New Orleans Republican.

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE UNITED STATES

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF NEW ORLEANS

NEW ORLEANS, JANUARY 24, 1877.

It's scold weather.

A man with a boil should not skate.

Club life fits a man for police duty.

The survival of the fittest is not so certain.

There are no new affairs of honor in New York.

All reporters are on the lookout for the outlook.

Cronin's nose turns again toward the setting sun.

Wagon wheels can not run far without being tired.

The city of Lockport, New York, is to be heated by steam.

The Florida *Union* says piety is increasing in Jacksonville.

Perhaps Sam Bard has moved on to the next town. He is silent.

The man who flopped over too soon will too soon flop back again.

Horace Greeley thought perseverance only another name for genius.

The price of potatoes continues to go up without regard to politics.

Be polite, and associates will not notice that you are not handsome.

There was a screw loose somewhere in the Ashtabula bridge business.

It is hoped the Cincinnati editors do not deserve all they say of each other.

Many of the new leaves turned over are not much better than the old ones.

The report of the congressional committees will be heard round the world.

The Boston Museum has a new comedy by H. J. Byron, called "Old Sailors."

The members of the Vermont Legislature attend prayer meeting every morning.

Natchez, and many other small towns, will have home-made Mardi Gras celebrations.

It is said a Western couple named their sixth boy "Enough." He is as good as a feast.

Amateur burglars can learn much to their advantage by visiting the museum on Canal street.

Mrs. Lander's "Scarlet Letter," played in Boston, did not create much of a scarlet fever.

A drumfish has been discovered which goes about destroying oyster beds for mere mischief.

The woman who faints at thought of being kissed is not fit to go through a railroad tunnel.

The salaries of the public school teachers of New York are to be reduced. It is a reform measure.

An agricultural paper says: "Brain farming pays." A bald head presents a clear field for action.

The city of Baltimore owes $33,000,000. Baltimore is rough and riotous and beautifully Democratic.

Levy has taken his cornet to Australia, where sheriffs cease from troubling and constables are at rest.

"Old Probability" is greatly missed in the weather business. The new "Indications" do not fill the bill.

The Baton Rouge *Advocate* speaks of Amos Collins as "one of our staunch colored Democratic friends."

The State Grange of New Jersey has had a defaulter in its employ. The man of hay seed is not above suspicion.

Ben Hill's time is divided between apologizing for himself and listening to the apologies of others for him.

Managers who use the word "parquette" must pit against Richard Grant White, who can see nothing sensible in it.

When a man prays that he may live to be old there are more chances in his favor than if he had prayed to be young.

After unearthing telegrams none of the investigating committees are wiser than "Seven more Mules," by Hewitt.

The ghost of General Jackson will laugh when it sees Watterson's 10,000 Kentuckians march on Washington.

The idea of a Democratic National Convention appears to have been given up since the failure of the State war meetings.

Mrs. Van Cott acknowledges that she once took delight in dancing. She was younger then, and had a better figure.

When Edwin Adams reached San Francisco he had the pleasure of reading a large number of obituary notices of himself.

Lotta's hair caught fire recently at the Park Theatre, according to the New York papers, but its color may have created a false alarm.

It may be force of habit, but the man who swore off goes out between the acts of a play and comes in chewing cloves, the same as in 1876.

The street car companies of Philadelphia made enough money during the Centennial to enable them to reduce fares for the benefit of residents.

The Grand Duke is a better man than he was. If ladies run after him now he intends to show his wife's picture. He didn't have it with him the other time.

Lucca made $50,000 by her farewell concerts in Germany. Artists who have been in the good-by business for many years consider that farewell tours are the most profitable.

We are under obligations to an esteemed correspondent for having furnished us extracts from the election and inauguration of the first President of the United States. We had, however, used Benton's compilation of the same facts before the receipt of the communication.

DE FACTO VS. DE JURE.

Can there be such a thing as a *de facto* government in a State of this Union which Congress or the President is legally obliged to respect as such?

The preamble of the constitution of the United States contains in few words the great objects for which this government was established:

> We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this constitution for the United States of America.

Patrick Henry was unalterably of the opinion that the words, "We, the people of the United States," obliterated the previous sovereignty of the individual States, and consolidated it in that of the United States, which "shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion, and, on application of the Legislature, or of the executive (when the Legislature can not be convened) against domestic violence."

