New Orleans Republican.

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE UNITED STATES

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF NEW ORLEANS

AUCTION SALES THIS DAY.

BY CONSTABLE JOHN McCORMICK, at 12 o'clock, at warehouse No. 142 Girod street, household furniture; at 2 o'clock, at No. 203 St. Charles street, contents of a laundry.

BY G. DE FERIET & CO., at 12 o'clock, at Merchants and Auctioneers' Exchange, five lots with cottage, corner of Live Oak and Bellecastle streets; stocks.

BY SHERIFF WAGGAMAN, at 12 o'clock, at the Merchants and Auctioneers' Exchange, a lot with buildings on Chestnut, between Philip and Jackson streets; same on St. Charles, between Louisiana avenue and Delachaise street; same fronting on Bordeaux, Baronne and Carondelet streets; same on Dumaine, between Villere and Robertson streets; same corner of St. Philip and Tonti streets.

BY S. M. & B. J. MONTGOMERY, at 11 o'clock, at corner of Camp and Natchez streets, assortment of new and second-hand furniture.

BY NASH & HODGSON, at 12 o'clock, at St. Charles Auction Exchange, a lot, with buildings, in square bounded by Annette, Urquhart, St. Bernard and Girod streets; an improved lot in same square; two lots, with buildings, in square bounded by Girod, Lafayette, Rampart and Basin streets; stocks.

BY C. E. GIRARDEY, at 12 o'clock, at St. Charles Auction Exchange, two improved lots in square bounded by Esplanade, Kerlerec, Robertson and Villere streets; a lot, with buildings, in square bounded by St. Charles, Carondelet, Terpsichore and Euterpe streets; a lot in square bounded by Broad, Abadie, White and Onzaga streets; a lot on Treme, between Conti and Bienville streets; premises No. 140 lower Rampart street.

BY CONSTABLE C. C. PIPER, at 12 o'clock, at the Merchants and Auctioneers' Exchange, a lot and a half in square bounded by Laurel, Jersey, Dufossat and Bellecastle streets.

Local Intelligence.

BRIEF MENTION.—The St. Charles and Carondelet streets line of cars gets no better fast, unless one bare exception is worthy of mention. An early gad fly pierced one of the mules, and greatly to the surprise of the driver the mule suddenly moved out of a slow walk.

The several recorders' courts yesterday attended to no other business than was actually necessary.

Street lamps were not extinguished much before eleven o'clock last night, and when the moon agreed to shine it did not quite keep its promise.

About this time of the year look out for picnic beggars.

Mary Meagher, only three years old, was last evening badly burned at No. 364 South Rampart street. The old story—playing with matches.

The body of a man, supposed to be Gustave Frederick, was yesterday found in the rear of No. 168 Tchoupitoulas street, and as it was greatly decomposed, must have been dead several days. A written recommendation found in a washstand for a person of the name mentioned was signed by J. M. Baldwin. Cause of death was congestion of the brain.

The body of a man dressed in United States military uniform was yesterday found in the river, head of Clouet street. Nothing was found to furnish a clue to his name.

William Allen, a sailor, sailed so far as to take the wind out of the sails of Mrs. Allen and Mrs. Becknel, who swear that he assaulted and battered them with intent to kill. Judge Long will gaze on him.

James Kelley, a milk peddler, was so unfortunate as to have one of his legs broken. His horse ran away, throwing the driver out with considerable force. Kelley was sent to his home corner of Conti and White streets.

The river is now five feet three inches below high water mark—a rise of only two inches in twenty-four hours.

Mrs. Crowley, the woman who abandoned her baby in a yard on Gaiennie street, was arrested, and got thirty days in the Workhouse for her heartlessness. The child was sent to an asylum. A son, seven years old, was sent to the Boys' House of Refuge.

The song of the mosquito is heard in the land.

Thousands of people promenaded Canal and other favored thoroughfares yesterday, and for the time seemed to forget the cares of business.

All about the City Hall was duller than usual yesterday, and even taxpayers did not crowd for front places.

Administrator Burke has a handle with which to turn off applicants for labor. When one of the unfortunates will not take no for an answer the major draws out a letter from a planter who wishes to hire several able-bodied men.

ELEPHANT JOHNNY'S CUSTOMERS.—Judge Evans was easy with the rabble arrested in Elephant Johnny's barrel house, letting some of them off for $2 50, while others went to the Workhouse in lieu of paying $10 fines. It was a bad crowd.

GOING TO THE RACES.—If you do not care to pay for a horse and buggy to go to the races next month, remember that there are two lines of cars starting from Canal street, each one going off every few minutes. Indeed the cars are far safer for ladies and undoubtedly cheaper, both of which items must be considered. Ladies are already preparing their dresses to attend the races.

DENIES THE TURNING.—Officer W. J. O'Connor, charged with having sent in a false fire alarm from box No. 38, puts in a flat denial and states that he will be fully able to prove his innocence when his trial comes up, but at present declines to say how he will prove himself guiltless.

THE SCHOENHAUSEN, PENITENTIARY.—A letter from Mr. J. Sanchez, captain of the convict camp at Kenner, writes to a gentleman of this city to deny the statement that Schoenhausen had escaped. The convict is still doing the State some service, which will be good news to many citizens and at least one alien.

CITY TAXES.—Thursday Administrator Pilsbury received the following amounts: For taxes, $7993 31; for licenses, $2172. Yesterday nothing was done.

THE FIRE LAST NIGHT.—The alarm sounded at twenty minutes after nine o'clock last night was caused by fire in a cottage, No. 78 Fourth street, owned by Mr. Getzinger and occupied by T. Brower. The fire was caused by the explosion or bursting of a coal oil lamp. The damage was small and covered by insurance in the Germania office.

