by over 150 feet deep.

A lot of ground, fronting on Baronne and running through to Penn street, between Poydras and Perdido streets, brought $1925, the fortunate bidder being Mr. H. Kern. There is a brick building on the ground, but the purchaser has a lien on it which is almost equal to proprietorship.

Three lots of ground at the corner of Chippewa and Richard streets were sold to Mr. Richard Ferrell for $525 each.

Three lots of ground, with improvements, running from Wells to Front streets, one fronting on Crossman street, were sold to Mr. Joseph Hernandez at $950 per lot.

Four lots of ground fronting on Bacchus, one on the corner of Robert street, were sold to Mr. J. Hernandez at $100 each.

The iron building, at the head of Canal street, was sold to Mr. John Lange for $3550, the purchaser to remove the structure.

A parcel of unimproved ground, about 150 acres, in the parish of St. Bernard, in the rear of the United States military cemetery, sold for $775 to the Mechanical and Agricultural College.

There were several other properties advised for sale with the above, but an injunction stopped proceedings.

AN OPENING FOR OLD AND YOUNG.—At the hour when to-morrow's sun shall for an instant halt at meridian, M. Francois Renaudin will appear from the mists of an unknown quantity and effulge in the castle known as No. 67 north side of St. Mary's market, formerly called the Old Place. The new proprietor, who was recently domiciled at No. 78, south side of said market, has fitted up his new place in a magnetic fashion, so as to draw all the best liquidating custom. Mr. Renaudin is rated as a *bon vivant*, and he has earned his good reputation.

DECIDEDLY HIGHHANDED WORK.—About the end of last month two colored men, tolerably equal physically, quarreled and fought. One named Henderson, was whipped fairly by his opponent, whose name has not been furnished us, and of course he suddenly became a rampant Democrat, and said he was beaten because of his political complexion. He made known his woes and managed to gather a number of white men to avenge him, and Wednesday night Henderson, at the head of the crowd, who called themselves White Leaguers, visited the neighborhood of No. 288 Common street and called for the man who had thrashed Henderson. They took the man out on the banquette and beat him unmercifully, leaving him in a street gutter for dead, and had not friendly hands carried him to the Charity Hospital, it is likely that he would have died. Henderson carried three ropes in his hand, saying that he intended to hang the man who had whipped him, but it seems as if he was satisfied to see his opponent thumped out of shape. If such outrageous proceedings are done in the name of the White League, that organization should be made to stand the brunt or emphatically deny all knowledge of this affair.

A SWORD RECOVERED.—The owner of a sword stolen from Exposition Hall may call at police headquarters and recover his property.

ALLEGED KILLERS.—Benjamin Reed, Jacob Dennis, Solomon Thomas and William Henricks were caught at the corner of Poydras and Liberty streets and jumped into the first calaboose because Robert Beechem says they attempted to make him a subject for a coroner's inquest.

BROCKY JOHN O'BRIEN.—This expert young man, whose ugly picture hangs in the rogues' gallery, returned here to make a harvest during the present festivities, but keen police eyes saw through his thin disguise, and a detective touched his collar. O'Brien is booked as a thief.

ARRAIGNED ON A CHARGE OF MURDER.—T. J. Newhouse was yesterday before Judge McArthur on a charge of murder, that is killing William L. Lucas. Accused will go to the Superior Criminal Court. The testimony was the same as already published.

BOYS, LOOK SHARP.—Little F. Fitzgerald was arrested and put in a horrible calaboose, because he thought it great sport to hang on the tail board of a street car. He now thinks that he can't see the fun.

IN THE CITY HALL.—There was a private meeting of Administrators in the Mayor's parlor yesterday, but it was stated that only routine business was transacted.

Mayor Leeds announced that he had declared this a holiday, in honor of the Knights Templar.

Administrator Burke notified Mr. Bell, city surveyor, that he had discharged nearly all the employes in that department.

A number of laborers are to-day to be put on the streets on which the procession will move, to clear obstructions and clean up.

The following order was issued:

DEPARTMENT OF IMPROVEMENTS,
New Orleans, December 2, 1874.

Mr. William Sway, Superintendent of Wharves and Landings:

DEAR SIR—You will proceed at once to make a thorough inspection of all the wharves and landings in the city, taking note of the condition, and making report to this office of repairs required. You will call upon the officers heretofore in charge of the wharf repairs, and receive from them all lumber and tools and public property in their charge belonging to the city, making report thereof to this office.

It will be your duty to make a daily inspection of the wharves and landings of this city, except the sixteenth and seventeenth wards, and promptly report to this office all repairs required. The improper storage of articles of great weight upon the wharves has heretofore been the cause of much injury to them, and consequently great expense to the city for repairs. You will give this matter your careful attention, and whenever you observe such improper storage, you will promptly call the attention of the officers of the Department of Commerce to the same, and if they fail to take the proper steps you will then report the matter to this office.