The President "shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed."

These are fundamental, imperative and paramount provisions, which neither Congress nor the people of a State may disregard without a glaring infidelity to the "United States of America."

To render the latter article operative the laws of 1795 and 1807 were enacted by Congress, authorizing and empowering the President to employ such part of the land and naval forces of the United States as he might deem necessary to suppress insurrection in a State whenever called upon by the Legislature or the executive thereof. In 1871 it was found necessary to enlarge and extend his powers in such an emergency, and hence the law to be found on pages 1034 and 1035, of the Revised Statutes of the United States, section 5299, by which he is now authorized to employ any part of the militia, or the land and naval forces of the United States, or of either, or by other means, as he may deem necessary for the suppression of insurrection, domestic violence, combinations of men, or conspiracies tending to obstruct or hinder the execution of the laws of a State or of the United States.

Now let us understand what is meant by the term, *de facto government*. Worcester says "*de facto* is a term used to denote a thing actually existing or done." "A king *de facto* is one who is in actual possession of the crown, having no lawful right to it, in distinction of a king *de jure*, who has a right to the crown, but is not in possession of it."—Tomlin.

Applying this to the government in Louisiana, it may be read thus: "A Governor *de facto* is one who has assumed the functions of an executive officer, having no lawful right to do so, in distinction of a Governor *de jure*, who has a right to perform those functions, but is prevented from it by force—military resistance. Since the government of the United States is to "establish domestic tranquillity," provide for the common defense," and since it is seen that the Congress of the United States must guarantee to every State in the Union a Republican form of government," and that the President is obliged to enforce the laws faithfully, can it be pretended, if can recognize a self-styled Governor who has no "lawful right" to act as an officer, in preference to one who has? That it can recognize an apparent government well known to have been inaugurated by military power, in open disregard of the forms and requirements of the laws, in opposition to one which it has recognized and hitherto sustained in accordance with its constitutional obligations? Without law to authorize it, it is impossible that such a thing as a State can exist. If this be unsound doctrine, then the provisions of the constitution already quoted, making it obligatory on Congress to enact laws to "insure domestic tranquillity" and to guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government, are meaningless, and consequently entirely useless. That instant Congress recognizes a State government belonging to this Union, it is, in the very nature of things, one of law, and for that reason can not be *de facto* alone and simply. A State has never been admitted in this Union without the approval of its written constitution as being republican in form, and how is it possible it can remain in it without it? There is no moment of time when a State government in this Union can exist otherwise than *de jure*, and this is equally true whether it be provisional or permanent. Instances have occurred (as in Rhode Island) wherein it was matter of grave question and great perplexity to discriminate and to decide which of the two ostensible governments was lawful; but these difficulties did not destroy the fact that there was a *de jure* government nevertheless. The coexistence of a *de facto* and a *de jure* government in this Union, standing before Congress inimical to and subversive of each other, would be an anomaly under the ægis of the constitution. Therefore, as soon as Congress decides in such a pretended state of facts which is the government *de jure*, the nature of the other, with all its illegality, stands confessed, and is absolutely deprived of any right to recognition under the constitution by its nominal designation. For under what pretext can Congress or the President tolerate a thing called a government which has no legal right to exist, and that, too, as against a government of law. The President "shall take care that the laws are faithfully executed." The term *de facto*, can never be applied in an antagonistic sense to a government of a State which can exist only in a *de jure* form; nor was it ever intended to be applied to other than nationalities which are of right independent. Louisiana is not of right independent of the government of the United States. "It can enter into no treaty, alliance or confederation," etc., and although the doughty chieftains and gallant chivalry of the ninth instant took possession of some of the offices of the city and State, they will not go so far as to assert it was done in defiance of the power of the United States. It is true, they claim to be only *de facto* rulers, etc., but they maintain in the same breath that they are the rightful successors to a *de jure* and constitutional government. It is perfectly clear they can not be *de facto* unless they are simultaneously *de jure* officials. They can not be *de jure* because they are where they are by military force. They deny that they have made any issue with the United States, by which they have taken violent possession of the *de jure* State government. Had they made such an issue, with ability to sustain themselves for a reasonable period of time against the authority and power of the United States, their status might correctly be styled *de facto*. But the idea that a mere party in a State may, by a sudden insurrection against the recognized government thereof, take possession of a number of its offices, and by a military conspiracy neutralize the functions of all the others, then plausibly announce to the United States, which is pledged to "insure domestic tranquillity" in every State in this Union, and to a President who must see that the laws are faithfully executed, that they represent a *de facto* government, which should be respected, is, in our opinion, too transparent to cause any serious perplexity. If, as they singularly contend, these acts have been done under the laws touching such matters, why theirs is a government *de jure*, and not one simply *de facto*. If it be found that such is not the case, what respect will their boasted government command from either Congress or the President?