A TERRIBLE FALL.—Last evening a three-year old son of Mrs. Wrenn, No. 110 St. Charles street, fell from a third story window to the ground. At the second story the child struck an open transom, which interrupted the fall and probably saved a life. Strange as it seems, no bones were broken, and it it thought that the little fellow will recover. The transom was torn off its hinges.

CURRENCY AND NOTE.—Last evening George Minneville and Jackson Levy were arrested, charged with stealing $165 in currency and a note for $75. The charge is made by S. C. Covington. Both men were placed in the first calaboose.

FOR PEACE AND QUIET.—At about twelve o'clock last night, on the affidavit of W. W. Cain, John Cowan, sometimes profanely called Elephant Johnny, and John Marie, were locked up at the first precinct station, because they violated the Revised Statutes in keeping a disorderly house.

The ante-bellum state is to be restored by a New York ordinance prohibiting the ringing of church bells on the Sabbath. Can not the ordinance be so construed as to put a stop to other rings with which neither the Church nor the Sabbath have anything to do!

People do not understand the English language who spatter it with French and Latin phrases.

ADMISSION OF SENATOR PINCHBACK

Speech of Hon. J. R. West, of Louisiana, in the Senate of the United States, on Monday, March 15, 1875.

The Senate having under consideration the resolution for the admission of P. B. S. Pinchback as Senator from Louisiana—

Mr. West said:

Mr. President—I would have preferred not to address the Senate to-day. I am not exactly prepared. I was in hopes some Senator either on this side of the chamber or on the other would have risen and claimed the attention of the Senate; but finding nobody else apparently inclined to do it, I will occupy their time for a brief period, premising that my remarks and perhaps my argument, from the fact that I did not expect to speak now, may be somewhat desultory and disconnected. But I am actuated to reply to a remark just made by the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Ferry) who claims that the Republican government in Louisiana which was elected in 1872, had no basis but infamous falsehood and forgery. That is the charge which we have had continuously to meet, on the part of our opponents, and I think it is time that some one should be prepared to rebuke that charge and to charge home upon our opponents that the falsehood and the forgery lie with them, and that the attempt to subvert the verdict of the people at the ballot boxes in the State of Louisiana in 1872 was a fraud initiated and continued by our opponents and not by the Republican party.

Following the example of the Senators who have hitherto participated in this debate, I offer the customary apology to those whose ears and attention are already weary of the subject, and essay to address myself to the later comers among us. I would ask the Senators of my own political faith to give attention while I show the frauds designed and perpetrated in 1872 upon the Republicans of Louisiana, whereby that State has been remitted to a condition of revolution, bloodshed, industrial depression and political oppression for the past two years; where by an ingenuity almost marvelous the better has been made to appear the worst cause in the popular estimation, and the Republican party throughout the nation has been held up as responsible for a political crime of great gravity, while the very perpetrators of that crime unblushingly parade themselves as innocent and denounce their victims as guilty.

I am not unmindful that there is a prevailing disgust with this so-called Louisiana case. It finds a parallel in two contemporaneous cases, one recently notorious in England and another in this country now vexing the searcher after truth. But our decision approaches, and I earnestly appeal to those of my political faith in this Chamber whose votes shall make that decision to remember the trials, the persecutions, and the sufferings of those who uphold the banner of that faith in the South. I ask them to look into all the circumstances. I ask them to believe as I do, and as I think I can demonstrate if they will listen to me, that the Republicans of Louisiana in 1872 were, and that they are to-day, in a majority, that they rightfully elected their Governor in that year, that the claimant whose right to a seat in this body we are now about to determine was in every respect legally elected, that he has been indorsed again and reindorsed by the Legislature, that he is, outside of all partisan considerations, fully entitled to be admitted; and if we shall so decide, I promise them and I promise the Senate that the much vexed and dangerous Louisiana troubles will be set at rest forever; that political strife will thenceforward be confined in that State within the control customary to other sections; and that peace shall reign and bless where anarchy has brooded and blighted. To other honorable Senators of the opposite political faith, I would plead for their attention that they hear the reverse of the story ordinarily presented to them, and I would ask them to pause ere they lend themselves to the perpetration of a wrong initiated by a few unprincipled men who adopted Democracy as a convenient cloak for spoils seeking, and who deliberately planned a scheme of wholesale fraud upon the elective franchise in Louisiana and have deceived and deluded the men of that party faith here, who, incapable of wrong themselves, are outraged in their delusive conviction that they have been defrauded of the government of their choice.

My proposition, Mr. President, will be to claim nothing by the so-called forged and falsified returns. Taking the returns as made by the Republican board of Louisiana, I claim nothing under them, and I as emphatically deny the claim of the opposition to anything resulting from their returns. The truth of the case is this: We had one board in that State pronounced by the highest judicial authority of that State as incompetent to deal with the returns, and that board had the returns. We had another board pronounced by that same authority as competent to take cognizance of the returns, and that board had no returns. Consequently we have no case presenting an election here, so far as returns are concerned. I shall endeavor to show that the claimant in this case, not for a seat, but the claimant, McEnery, that the Democratic party carried that State, has no authentic claim, and, as a logical consequence, if he was not elected, it follows that the Republican candidate was. You can have but one determination to an election. When two men are voted for, it must be concluded that one or the other of those two men was chosen, and in denying that the Democrat was elected I think I shall prove that the Republican was.

Let me ask your attention, because this is the new feature in the case, and I believe I am the only Senator who presents it in that light, that I go behind the returns, as we are forced in this case to go behind the certificate of the claimant. I go behind the returns and I ask you from all the evidence in this report, I ask you from the conclusions of the report itself, whether the legitimate result is not that the Republican party lawfully elected their candidate on that day?