You will at once proceed to make to this office a report of all incumbrances on the wharves and landings, such as ballast, stones, sheds, coal, lumber, staves, etc. You will make this report in detail, giving the names of the owners and streets, as far as practicable, where the obstructions are located, including in this report all fences located on the landings of the city, and obstructing the same.

Yours, respectfully,
E. A. BURKE, Administrator.

Three capital prizes,
Three capital prizes,
Three capital prizes,
Of $10,000 each,
Of $10,000 each,
Of $10,000 each,
In the Louisiana single number lottery,
In the Louisiana single number lottery,
To be drawn next Saturday.
To be drawn next Saturday.

THE FACTS OF THE CASE.

Major Edgar Selye's (Deputy United States Marshal) Sworn Statement of the Facts in Relation to the Arrests Made by Him in North Louisiana, and the Proceedings Taken by Judge Trimble to Check Him in Making Further Arrests for Violation of the the United States Laws.

As a great deal has been said, telegraphed and published in the Democratic newspapers in order to create a sensation in favor of the White League party in North Louisiana on account of the arrest by me, as deputy United States marshal, of Richardson, Ramsey and Scott at Homer, Claiborne parish, Louisiana, and the subsequent conduct of J. E. Trimble, judge of the State District Court, issuing what he calls a writ of habeas corpus to inquire into the legality of the arrests, and as Judge Trimble has seen cause to publish his opinion refusing me a rehearing from his order to punish me for contempt of his supposed writ of habeas corpus, which, in the statement he makes, is in many respects untrue, I deem it due to myself, to show the means resorted to by the Democrats, and the willing subserviency of Judge Trimble to throw every obstacle in the way of the execution of writs of arrest against persons charged with violation of the enforcement act of Congress of 1870, to make a full statement of the whole affair from beginning to end.

On the twenty-fourth of October, 1874, D. J. M. A. Jewett, United States commissioner, placed in my hands, as deputy United States marshal for the district of Louisiana, a writ of arrest directing me to arrest Richardson, Ramsey, Scott and others named in the writ. This writ was predicated on an affidavit charging the parties with violating the sixth section of the enforcement act of the United States of 1870. Lieutenant B. H. Hodgson, of the Seventh United States Cavalry, and a detachment of fifteen men, were summoned by me, as a posse comitatus, at Homer, Claiborne parish, Louisiana, to assist me, as deputy marshal, to execute a large number of writs of arrest against persons in North Louisiana, in my hands for execution. The above parties, Richardson, Ramsey and Scott, being in Homer when I received the writ, I, as deputy United States marshal, aided by the United States troops, proceeded about half-past seven o'clock in the evening of the same day to arrest said parties. When I arrested the parties, which was done separately, I read the writ to them as my authority for their arrest. The writ directed me to convey the parties, when arrested, to Monroe, parish of Ouachita, Louisiana. Having other writs of arrest against parties living in and near Vienna, the county seat of Lincoln parish, Louisiana, lying on the direct road from Homer to Monroe, I proceeded at once from Homer to Vienna, where I arrived with the prisoners about daylight the morning of the twenty-fifth of October, and arrested three other parties under another writ. While at Vienna, and about 4 P. M. on the twenty-fifth, a Mr. Aycock, who, I have subsequently learned, was sheriff of Claiborne parish, handed me a paper, of which the following is a copy:

"State of Louisiana, Parish of Claiborne—By reason of the law and the evidence in this case being in favor of the application for a habeas corpus, and by further reason of the affidavit, it is ordered that a writ of habeas corpus issue to the sheriff, W. F. Aycock to take and bring N. J. Scott, John R. Ramsey and Sterling R. Richardson before me, judge of the eleventh judicial district, in the town of Homer, by, on or before 10 A. M., October 27, 1874, and show any authority, if any, said Selye, United States Marshal has for detaining said parties. Thus done and signed in chambers, this the twenty-fourth day of October, 1874.