To assert that the party has established a *de facto* government only, is tantamount to a confession of criminality, for such a one is never authorized by any law that can be applied to a State in this Union. It is impossible to conceive the idea of the existence of a State government without the sanction of concurrent laws on which and by which it is established. We readily understand how a nation having a government of law may be overpowered by an enemy; how it may be occupied and dominated by it, independently of its laws; but how a State of this Union can be dominated by a faction of its own people, independently of its laws, and reasonably expect that Congress will approve it, notwithstanding its plain constitutional obligation to see that no State is ruled without republican laws, is something we are not able to grasp. It must see to it that every single State government in this Union is strictly *de jure*, and it can not, nor will it, tolerate one which sets up no higher claim to recognition than that it is only *de facto*.

THE ELECTORAL BILL.

The sensational dispatches of Monday claimed—

1. That this bill would pass Congress.
2. That the President would sign it without hesitation.
3. That the Federal judges would accept the powers conferred upon them by Congress.

Among other reasons assigned for this extraordinary concurrence was that the passage of the bill would appease the friends of Mr. Tilden. It does not seem to have entered the idea of the reporters that to surrender the electoral result and the constitutional umpire might somewhat dissatisfy the friends of Mr. Hayes. Democratic intimidation and Republican submission would seem to be an epidemic which overspreads the Union. When the law that governs the choice of a President is read by the history of the country, our amazement that any impartial mind can see any possible justification for the compromise bill subsides into a suspicion that other agencies than that of reason must have entered into its suggestion. The Federal constitution defines the duties of the President of the Senate. The same body testifies to the precise mode of performing these duties. This we have heretofore quoted. The first Senate which assembled under the constitution contained five members of the constitutional convention, to wit: Messrs. John Langdon, of New Hampshire, William S. Johnson, of Connecticut, Robert Morris, of Pennsylvania, William Few, of Georgia, and William Paterson, of New Jersey. The official record says:

> MONDAY, April 6.—Richard Henry Lee, from Virginia, then appearing, took his seat and formed a quorum of the whole Senators of the United States.
>
> The credentials of the members present being read and ordered to be filed, the Senate proceeded, by ballot, to the choice of a President for the sole purpose of opening and counting the votes for President of the United States.
>
> John Langdon was elected.
>
> Ordered—That Mr. Ellsworth inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is formed; that a President is elected for the sole purpose of opening the certificates and counting the votes of the electors of the several States in the choice of a President and Vice President of the United States; and that the Senate is now ready, in the Senate chamber, to proceed in [page ten] the presence of the House to discharge that duty; and that the Senate have appointed one of their members to sit at the Clerk's table to make a list of the votes as they shall be declared; submitting it to the wisdom of the House to appoint one of their members for a like purpose.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> The Speaker and the members of the House of Representatives attended in the Senate chamber, and the President elected for the purpose of counting the votes declared that the Senate and House of Representatives had met, and that he, in their presence, had opened and counted the votes of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, which were as follows: 69, 34, 2, 9, 4, 6, 3, 6, 2, 1, 1, 1.

We omit the tabular statement.

> Mr. Madison, from the House of Representatives, thus addressed the Senate:
>
> Mr. President—I am directed by the House of Representatives to inform the Senate that the House have agreed that the notifications of the election of the President and of the Vice President of the United States should be made by such persons and in such manner as the Senate shall be pleased to direct.