We have had the proposition stated to us again and again that the certificate of Governor Kellogg does not constitute an election of Senator by a lawful body. We are forced into this attitude by those who oppose the admission of this man. We are forced to analyze what constitutes an election. It is denied that there is anything on the face of the papers; and if they are determined to go behind our papers I insist upon going behind theirs. Assuming for the sake of the argument that this is true, are we not then permitted to inquire whether a certificate made by a returning board that a certain man was elected Governor of Louisiana in 1872 does or not constitute an election by a lawful body of electors? If we can look into the qualifications or the acts of the Legislature that elected a Senator, are we not permitted to look into the acts of the electors who elected the Governor? If we can inquire whether Pinchback was not elected notwithstanding his certificate, can we not inquire whether Kellogg was elected although he has no certificate, according to the ground and position taken by our opponents? They take the ground that a certificate does not constitute an election. I adopt their argument and say the votes of the legal Legislature caused an election of Senator and the votes of the people elected the Governor. If the votes of the people show that Kellogg was elected Governor, the same votes will show that the Legislature that chose Mr. Pinchback Senator were also elected. I have never based the claim of either the one or the other upon returns or certificates. Kellogg's certificate can only give Pinchback a prima facie case, leaving us the authority to investigate whether the Legislature was legally chosen that sends him here as the representative of that State. In dealing with this case I maintain that we are permitted to examine into what constitutes an election for Governor as well as what constitutes an election for Senator. If the proof demonstrates the fact that Kellogg was elected, it will necessarily show that the Legislature was.

It is necessary, in the line of what I am stating, for me now to examine into the political complexion—and the word is particularly appropriate in the connection in which I use it—the political complexion of the voters of Louisiana. With a maladroitness that will not stand scrutiny, the census is continually quoted as proving conclusively that the division of races is such in that State and the political affinities of those races are such that it is impossible that there should be a Republican majority in that State. Merely recurring to the results of the election of 1870, in which the Republican party carried that State by some twenty-odd thousand majority, I will come down to the inauguration and the initiation of the compaign that has been so long discussed here. Taking the figures of the census of 1870—and here is where I want to refute one of the fallacies that are continually thrust upon us—we find that the white and black races in Louisiana are divided, counting men, women and children, within about 2000 difference. There are some 2000 more black inhabitants of the State of Louisiana than there are white. Taking that same census and examining the number of male adults, you discover that there are just about 160 more white male adults than there are black; and there is where the examiners of this census who take the other side of the position from the one that I assume, choose to stop their investigation. In a recent report that we have from the House on this subject, the gentlemen making the report, contrary to the opinions that I hold, use that very census. Now let us see how they use it.

"The census of 1870 (the correctness of which is unimpeached)—I hold them to their own authority and their own testimony—showed 87,076 whites and 86,913 colored males over twenty-one years of age. All the statistics and evidence before us indicated no change in this proportion in favor of the colored voters."

In a previous report these very gentlemen said that they made no examination into the political condition of the State generally; but they expressed their surprise here that there should have been an increase of 4000 colored men, and they say it is unaccustomed. The facts are that since some of the States in our immediate vicinity have relapsed under control of a party inimical, as they consider it, to the black men, they have largely emigrated from those States and immigrated to mine. It is then, in my judgment, easy to account for the fact that there should be an increase of the black vote over the census. Then they say that the white registration is 10,000 less than the census. As I took occasion to say to the Senate once before, had they examined from pages 619 and 629 of the census report of 1870, they would have discovered that in the State of Louisiana there are 15,000 unnaturalized foreigners not entitled to vote; they would have discovered that in the single parish of Orleans alone, out of those 15,000 there are 9000 congregated; and yet the Democrats claim that they shall be legitimate voters to offset the colored men who are legal citizens.

So, taking the census, taking their very authority, taking their own documentary evidence, we have an admitted majority in that State of 15,000 Republican voters. I know that it will be urged, "Does it follow that because a man is black he votes the Republican ticket?" Once more I want to quote their own authority on the subject. In the testimony taken before this Committee on Privileges and Elections there was a contestant for a seat in this body for the short term, and subsequently for a seat for the long term; his name was McMillen, a gentleman for whom I entertain the highest respect; and when he was examined on oath before the committee he testified, as, Senators will have the opportunity of realizing it they will examine his testimony, that there were as many black men as white men who voted opposite tickets during that campaign, that the number was about equalized; in other words, he said that from the best of his information there were 5000 white men who voted the Republican ticket, and he thinks there were 5000 colored men who voted the Democratic ticket. So then the vote is left standing as it was on the color line, with our ascertained majority in that State of 15,000.

I know how customary it is to say that colored men are not allied to the Republican party. We have had evidence on that subject here too, and we have refuted that idea, and the assertion is now seldom made. There was one other witness and the only witness who gave any testimony on that subject, and he was a gentleman more noted for the volubility of his utterances than for the soundness of his judgment, and he thought there were 8000 black men who voted the Democratic ticket.

Now let me go back to the facts again, which show a presumption as to how these votes were cast, and show also a corroborative presumption. The whole election machinery of that State was in the hands of our political opponents, and in manipulating the registration of the State to all the ultimate advantage that they could expect that has been made upon which so much reliance is placed to show to derive from such practices, that very Democratic board of registration was compelled to return a colored majority of 11,000 in the State. I will not follow the details of that election. On one side it is all fraud, and on the other side it is all guess work. It is not necessary to go into those facts; but let us quote now the report that we did not carry the State.