J. E. TRIMBLE,
Judge of the Eleventh Judicial District of Louisiana."

This was the only paper handed to me; none was handed to Lieutenant Hodgson. Mr. Aycock said to me, when he handed me the above paper, that there is an order from Judge Trimble for the prisoners. I then read the document carefully, and said to Mr. Aycock, this is addressed to you as sheriff, and I will take the matter under consideration, supposing he wanted me to deliver the prisoners to him. I then called Lieutenant Hodgson, who was lying in the tent, and showed him the document, who then used the language in substance quoted by Judge Trimble in his opinion above referred to, which he did not, however, address as to Mr. Aycock or any one in particular. I told Mr. Aycock that that was not my answer, and that I was not responsible for the lieutenant's language, knowing that it was my duty to obey the writ placed in my hands as United States marshal, and, though not versed in the law, yet it struck me that no State authority had any right to interfere with a United States process, or to require me to give up the prisoners to any State officer, and seeing the writ directed "Sheriff W. F. Aycock, to take and bring" the prisoners before Judge Trimble, a State judge, and looking at what the document commanded, I came to the conclusion that I could not give up the prisoners to Sheriff Aycock, and I never once thought that anything else was demanded of me, and I concluded not to do so. I then proceeded with the prisoners to Monroe, where I arrived early on the twenty-sixth of October. On arriving at Monroe I took the above document, the only one served on me, to Hon. John Ray, who was acting for the United States district attorney at that time, and informed him what had happened, and the view I took of the document, and he advised me I had done right, and said the document was not a writ of habeas corpus, although on its face the words habeas corpus were used.

The prisoners were examined at Monroe before the United States commissioner and bound over to answer the charges preferred before the United States court.

I proceeded with Lieutenant Hodgson and the men under his charge to execute other writs, having writs against 250 or more persons for violation of different provisions of the enforcement act of Congress of 1870.

When, in the neighborhood of Vienna, on the fifth day of November, 1874, about 12 M., with Lieutenant Hodgson and his command, fifteen men, for the purpose of executing the writs of arrest against persons living in that neighborhood, where some sixty or more of those persons lived, I was credibly informed that there were two encampments of armed men in the neighborhood, one of about seventy and the other of about eighty. Knowing the desperate character of many of these people, and the great excitement produced by the arrests already made, I deemed it prudent not to attempt any further arrests with my present force, and concluded to return to Monroe and call for further assistance. Accordingly, I returned to Monroe, where I, with Lieutenant Hodgson, arrived about 2 P. M., and in a short time, say about 4 P. M. on the same day, a mob of some 200 armed men, claiming to be the deputy sheriff with a posse, and composed in part of the same men I had warrants of arrest for, and those who had been arrested by me, and were bound over to appear before the United States court, and arrested Lieutenant Hodgson and myself under a warrant which was not read to us—a copy of which I have since obtained, and here give copy and the deputy sheriff's return.

"Parish of Lincoln, Louisiana, Eleventh Judicial District of Louisiana.—Whereas, a writ of habeas corpus issued from the Eleventh District Court, parish of Claiborne, service of which was ordered to be made by W. F. Aycock, sheriff, upon Lieutenant Hodgson and Edgar Selye, commanding them to produce before said court the bodies of S. R. Richardson, N. J. Scott and J. R. Ramsey, illegally detained and held in custody by said Hodgson and Selye; and whereas, the said writ was treated with contempt by said parties;

"Now, therefore, the sheriff of the parish of Lincoln, or any of his legal deputies, commanding, in the name of the State of Louisiana, that you arrest the said Lieutenant Hodgson, United States army, and Edgar Selye, and them bring before me at Vienna instanter to be punished according to law.

"Given under my hand, official, this the fifth day of November, A. D. 1874.

"J. E. TRIMBLE,
"Judge of the Eleventh District of Louisiana."

On this is indorsed the following return:

"Received the within writ on the sixth day of November, 1874, and proceeded to serve the same on the same day and date by pursuing the defendants, Edgar Selye and Lieutenant Hodgson, from Vienna to the city of Monroe, where they were overtaken and arrested by me about 4 P. M. on the sixth instant. Defendants are at this date confined in the jail of the parish of Lincoln, subject to the orders of the honorable the judge of the Eleventh District Court in and for the parish of Lincoln.

"Done and signed on this the seventh day of November, 1874.

"EDGAR HOWARD,
"Deputy Sheriff."

When Lieutenant Hodgson and myself were arrested I was tied and hurried off in a wagon in great haste, through indirect roads, toward Vienna. I firmly believe that the fact of those having us in charge, being the more moderate of the party, taking us from the direct road and avoiding the excited crowd saved our lives. On the way to Vienna the wagon upset, and being tied and unable to extricate myself I got seriously bruised and injured. We arrived at Vienna about 2 A. M. on the seventh instant. Early in the morning I addressed a note to Judge Trimble, stating my bruised and injured condition and asking for an early hearing of the case, not doubting but that when I showed Judge Trimble my authority for the arrest issuing from the United States commissioner, and the character of the order served on me by Mr. Aycock, and brought to his attention the fact known to every lawyer and officer, that a State judge has no right, after he is judicially informed that the party is imprisoned under the authority of the United States, to interfere with the prisoners or to require them to be brought before him; and that it is the duty of the United States marshal not to suffer the prisoners to be taken before a State judge or court upon a habeas corpus issued under State authority; and that it was not my intention to treat with contempt the order served on me, and the further fact that I was entitled to my release on complying with the habeas corpus, if it be one, by showing my authority, but that as an officer of the United States I was bound to obey its orders: that he would release me, but to my utter astonishment, I met the return of Aycock that he had served the writ on myself and Hodgson, and that "they" had given as "their" answer the language reported as having been used by Hodgson, that, as will be seen by the facts, was flat perjury, to the great gratification of the large crowd which throged the courtroom, composed in part of those whom I, as United States deputy marshal, had writs of arrest for. Shouting applause, Judge Trimble issued the following order:

"Eleventh District Court of Louisiana, parish of Lincoln; in the matter of the contempt of order of habeas corpus case of Scott and others—Edgar Selye and Lieutenant Hodgson, arrested on a warrant issued by the honorable the judge of the Eleventh District of Louisiana, on the return of the writ of habeas corpus in the case of Scott and others, under oath of sheriff, W. F. Aycock; and said parties called upon by the judge of said district, in the parish of Lincoln, to show cause, if any they have, why they should not be punished for contempt and otherwise dealt with according to law; and no sufficient cause being shown, it is ordered that the said Edgar Selye and Lieutenant Hodgson be imprisoned ten days in the parish jail of Lincoln parish; and that they further pay a fine of $100 each, and costs of arrest. It is further ordered that the sheriff of the parish of Lincoln be charged with the execution of this judgment.

"Given in chambers in the parish of Lincoln this, the seventh day of November, A. D. 1874.

J. E. TRIMBLE,
Judge Eleventh District of Louisiana."

After the above judgment was rendered, which was on Saturday, on the following Monday I obtained counsel and applied for a rehearing, which was refused, and the judge has written out his opinion for refusing the rehearing, which has been published, and induces this reply and full statement of the case.

Under the above judgment I was confined in a most loathsome jail, in a bad condition of health, until November 13, 1874, when I was released by virtue of the Governor's pardon, which Judge Trimble endeavored to prevent me from obtaining, as will appear from the following telegram addressed to Hon. Frank Morey:

FARMERVILE, La., November 7, 1874.

To Hon. Frank Morey:

The writ was sufficient, though ambiguous. The return showed who had prisoners, and the duty of custodians was to answer. The writ was drawn up by Judge Egan. If you have influence, recall the pardon in the case. I tell you the people must not be goaded to desperation. They will obey the law if justice is its end.

J. E. TRIMBLE.

This short telegram tells a story. "The people must not be goaded to desperation." Was the execution of the United States laws in arresting those who had violated them "goading the people to desperation!" This was my only offense—being a United States deputy marshal, executing legal writs. In this telegram the judge says: "The writ was sufficient, though ambiguous." I understand a proceeding to punish for contempt is a criminal proceeding, and this just judge proceeded to inflict a penalty in excess of what he was authorized to do by law in any case for contempt, as he ordered me to jail for ten days and to pay a fine of $100, when the very law he cited (article 131 of the Code of Practice) only permits a fine of $50; all for failing to obey an ambiguous writ. I have always understood that in criminal proceedings all reasonable doubts were to be construed in favor of the accused, and clearly an ambiguous writ created such a doubt as to what it meant; but I must be offered up as a sacrifice to appease the desperation of the people against arrests for violating United States criminal laws.

Now, to show the animus of the judge in this case, or those who stood behind him and goaded him up to do what he did, I propose to examine the legal proceedings.

I understand, in law, that it is not the name or title you give a writ that gives it effect or legality, but what the writ orders to be done or omitted gives it its force and character. Now, let me judge of this order called a habeas corpus by this rule, and see what it is. In the first place, it will be recollected that the order as copied into this communication was all that was served on me by Aycock or any one else. The petition and affidavit on which it was granted were not served on me, and I was thirty-five miles from the place where they were when the order was served on me. So it was impossible for me to know what was contained in them, and I believe that a writ must contain all that is demanded of the party on whom it is served. It is the writ he is to obey.