The Senator from Michigan (Mr. Christiancy) to whom I listened the other day with profound respect and great regard in reference to his law points, although I must be constrained to take some exception to them simply because they leave us without remedy; to use one of his own illustrations, they are "entirely circular, they end where they begin and begin where they end," warns us of danger, and he points out to us no path of safety; but in quoting the facts he took occasion to say:

"Now, according to my reading of the evidence, and according to the report made to this Senate in 1873, and those recently made to the House, the majority of the people of Louisiana are opposed to the Kellogg government."

According to the report made to the Senate in 1873!

Mr. Christiancy—The Senator will allow me to say that that was in reference to this point which I made:

"It has been gravely urged here that Louisiana, being entitled to two Senators upon this floor, it is a wrong to the people of that State to refuse them the enjoyment of that right."

The question of a majority of the people one way or the other, so far as it relates to my argument, was confined to the majority as it now exists, not as it existed in 1872, unless the Senator should claim that Mr. Pinchback, if now elected, would be entitled to go back and vote upon every measure which has been passed or presented here since the time of his election up to this time. The question was the hardship of depriving a State of two Senators upon this floor. I suppose the Senator will hardly claim that that hardship can be removed now so far as the past is concerned, but only as to the future. Now, I confess that the reference in that connection to the report of the Senate committee to which I alluded was entirely irrelevant and inadvertent, and I should have confined it entirely to the majority and minority report as recently made to the House of Representatives by its committee. But so far as the argument I was then making use of was concerned I might safely concede to the gentleman that there were 10,000 or 15,000 majority of the people of Louisiana, not as shown by their votes but of the population who are in favor of the Kellogg government; it does not touch this question now, inasmuch as these reports recently made show that now a majority is opposed to the Kellogg government, and consequently to Mr. Pinchback's admission here.

Mr. West—Well, Mr. President, I did not intend to arraign the Senator. I merely referred to him as having illustrated a position which I wanted to controvert. He states now that he made it inadvertently and unintentionally, and that it does not apply to the argument, and I will not say anything further in regard to his position, but I will merely go on and maintain my own.

The Senator asks me whether the admission of Mr. Pinchback will repair the damage that has been done to my State for the last two years by the failure of the expression of his vote on various occasions. Unfortunately not. Even on a recent occasion here had Mr. Pinchback's vote been available for the State of Louisiana the inundation of the land and the destitution of that people might have been avoided. Here last year out of the coffers and by the charity of this government we fed the starving hundreds of thousands of people in Louisiana. Here once more the benign protection of the government was appealed to on behalf of Louisiana to save her starving people from inundation and it failed because Mr. Pinchback was not here as a Senator from Louisiana to cast a vote. His one vote would have carried the measure; and it is upon these legal technicalities that the people of Louisiana are condemned to suffer, because they are not allowed to be heard.

Now let me refer to this much lauded report. The report proves just exactly what I said in the outset, that so far as the ballots cast on that day were concerned the voice of the people was expressed in favor of the Republican candidate. What does the report say?

"The colored population of that State outnumbers the white, and in the last election the colored voters were almost unanimous in their support of the Republican ticket."

Corroborated by the testimony that I have quoted, corroborated by the testimony of a man familiar with the politics of that State, familiar with all the proceedings of that canvass, even down to their absolute iniquity, he tells you that in the main the colored men of that State cast their votes for the Republican ticket, and he tells you, and this report tells you that they are largely in the majority in that State. So outraged did this committee feel in their examination, in their researches of the frauds perpetrated there in the name and on behalf of Democracy, that they brand the whole proceeding as an infamous fraud, and they say the attempt to foist McEnery on the people of Louisiana was contrary to the wishes and contrary to the expressed wishes of the majority of that people. Senators are here upholding that fraud, unwittingly I admit, according to their conscientious convictions of duty—they are here upholding a fraud to-day that was so pronounced by a committee of this body over two years ago.

All the frauds are on the part of the Republicans, says the Senator from Connecticut; the whole claim of Kellogg and the Republicans is based on infamous outrage and fraud. Sir, I base the right of the Republicans upon the expressed will of the sovereigns of that State, who undoubtedly cast their votes for that man. There is something else in an election besides the returns. Something else constitutes an election. The primary cause of an election is the intention, and it is the expressed intention of the voter as to who shall be his choice, that mainly constitutes an election.

Now, Mr. President, let me say one thing in regard to the election laws of my State, in regard to the election law that prevailed and controlled the election of 1872. It was a law passed by the Republican party, I will admit—passed to protect Republicans from the scenes of violence and intimidation that were practiced in that State in the Presidential election in 1868. It had accomplished its purpose. It was deprecated by Republicans and by Democrats, and there was a universal demand for its repeal or for its modification. The Governor of that State at that time had on three successive occasions, according to my recollection, appealed to the Legislature to relax the stringency of those laws, and he had deprecated their existence. The Legislature, yielding to the justice of the demand, yielding to the equities of the demand, during a preceding session just prior to this election had modified and repealed that law and modified many of its obnoxious features. Was the repealing act approved? Was it allowed to go into operation so as to give one party or the other the same opportunity for an equal and fair election? No, sir; but it was quietly kept for an opportunity for its use, an opportunity for its use which is well known to this Senate, and certainly must be known to the new members here. According to the testimony in the report there was a law that had been denounced from one end of that State to the other as obnoxious, oppressive and infamous, and denounced by the Democratic party, according to their admission. Then what was their proceeding? They made terms with the Governor who had the manipulation of that law, and this very thing which they had denounced, which they stated themselves was an alliance with an infamy, that was worse than infamy itself, they hugged to their bosom and they undertook to practice the frauds that it admitted. On the ratification of what is called the Fusion ticket there was a mass meeting held, and speakers from that stand announced that that law was to be used in favor of the party that had for years denounced it. Ah, they said, this is a glorious law; give it to us now and we will carry the State for the Democracy; thus prostituting all their professions of repugnance in order that success might follow such prostitution. What did one of the speakers say?

"Now, I propose to tell the people of this city, and through the press represented here the people of the State, the simple, plain reason that I do not sign these laws. In the first place, they make no material modification of the old election and registration laws. In the second place, it was intended, when the repeal of these laws was forced through the Legislature, that instead of them General Grant should use his election law upon the people of this State; and then, besides that, the great mass of the people"—

To whom was he speaking at the moment? To the Democracy as represented at a mass meeting in the city of New Orleans—

"The great mass of the people who have so long demanded the modification or repeal of these laws have changed their minds."

Ah, it makes a very great difference whose ox is gored. These were laws to be denounced when operated in the interest of the Republican party, but oh! what sweet and wholesome things they were when they could be diverted to the fraudulent purposes of the Democratic party. And I have just this one apology to make to my friends in using that term: It was not the Democratic party of Louisiana that originated or perpetuated these frauds; it was a few political adventurers there claiming the cloak of Democracy to enhance and advance their own views. Through them and by them the Democratic masses of the State of Louisiana have been made to believe, and do this day believe, that they have been outraged. Here were the instructions sent out by the authorities having control of these election laws as to how proceedings were to be managed under them:

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
Office of State Registrar of Voters,
New Orleans, October 24, 1872.

SIR—In addition to the instructions contained in circular No. 8, from this office, you are instructed—

"First—In counting the ballots after election, count first the votes cast for presidential electors and members of Congress, keeping tally lists on the form No. 1, provided for that purpose, and making up and completing the statement for each poll upon form No. 1. Then close the box, reseal it and proceed in a similar manner until all the national votes have been counted. Then proceed with the counting of the State and parish votes, bearing in mind the fact that the United States supervisors of election and deputy marshals have no right whatever to scrutinize, inspect or be present at the counting of the State and parish votes."

Here are the facts, and here are the practices pursued in that case. The supervisors appointed by the United States judge were allowed to remain as witnesses of the count of national votes, and the moment it became necessary to practice hocus pocus on the boxes in order to get in Democrats they told these gentlemen they had no legal right there. They excluded them from witnessing the count, and they went on and consummated their fraud. The Republicans were not allowed to have a man there. I assert it as a fact that there was not a Republican officer of election throughout that whole State on that day, except these supervisors of election, and they were excluded immediately after the national vote was counted. Here is the answer again from the registrar of voters of the State to a Republican, the president of the State Republican committee:

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
Office of State Registration of Voters,
New Orleans, November 2, 1872.

SIR—In reply to your communication of date, I must respectfully decline compliance with your request to appoint one commissioner of election at each polling place from the Republican party at the general election to be held November 4, 1872.

In regard to your second request, I have the honor to inform you that the list of polling places in this parish will be published in the official journal and other papers to-morrow, third instant.

Very respectfully,

B. P. BLANCHARD,
State Registrar of Voters and Supervisor of Registration, parish of Orleans.

Hon. S. B. Packard, President State Republican Committee.

In the first place, there shall be no Republican to witness the wrongs that we intend to perpetrate in this counting of the vote. In the next place, we do not pretend to let you know where the polling places are to be, either here or throughout the State, until the morning of the election; and the testimony goes to show that they were scattered and located and placed in such positions that the poor, ignorant colored men had to travel twenty odd miles in some instances to find where they had the opportunity to vote, while every Democrat in the State knew exactly where to find his hole. But our voters were not to be deterred in that way; against all difficulties they asserted their rights and were not foiled by such practices.

Now let us look at some of the marvelous mathematical results of these proceedings. In 1870, in sixteen parishes in my State, sixteen exclusively Democratic parishes, the majority for the Democratic ticket was 7300. Those are what are known as Democratic strongholds. Those same sixteen parishes in 1872, the election upon which this case turns, gave 7100 majority for the Democrats. In parishes exclusively Democratic, the Democratic vote fell off. The Republicans gained ground in the Democratic strongholds, but how did they figure out results in the Republican strongholds? Now I want to take my listeners to another part of the country; I want to take them to the thirty-six Republican parishes of the State and show the legerdemain that was practised in order to give the Democratic candidate a majority. The remaining thirty-six parishes of the State, our Republican parishes, were all carried by the Republicans in 1870 by a majority of 32,616, and the Democratic board in 1872 gave an actual aggregate majority of 1500 for their ticket. In other words, at an election which showed large Republican gains all over the United States, which showed in a certain portion of our State Republican gains over the Democrats in their own strongholds, an astonishing gain of 34,000 in the opposite direction, with no assignable cause for the change, was claimed in the exclusively Republican parishes of Louisiana by a board which admitted a Republican gain in the exclusively Democratic parishes. Where they did not need an opportunity to practice this legerdemain, this infamous practice upon the returns of an election, they lost ground; and where they did, they entirely turned the tables upon us. Can anybody believe that such was the actual result? It is incredible. We can go into their own strongholds and legitimately defeat them; they can come into ours and cheat us out of the expression of the will of our people.

Reference has been made in this discussion to the forged returns of four parishes. It is admitted that they were forged. The opposite counsel did not deny it. The true returns would have given 4000 majority for the Republican ticket. We lost 4000 there. Six parishes were rejected by the Fusion board, and it is a remarkable coincidence that they were all Republican parishes. Those six parishes polled by the registration 4500 majority for the Republican ticket. There are 8500 votes of Democratic figures whistled down the wind.

But it is not upon the figures of the returns that I rely; it is not to the figures of the returns that I advert; but I am calling the attention of the Senate and asking them to go back to what they believe was the desire and the wish of the people, and I ask them if we are not in this situation, that for two years we have been defrauded of our legitimate political rights?