What is a habeas corpus under the laws of Louisiana which is authorized to be granted by one of her judges? It is clearly defined in article 791 of the Code of Practice, which says: "The habeas corpus is an order in writing issued in the name of the State by a judge of competent jurisdiction, and directed to a person who has another in his custody or detains him in confinement, commanding him to bring before the judge the person thus detained at the time and place appointed, and to state the reasons for which he thus keeps him imprisoned and deprived of liberty." This is the State law, and made applicable to persons detaining others in confinement under State proceedings. I will show hereafter that its application to persons detaining others in confinement under the United States laws is very restricted. Now let me see what this ambiguous order says. It says: "It is ordered that a writ of habeas corpus issue to the sheriff, W. F. Aycock, to take and bring "Scott and others before him, the judge, * * * and show any authority, if any, said Selye, United States marshal, has for detaining said parties." This, then, is not "directed to a person" who detained Scott and others in confinement, but it directed Sheriff Aycock to take and bring Scott and others before him. If it had treated Sheriff Aycock as being in custody of, and directed him to bring Scott and others before him, it would have been an order directing Sheriff Aycock to produce Scott and others before him, and upon the service of such order on any other person detaining such persons, it would have been their duty to comply with the requirement of the order; but this was not such an order, but it was to take and bring Scott and others before him. I was in possession of the prisoners, and they were to be taken from me by Aycock. This order was aptly pronounced to be a curiosity in the law by the counsel to whom I submitted it for advice, but in my opinion it was so worded for a purpose, and a most nefarious purpose too; that was to produce a conflict between the State and United States authorities and consequent bloodshed; in this, Sheriff Aycock was ordered to take Scott and others and bring them before the judge. It was not pretended in the petition or affidavit (copies of which I have since obtained), that Sheriff Aycock had those parties in custody. Sheriff Aycock's name is no where mentioned in the petition or affidavit, why then order him to take and bring those parties before the judge? To do so, he would have to take them from the United States marshal, as in my order itself. Selye is described as United States marshal, and Aycock is ordered to show by what authority Selye, as marshal, held them. Now, if Aycock, sheriff, had literally obeyed this order, and proceeded to attempt to take Scott and others out of the marshal's custody, and the marshal had refused to give them up, as it would have been his duty to do, a conflict would have been brought about, and if any bloodshed had been the result, Aycock and his abettors would have attempted to shelter themselves behind this order. This has been the artful dodge of the Democrats, the Ku-Klux and White Leaguers in all their nefarious crimes in this State to protect themselves behind some kind of supposed legal order as in this case, and had Aycock, sheriff, received this order before I conveyed the prisoners out of his parish, I have no doubt but that he would have attempted, with a posse, to take the prisoners out of my hands under that order, which would have been resisted by me as United States marshal, as it would have been my duty to do.

I will now proceed to show that the proceeding against me for contempt of court for not obeying the supposed habeas corpus was entirely unauthorized and illegal, even if the order had been a habeas corpus in proper form and substance. In the first place, disobeying a writ of habeas corpus is not a contempt of court, in the sense in which contempts of court are punishable, according to article 131 of the Code of Practice. In the second place, a contempt of court is in the nature of a criminal proceeding, and can only be pronounced and punished when the court is in regular session, in term time—it can not be done in chambers. In the third place, the law has expressly provided how a party who disobeys a writ of habeas corpus must be proceeded against. If a party refuses to obey the writ, the law, article 814, Code of Practice, says: "When the habeas corpus has been duly served, if the party in whose favor it has been granted is not produced within the time above fixed, the judge who issued the writ shall issue a warrant to some officer of justice, commanding him to arrest and take in charge the person who disobeyed the writ, and to bring such person before him to be proceeded against according to law." If I was bound to produce the persons, Scott and others, before the judge in answer to the writ of habeas corpus and failed to do so, I was liable to arrest as provided for in the above law, and to be brought before the judge to be proceeded against according to law, not for contempt of court. The following article 815, defines what this proceeding according to law means; it says: "If the person thus brought before the judge refuses to deliver the habeas corpus which has been served upon him, or to produce the party whom he was ordered to produce in the case, where, according to the above provisions, he might be compelled to do it, he shall be sent to prison, and shall remain there until he obeys the habeas corpus, and shall be condemned to pay all the costs of the proceeding, besides the action for false imprisonment which the party may institute against him." This is the penalty for refusing to obey a writ of habeas corpus provided by law. A party is not subject to be punished for a contempt of court for refusing to obey a writ of habeas corpus, any more than a writ of injunction, when the law expressly provides the penalty, as in this case.

Now, in this case the order of the judge on its face charged me with treating his writ with contempt, and the judgment pronounced against me of imprisonment for ten days and a fine of $100 and costs of arrest is stated to be "for contempt." No demand was made of me to comply with the supposed writ of habeas corpus, and my defense made orally when I was brought before the court for contempt was, that I arrested the parties, Scott, Ramsey and Richardson under a writ of arrest issued by a United States commissioner, which I had then in my pocket, and would have produced it if I had been asked for, or I had been permitted to do so. But no, I was not to be released on complying with the order, if it even was a habeas corpus, by showing my authority for the arrest, which emanated from a United States authority, and the very production of which would deprive Judge Trimble of any jurisdiction in or over the case. No, this would not satisfy the people, "goaded to desperation" on account of being liable to arrest for violation of the United States criminal laws, but I must be punished, however illegal or unjust it might be, to atone for my being a deputy United States marshal, entrusted with the execution of such arrests; and this was the means resorted to to do it, and Judge Trimble lent himself a willing tool to carry it out.

In closing the legal argument in this case, I wish to state that the law is well settled by the unanimous opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Abelman vs. Booth, 21 Howard, 523—that a State court or judge may issue a writ of habeas corpus against any person holding another as a prisoner, and inquire into his authority for so doing. The court says: "But after the return is made and the State judge or court judicially apprised that the party is in custody under the authority of the United States, they can proceed no further." And the court proceeds to say: "If he is wrongfully imprisoned then (the United States) tribunals can release him and afford him redress. And although as I have said it is the duty of the marshal or other person holding him to make known by a proper return the authority under which he detains him; it is at the same time imperatively his duty to obey the process of the United States to hold the prisoner in custody under it and to refuse obedience to the mandate or process of any other government. And consequently it is his duty not to take the prisoner, nor suffer him to be taken before a State judge or court upon a habeas corpus issued under State authority. No State judge or court, after they are judicially informed that the party is imprisoned under the authority of the United States, has any right to interfere with him or to require him to be brought before them. And if authority of the State in the form of judicial process or otherwise should attempt to control the marshal or other authorized officer or agent of the United States, in any respect, in the custody of his prisoner, it would be his duty to resist it, and to call to his aid any force that might be necessary to maintain the authority of law against illegal interference; no judicial process whatever form it may assume, can have any lawful authority outside of the limits of the jurisdiction of the court or judge by whom it is issued, and any attempt to enforce it beyond these boundaries is nothing less than lawless violence." This long quotation from the highest judicial tribunal is given to show my true position in this case, and to show the lawless and vindictive conduct of Judge Trimble toward me. I conceive I did my duty in the case and in no manner violated the law, and in doing so I have been most shamefully treated.

But there is another and which is the true aspect of the case, and is the key to Judge Trimble's whole course in this matter. A great number, I dare say, a majority of the white men of North Louisiana, who are White Leaguers, have grossly violated the enforcement act of Congress of 1870, in order to intimidate the colored people and white Republicans in the late election. To punish this violation of the law and to prevent its further violation affidavits were made of the facts and warrants were issued by the United States commissioner for the arrest of those violators of the United States law, and I was deputed as deputy United States marshal with a detail of United States cavalry to execute those writs. These were writs issued against several hundred persons. I had commenced making the arrests, and I provided first to arrest the most prominent men against whom writs had issued; hence I arrested Scott, parish judge; Ramsey, clerk of the district court, and Richardson, mayor of Homer. This created terrible excitement. That such prominent citizens should be arrested was declared an outrage, and, as Judge Trimble says in his telegram to Hon. Frank Morey, "*the people must not be goaded to desperation,*" when he was, in his kindness to me, trying to prevent me from getting a pardon to rescue me from a loathsome dungeon.

It was to stop those arrests, and to deter United States officers from attempting to make further arrests that this proceeding of Judge Trimble was inaugurated and carried out. I held warrants for the arrest of the very men, the deputy sheriff who arrested me and many of the posse who accompanied him in doing so at the time they arrested me.

If such schemes to avoid prosecution for violation of the United States criminal laws are to be quietly submitted to, and her officers sent to execute them are to be thus treated and trampled on by State officials, to render nugatory the United States laws, what respect will the people soon have for the United States laws, and what officer will feel justified in attempting to execute them.

In the interest of the quiet and law abiding people of this country, who are now subjected to every outrage, from insult to murder, on account of their respect for the federal government and obedience to her laws, I call on that government to protect those people, which can only be properly done by a rigid enforcement of the laws, and this can only be done by protecting the officers of the law in discharging their duty. For myself, I have my personal redress for the injuries and wrongs I have received at the hands of Judge Trimble, of which it is my intention to avail myself in the courts of the country, believing that no such outrage on the person of an officer of the law will be tolerated in the courts, although it may be perpetrated under the guise of judicial authority.

State of Louisiana, Parish of Orleans.—Personally appeared before me, the undersigned authority, Edgar Selye, well known to me, who makes oath that all the facts stated in the foregoing communication are true and correctly stated.

EDGAR SELYE.

Signed and sworn to before me, this first day of December, A. D. 1874.

F. A. WOOLFLEY,
United States Commissioner, District of Louisiana.

SPECIAL NOTICES.

Notice.—Office of the Merchants' Fire Insurance Company, No. 43 Carondelet street.—A meeting of the stockholders of the Merchants' Fire Insurance Company will be held at their office, corner Carondelet and Union streets, on MONDAY, December 23, 1874, between the hours of 1 and 3 P. M., to vote upon proposed amendments to the charter.

S. SALOMON,
de3 Secretary.

The annual meeting of the stockholders of Franklin Temperance Hall Association will be held in their hall, corner of Rampart and Spain streets, Third District, on MONDAY EVENING, December 7, 1874, at 7:30 P. M., for the purpose of electing five Directors to serve for the ensuing year.

By order.
A. R. MOULIN,
no25 29 de5 8* Secretary.