The Senator from Maryland (Mr. Whyte) pleaded the admission of the Democratic candidate for Congress at large to the floor of the House, and to the privileges of membership just prior to the adjournment of that body, and cited it as evidence that in the judgment of that committee and in the judgment of that House he had received a majority of the votes, and that consequently if the Congressman at large on the Democratic ticket was elected the Republican Governor was defeated. Did he know the circumstances of that contest? Did he know that the Republican contestant was a claimant for a seat on this floor, and that his appearance in that body somewhat jeopardized and imperiled his right to a seat here? Did he know that the very committee which reported the fact says that Pinchback failed to take any testimony within the time given in the resolution? Did he not know that neither by himself nor by his counsel did he put in an appearance on the occasion? Do not the committee in their report admit that? They say:

"The present contest does not either necessarily or actually involve the so-called Louisiana question or settle the matter at issue pro or con of the legality of the present State government of Louisiana, as will appear from the several considerations suggested by the facts and testimony before the committee.

"First—The contestant was a Liberal Republican candidate, and received in addition to the full strength of the vote of what was known as the 'Fusion party,' a large Republican vote."

There was no Liberal Republican candidate for Governor. This man was a Liberal Republican candidate, and he did get some Republican votes, and this very committee that reported to seat him reported that he got a large vote from the Republican side, and that their determination in no way affects the main result as between Kellogg and McEnery.

Let me here say a word in justice to the claimant for this seat. He has been held up here as a target for two years to be laughed at, receiving all the shafts of scandal, calumny, rivalry and jealousy. His personal character is not impugned, but there is something in his official character that should be known. He was selected as the Republican candidate for Congress at large for that State in October, 1872. He was voted for as a Congressman at large in November. He was taken up by his party friends and voted for as Senator in January following. Is the fact that he was selected as the standard-bearer of his party on one occasion throughout the State to be pleaded in detriment of his right to a seat here? On the contrary, it shows the estimation in which he was held. He is spoken of as an adventurer who is willing to let his foot rest on any soil that will give him pap and emolument. He is denounced for appearing in that House, and he is condemned for presenting himself here. Is he not, from what I have said, fully and entirely justified for this double two-horse act of his? It is not his selection. He is here in obedience to the wish of the majority of the people of Louisiana, and certainly no reflection should be cast upon him, because in that case it would apply equally to any one of us who assumes the duty to which he aspires.

Mr. Saulsbury—Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. West—With pleasure.

Mr. Saulsbury—I wish to inquire of the Senator if Judge Dibble, of Louisiana, was not one of the counsel who advocated the claim of the claimant to a seat in this body before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and whether that judge has not recently published a letter in which he declares that the existing government of Louisiana was obtained by revolution?

Mr. West—There is some truth in what the Senator states. The judge appeared on one side, but, like a good many other politicians, he is ready to jump on the other horse if he thinks he is going to win the race. I do not attach the slightest consequence to that any more than I do to the sudden somersaults that some people have made in other political contests.

Mr. Morton—The Democracy took him at once.

Mr. West.—The Democracy, as my friend suggests, were willing to adopt him immediately.

We are referred also to the report made by the House committee, and told that that report says the Kellogg government exists in defiance of the wishes of the people of the State! Are they the White Leaguers, the turbulent red-handed revolutionists, who override all law, unless that law is administered in their behalf and in their interest? No, sir, they are law abiding, the laboring people, who, unfortunately, have few to plead their cause or speak in their behalf. What does this committee say again on further investigation? Their "best judgment" is that Governor Kellogg was elected. "We find that many of the more moderate of his opponents concede his election." Yes, not only his moderate opponents but the very men who put up this trick in 1872—these so-called Democrats. **They laughingly have told me over and over again how near they came to winning and what a glorious thing it was. They laugh over it. They have thrown a State into turmoil, anarchy, revolution and bloodshed for two years, and they laugh over the** adroitness of their practice and how nearly they came to succeeding.

Mr. Christiancy—I suppose my friend refers here to the report of the minority of the House committee?

Mr. West—I refer to the report of the minority, and I shall refer to the majority report, if the Senator will wait.

"Sixth—While we believe Governor Kellogg to have received a majority of votes in 1872"—

That is what the minority says; and that minority consists of George F. Hoar, W. A. Wheeler and William P. Frye.

They believe it. They have investigated the matter. The majority of the committee say in their report that they never did investigate that election; and what are their words? I am going to quote them in a few minutes. They say in their original report that they never investigated the election of 1872, and here in their supplemental report they express their opinion.

Mr. Christiancy—Were they authorized to investigate it?

Mr. West—If they were not authorized they were not competent to express an opinion about it. What did they do? And here again I come back to the majority report.

Mr. Dawes—Does the Senator mean to state that they did in point of fact investigate that question?

Mr. West—I presume that the committee looked into the matter at large, and I know that they did take some testimony in regard to it. That testimony, unfortunately, is not available, but it will be demonstrated by the testimony when it comes out that the Democrats admitted throughout the State that Kellogg was elected, and I am told that that testimony shows it. I applied to the government printing office, having been apprised of the names of the witnesses who testified in that case, but I could not get it; it is not available at the moment. The majority of the committee maintained that Kellogg was not elected on his own color line, and they never had the courage to go out to the utmost verge of that color line and see whether there is a majority of white or colored voters in that State. This majority come back and say that it is impossible that the Republicans could have carried that State, because the white element were their equal in numbers and their superior in intelligence; once more falling back upon the mistake and the error of which the Senator from Wisconsin not now in this Chamber was convicted, of saying that there are as many white voters in that State as colored. That is the ground again that they offer to us upon which the majority base their idea that Mr. Kellogg was defeated.