Office American Mutual Insurance Association of New Orleans, No. 25 Commercial place, between St. Charles and Camp streets, New Orleans, November 10, 1874.—At a general meeting of stockholders held this day, it was unanimously resolved to go into liquidation, and the undersigned gentlemen were elected to liquidate the affairs of the association. Parties holding claims against this association are requested to present them for adjustment, and all persons holding policies will present them for cancellation, and the return premium due will be refunded. Parties indebted to this association are requested to settle forthwith.

F. HOLLANDER,
F. BELING,
F. J. KRAMER,
no13 27 de12 Liquidators.

Notice.—The annual election for directors of the Louisiana Canal and Land Improvement Company for the year 1875 will be held on MONDAY, December 7, 1874, at the office of the company, No. 76 Baronne street, between the hours of 10 A. M. and 2 P. M.

W. WILLIAMSON,
no26 de2 6 President of the Company.

Office of the New Orleans City Railroad Company, No. 121 Canal street, New Orleans, December 2, 1874.—The cars of this company will run until 4 A. M. on WEDNESDAY, THURSDAY and FRIDAY NIGHTS, as follows:

The Magazine and Prytania cars will leave Canal street every half hour after half past twelve o'clock.

The Canal street (to station only), Esplanade and Bayou, Rampart and Dauphine cars will leave Canal street every hour after 12:45 A. M. de3 4t

Blood Fertilizing Works of New Orleans.—The stockholders are hereby notified that the annual election for five directors will be held at the office of the company, No. 37 Peters street, on the fourteenth of December, between the hours of 6 and 9 P. M.

JOHN DOLHONDE,
de2 td Secretary.

Southern Bank.—New Orleans, November 27 1874.—An election for directors of this bank, to serve the ensuing year, will be held at its banking-house on the NINTH DECEMBER, 1874, from twelve o'clock to 1 P. M.

J. GARR, Cashier.
no28 td

Office Lafayette Fire Insurance Company, New Orleans, October 20, 1874.—At a meeting of the board of directors held on October 15, 1874, it was resolved to call in a cash installment of FIVE PER CENT on the capital stock, in accordance with article four of the constitution of the company, payable at the office of the company within forty days.

LOUIS MATHIS,
oc21 40t Secretary.

OFFICIAL NOTICES.

PUBLIC SALE OF CONDEMNED GOVERNMENT PROPERTY.

JACKSON BARRACKS,
New Orleans, November 29, 1874.

AT TEN O'CLOCK A. M., WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 30, 1874, at Jackson Barracks, New Orleans, Louisiana, there will be sold—

A LOT OF IRON BUNKS, AXES, PICKS, TROWSERS, STOVES, BUCKETS, WAGONS, TOOLS.

Also, a large lot of CANVAS, consisting of Tents, Tent Flies and Pauline.

Terms—Cash in government funds.

By order of the Department Commander:
FRANCIS B. JONES,
Lieutenant Third Infantry, Acting Assistant Quartermaster. de1 6t

THIRTEENTH CALL.

Redemption of Five-Twenty Bonds of 1862.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, November 2, 1874.

BY VIRTUE OF THE AUTHORITY GIVEN BY the act of Congress approved July 14, 1870, entitled "an act to authorize the refunding the national debt" I hereby give notice that the principal and accrued interest of the bonds hereinbelow designated, known as "Five-twenty bonds" will be paid at the treasury of the United States, in the city of Washington, on and after the SECOND DAY OF FEBRUARY, 1875, and that the interest on said bonds will cease on that day. That is to say, coupon bonds, known as the fourth series, act of February 25, 1862, dated May 1, 1862, as follows:

COUPON BONDS.

$50—No. 4281 to No. 4981, both inclusive.
$100—No. 4201 to No. 10,500; both inclusive.
$500—No. 5001 to No. 7000, both inclusive.
$1000—No. 14,001 to 20,000, both inclusive.
$5,000,000.

The amount outstanding (embraced in the numbers as above) is five million dollars of coupon bonds.

United States securities, forwarded for redemption, should be addressed to the "Loan Division of the Secretary's office."

no3 S. H. BRISTOW, Secretary.

NOTICE TO HOLDERS OF WHARF IMPROVEMENT BONDS.

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE,
City Hall, New Orleans, November 22, 1874.

PROPOSALS FOR THE SALE TO THE CITY OF fifteen wharf improvement bonds will be received at this office until FRIDAY, December 4, at twelve o'clock M.

The city reserves the right to reject any and all proposals.

LOUIS SCHNEIDER,
no22 td Administrator of Finance.

OFFICIAL.