Mr. Morton—Will the Senator allow me to read an extract from the report in reply to the question asked by the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Dawes) if I do not interrupt him?

Mr. West—Certainly.

Mr. Morton—I read from the report of Messrs. Hoar, Wheeler and Frye:

"We were unable to make any direct and thorough investigation of the election of 1872. It is apparent from the facts stated in the report of the Senate committee (Senate report, third session, Forty-second Congress, No. 457), that the action of the officials was so tainted with fraud and illegality that the action of neither of the pretended Returning Boards, or the certificates of the local election officers can be relied on in the least as a basis for making up an opinion as to the true result. Indeed, this is conceded by several of the most intelligent of the Conservative witnesses. It would be impossible at this distance of time, and probably at any time, to go behind the returns and ascertain the true expression of the people's will. But our best judgment is that Governor Kellogg was elected. We find that many of the more moderate of his opponents concede his election. There is no argument to show the election of McEnery which is not met by one equally strong in proof of the election of Kellogg."

I call the attention of the Senator to what follows:

"The registration—"

And mark you, the registration was exclusively in the hands of the appointees of Governor Warmoth, who had joined the Democratic party, and every one of the election officers throughout the State was either a Democrat or a Republican who had deserted and gone over to the Democratic party—

"The registration shows a considerable majority of colored voters, and it is not denied that Kellogg received substantially all the colored votes, besides some thousand whites. Taking the Democratic returns in 1872 for all the parishes except four, for which the returns are conceded to be forgeries, and six others from which they threw out the returns for fraud and violence, and get at the true vote in those parishes in any way you can, by comparing the vote with the registration of white and colored voters, or by taking the Republican and Democratic votes at the election of this year, and it gives Kellogg a majority of several thousand."

Mr. Dawes—My inquiry of the Senator from Louisiana was wholly for information. I was aware that the testimony taken by the committee was inaccessible, but I had a conference with some members of the committee; and I knew or supposed what their opinion was. I agree with the Senator from Louisiana that it was the opinion, I think of a majority of the committee, that Governor Kellogg was elected. I do not think that they made any investigation of the facts as to that election; I did not suppose they had, and therefore I made inquiry of the Senator. But their opinion as to the election of the rest of the ticket is quite another question.

Mr. Morton—I will state to the Senator from Massachusetts that I understood from one member of the committee that in the course of the cross-examination of some Democratic witnesses before the committee in regard to certain parishes in 1872, the result of that cross-examination in regard to those two parishes was to show such a change as to elect Kellogg, but that there was no direct examination made for that purpose. It came out incidentally in the cross-examination of Democratic witnesses.

Mr. Dawes—I can not speak with any confidence as to how far the investigation went. I think it will be found when the evidence is published that they took no testimony at all in reference to the election of 1872; but that was the opinion of a majority of that committee, based upon such information as they could obtain in the matter, that Mr. Kellogg was elected Governor; but they came to an opposite conclusion as to the rest of the ticket.

Mr. West—Whatever apprehensions I might have had at the commencement of making some points, I certainly must express my acknowledgment for the assistance given me by my friend from Massachusetts and my friend from Indiana. The Senator from Massachusetts has had a more favorable opportunity than myself of knowing what information was elicited by this committee, a member of which was one of his colleagues in the other body. All that I know in regard to it is the fact, communicated to me by persons who were cognizant and heard of and heard that testimony, that this committee solicited an expression of opinion from among intelligent men of both parties in that State as to how the election resulted in 1872, and that while Republicans were in no hesitation or manner of doubt as to the result, there were some fair minded Democrats who repudiated the cheat that was practiced upon them, and who admitted to this committee that in their opinion the State had gone Republican. If an expression of opinion is to be cited adversely to us, we certainly must be allowed to use those same expressions of opinion when they redound to our benefit.

I have not had the opportunity of looking at the remarks of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Whyte) who spoke on Saturday, but I would call the attention of the Senate to one of his presumptions of fact that is scarcely substantiated by the record. He says that as the Senate had upon the testimony refused the electoral vote of Louisiana in 1873, we are now stultifying ourselves by admitting the representative of that State, or that we would stultify ourselves; that the decision to-day in favor of Pinchback would controvert and annul the decision of the Senate on a previous occasion as to the electoral vote.

Mr. Whyte—Will the Senator allow me to correct him?

Mr. West—Certainly.

Mr Whyte—I did not say that the Senate had acted upon testimony when it excluded that vote. I stated the fact that, owing to the condition of affairs in Louisiana, both houses, acting separately, had each determined that the electoral vote of Louisiana should not be counted at all.

Mr. West—And that if we now received it we should be stultifying ourselves. Perhaps I do not use exactly the words of the Senator, but I think that was his idea.

On the tenth of February, 1873, the Committee on Privileges and Elections of this body made an entirely separate report from what is known as the Carpenter report. They made it on the electoral vote of the State of Louisiana, investigation into the validity of which had been confided to them. The Carpenter report was not made until the twenty-third of February. On the tenth of February, 1873, they came to this conclusion:

"We find that the official returns of the election of electors from the various parishes of Louisiana have never been counted by anybody having authority to count them."

The Senate resolved:

"That, all the objections having been considered, no electoral vote purporting to be that of the State of Louisiana be counted."

Certainly the Senator will not contend that that is *res adjudicata*. Certainly he will not contend that the Senate did not reserve to itself the competency upon any future occasion, on a subsequent measure, to examine into the returns and the facts. What would have been the action of the Senate and House of Representatives on the twelfth day of February, 1873, under the solemn sanction of the constitution to declare what the votes of the people of the United States were for President had there been such an issue as that presented? Had the issue between President Grant and Mr. Greeley turned on the electoral vote of Louisiana, would you have said there was no return? Would you have shut the door and said, "Here are 179 votes on one side and 179 votes on the other; anarchy prevails, and there is no government in the United States," as you assume to say now, that there is no government in the State of Louisiana? No, sir; you would have held possession of this government by all the power of the bayonets of the United States until you had examined into the right and wrong of this case and set the right and condemned the wrong. Would you have remitted your government to anarchy, confusion, detraction and violence, such as we have had in Louisiana, simply because you had no return before you? No, sir; you would have gone into the facts, and you never would have been satisfied until you knew how every man in that State, black and white, had voted. What you would have done for this country at large, and what you would have done for this confederacy of States, I claim now that you shall do the same justice to us. We have been defrauded out of our rights. We show you the villainous and infamous conspiracy to defraud the Republican voters of my State, and you tell us we have got no rights. We have a right to look to our Republican friends in this body for sympathy and justification and support when all the presumptions of the case go to show that the Republican party was in the ascendency on that occasion. We have a right to appeal to you in our distress. We have been outraged there. Republicans have been killed by the hundreds in that State for maintaining that their cause was successful in 1872, and you put us off with the cold proposition that the only result and conclusion we can come to is that one board was legal and had no returns and another board was illegal and had forged returns.

What will be the result to us if your verdict is against us to-day? It will leave us but a continuation of this interminable, inconsequential Louisiana case. Refuse to admit this man, and the word goes out once more to the country that the Kellogg government is a fraud, and agitation in that region is renewed, crime and violence run riot there, White Leagues muster, and your President is called upon once more by the strong hand to preserve the peace. Can he do it? Is he competent to do it when his judgment is reversed by this deliberative assembly? What have we got to expect there? Not satisfied with keeping us in that condition for two long years, not satisfied with holding us under the ban of prejudice and oppression, are you to refuse now, when you know the facts and the circumstances of this case, to adjudicate and to give us peace.

Where is the Democrat in this chamber with the facts before him who can convince you, Republicans, that that State went Democratic in 1872? He will convince you of nothing except the existence of a "gigantic fraud" and an attempt to cheat the people out of their votes. I ask you again, can there be any other choice but one of two? When only two men are running for the same office you must either admit one or the other. You can either acknowledge that Kellogg is elected or you must have our State go into the hands of the Democrats. That is the platform on which I wish to stand. That is the logical result of the vote of this Senate. It will be either an admission on the part of the Senate that the Republicans are entitled to the government of that State or it will be the verdict of the Senate that the Democrats are, because that will be the practical result.

Mr. President, I said at the outset that I had not expected to say anything on this subject to-day. I have gone over much of the ground that has been trod over and were I a Senator from any other State except the State of Louisiana I would not have vexed the ears of the Senate to-day. It has been incumbent upon me, however, to say something, and I have felt it incumbent upon me to repel, in the strongest terms of which I am capable, the charge that the Republicans are the only fraudulent manipulators of election machinery in that State; and I charge home to the Democrats that they conspired and fraudulently deceived the people, and have deceived the Democrats of Louisiana as well as the Democrats throughout the country.

SPECIAL NOTICES.

New England Mutual Life Insurance Company, of Boston, Massachusetts.—Mr. R. D. Carll is no longer agent of this company. Policy holders will please report to MILTON C. RANDALL, No. 47 Carondelet street, who will, under authority of the company, receive premiums due.
mh25 3t BENJAMIN F. STEVENS, President.

Office of the Louisiana Levee Company, No. 23 Carondelet street, New Orleans, March 24, 1875.—In compliance with article five of the act incorporating this company notice is hereby given that an election for twelve Directors, to serve during the ensuing fiscal year, will be held at this office on SATURDAY, the third of April next, between the hours of 10 A. M. and 1 P. M. The transfer books will be closed on MONDAY, the twenty-ninth instant, at twelve o'clock M.
M. A. TARLETON,
mh25 td Secretary and Treasurer.

Office of New Orleans City Railroad Company, No. 124 Canal street, New Orleans, March 20, 1875.—At a meeting of the Board of Directors held on the tenth instant, a dividend of THREE DOLLARS per share was declared, payable to the Stockholders on and after April 1.
mh20 tapl C. C. LEWIS, Secretary.

Notice.—Canal Street, City Park and Lake Shore Railroad Company, March 26, 1875.—An installment of TEN PER CENT on the capital stock of this company will be due and payable at the office of the company on the EIGHTH DAY OF APRIL NEXT.
By order of the Board.
mh26 1t R. M. HARRISON, Secretary.

NOTARIES.

A. HERO, JR.,
NOTARY PUBLIC AND COMMISSIONER OF DEEDS
Office No. 17 Commercial Place.
Passports procured with dispatch, and prompt attention given to all. ly and

FOR RENT.

TO RENT—VERY DESIRABLE ROOMS TO rent, furnished or unfurnished, No. 128 Pacanier street, next door to the corner of Race street, opposite Annunciation square. Terms moderate.
fe18

FOR RENT.—A DESIRABLE COTTAGE TO rent, situated on St. Andrew street, between Rampart and Franklin streets, No. 469, at $15 per month; will rent it for less to a prompt paying tenant.
1a21

TO RENT, FURNISHED—ONE LARGE front room, suitable for a single gentleman, in a private family, No. 707½ Magazine street, corner of Washington.
fe21*

FOR SALE.

FOR SALE.—IN THE FOURTH DISTRICT—cheap, even for the times—a residence in good order, having a lot 30 feet front by 127 feet deep, highly improved, in a choice neighborhood, near Magazine Market, and convenient to the Magazine and Prytania cars.
Apply to T. M. GILL,
mh14 21 28 ap4* No. 54 Camp street.