COMPILED RETURNS OF AN ELECTION HELD in the parish of St. Bernard, State of Louisiana, on the second day of November, A. D. 1874, under a writ of election dated the tenth day of September, A. D. 1874, ordering same, and pursuant to the provisions of act No. 96, to regulate the conduct and to maintain the freedom and purity of elections; to prescribe the mode of making returns thereof; to provide for the election of returning officers, and defining their powers and duties; to prescribe the mode of entering the rolls of the Senate and House of Representatives, and to enforce article one hundred and three of the constitution, approved November 20, A. D. 1872, to wit:

FOR CORONER.

	M. Fabregat,	M. Green,	H. Watkins,	Scattering.
Poll No. 1	78	417	93	1
Poll No. 2	27	80	31	3
Poll No. 3	90	114	7	1
Poll No. 4	9	29	24	2
Total	204	640	125	5

CERTIFICATE.

We, the undersigned returning officers, pursuant to authority vested in us by act No. 96, approved November 20, 1872, do hereby certify the foregoing is a true and correct compilation of the statement of votes cast at an election for Coroner, held on the second day of November, A. D. 1874, under a writ of election promulgated on the tenth day of September, A. D. 1874, ordering same, and we hereby declare that the following named person was duly and lawfully elected Coroner of the parish of St. Bernard, State of Louisiana, to wit:

Matthew Green, Coroner.

J. MADISON WELLS,
THOMAS C. ANDERSON,
G. CASIMAVE,
LOUIS M. KENNER,
OSCAR ARROYO,
de1 1t

SUCCESSION NOTICES.

Succession of Christian August Wiemann.

ALL PERSONS INDEBTED OR HAVING PROPERTY belonging to said deceased, and all who have claims against his estate, are requested to make the same known to Friedrich W. Keppe, testamentary executor, No. 65 Treme street, New Orleans, or to A. J. LEWIS, Attorney at Law, No. 33 Exchange alley, corner of Customhouse street. de3

Successions of Lewis Bewerung and William Gierke and Sophia Landman, his wife, deceased.

SECOND DISTRICT COURT FOR THE PARISH of Orleans, Nos. 34,248 and 34,249.—Notice is hereby given to the creditors of this estate, and to all other persons herein interested, to show cause within ten days from the present notification, if any they have or can, why the account presented by William Bewerung, tutor and administrator of this estate, should not be homologated and approved, and the funds distributed in accordance therewith.

By order of the Court.
de4 8 12* FRANK PACE, JR., Clerk.

Succession of Catherine Young, Wife of George Beiber.

SECOND DISTRICT COURT FOR THE PARISH of Orleans, No. 37,562.—Whereas, Mrs. Margaret Young, wife of Francis X. Deicheilbohrer, has petitioned the court for letters of administration on the estate of the late Mrs. Catherine Beiber, deceased, intestate. Notice is hereby given to all whom it may concern, to show cause within ten days why the prayer of the said petitioner should not be granted.

By order of the Court.
de3 8 12* FRANK PACE, JR., Clerk.

Succession of Thomas B. Bodley.

SECOND DISTRICT COURT FOR THE PARISH of Orleans, No. 36,250.—Notice is hereby given to the creditors of this estate and to all other persons herein interested to show cause within ten days from the present notification, if any they have or can, why the account presented by the administratrix of this estate should not be homologated and approved and the funds distributed in accordance therewith.

By order of the Court.
no29 de4 8* FRANK PACE, JR., Clerk.

Succession of Charles P. Kramer.

SECOND DISTRICT COURT, FOR THE PARISH of Orleans, No. 37,389.—Notice is hereby given to the creditors of this estate, and to all other persons herein interested, to show cause, within ten days from the present notification, if any they have or can, why the account presented by the testamentary executrix of this estate, should not be homologated and approved, and the funds distributed in accordance therewith.

By order of the Court.
no28 de4 4* FRANK PACE, JR., Clerk.

LEGAL NOTICES.

THE STATE OF LOUISIANA.

FIFTH DISTRICT COURT FOR THE PARISH OF ORLEANS.

ELIZABETH MONNERJOHN VS. JOHN MONNERJOHN, her husband—No. 6000.

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT ON THE SIXTH day of November, 1874, judgment was rendered in this court in the entitled suit, in the words and figures following, to wit—

Elizabeth Monnerjohn vs. John Monnerjohn, her husband—No. 6000.

On motion of Branghn, Buck & Dinkenspiel, of counsel for plaintiff, and on producing to the court due proof in support of said plaintiff's demand, the law and evidence being in her favor, it is ordered, adjudged and decreed that judgment by default herein entered on the third instant be now confirmed and made final, and accordingly that there be judgment in favor of plaintiff, Elizabeth Monnerjohn, and against defendant, John Monnerjohn, her husband, decreeing a separation of property and a dissolution of the community of acquests and gains heretofore existing between the said parties.

It is further adjudged and decreed that the said plaintiff do have and recover of the defendant, her husband, the sum of three thousand five hund