Here, then, we find the construction placed upon the meaning of the constitution by this unanimous resolution of its members at the same time with the adoption and signature of that instrument, carried out in the same words under the presidency of one of those convention members and in the presence of others. Who can thus pretend to doubt the meaning of the constitution? A President of the Senate "elected for the sole purpose of receiving and opening the certificates and counting the votes," are these not the words of Washington, president of the constitutional convention? Were they not indorsed by that body unanimously? Are they not repeated in the proceedings of the first Senate? Has not this practice been pursued from the foundation of the government to the present? It is now to be reversed from a fear that a violent class of politicians may not be satisfied with the practice of Washington and Langdon. We may add that James Madison, another member of the constitutional convention, then a member of the House of Representatives, appeared to inform the Senate on behalf of the House that it had agreed that the notifications of the election of the President and Vice President of the United States should be made by such persons and in such manner as the Senate shall be pleased to direct. We have not at hand the roll of the House of Representatives, but it is sufficient to show that James Madison, on behalf of that body, recognized the proceedings as regular and in perfect accordance with the intention of the Federal convention and constitution.

We do not know that this publication of the initial election of President could have any weight. It has been before Congress and is well known to its members. We, therefore, repeat that there would seem no solution of the compromise bill, unless in attributing to sworn and intelligent members motives which we do not care to suggest, since their existence would imply that neither the constitution nor the love of constitutional liberty were any longer dominant principles among us.

POLITICAL CHAOS.

If there be those who desire that all the lights of the constitution shall be blown out by the rude breath of popular violence; if there be a party which, having failed to impress its rule upon the Federal government, shall mock at the struggle which precedes its dissolution and rejoice to see the vessel sink which it could not be permitted to command, the present aspect of affairs will consummate such designs and fill with joy the hearts of those who hate republican government.

The popular body of Representatives has employed its casual and accidental majority to defame the administration of the Federal government; to suspend the appropriations for giving effect to the laws; to surrender every principle of constitutional construction which formerly separated the people into parties; to substitute a sectional and sectarian hate for the honest differences as to the best mode of preserving the common inheritance; to attack the acts of State officers once regarded as sacred, and to threaten in effect an armed revolution to any government which the leaders of these ambitious designs can not be permitted to control.

President Lincoln once said that the States were "the counties of the Union." It was regarded by the then party of State rights as a sacrilegious sentiment.

The States were, in the eyes of the Southern Democracy, sovereignties. To-day they are not even respected as would be counties or other political corporations. The House of Representatives having assumed to itself the right to decide the presidential election, has invaded the States with an authority that it could not exercise over the corporation of a railroad, a bank or an insurance company. It has demanded the persons of officers created by State law, and responsible alone to the State for the performance of their duties. The constitution says:

> Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors. The Congress may determine the time of choosing the electors.

Yet under this limitation of powers the House of Representatives summon before them the officers appointed by this State to determine the vote for the electors, and would compel these officers under pain of imprisonment, to submit their official acts to the adjudication of the House of Representatives. Were this usurping body to have extended this claim of authority over the whole Union, and compel the officers of all the States to surrender their discretion, and submit their acts to the reversion of the House, there might be some apparent purpose to assert for the popular body the paramount right to construe and control the rights of co-ordinate departments of the government. This is not the case. The great States of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, etc., have been allowed to appoint and elect their electors in their own way, while the claim of authority is restricted to a few comparatively weak States, whose votes are supposed to award the presidency and its patronage to the Democratic majority which rules the House of Representatives.

The Republican party has been denounced because under the constitutional amendments and laws passed thereunder, the executive has maintained the peace, and enforced the Federal laws within the United States. For this there is warrant of law. The power has been exercised without injury to person or property, but for the preservation of both. What, however, can be said in explanation of this extraordinary claim of power in the House of Representatives? Nothing except a determination on the part of the Democracy which constitutes that body, that it will neither command nor scuttle the ship of State. If Mr. Tilden be not inaugurated, then will the Democratic party claim the same absolution from any obligation to obey the laws of the Union that they now exercise in Louisiana, to defy the laws as administered by the Republican government of the State.

Nothing except the inauguration of the lawfully elected President, Hayes, can prevent a political chaos, nor can even that result prevent such a deplorable condition of affairs unless with the cordial concurrence of all conservative citizens in sustaining the constitution and restraining the ambitious and reckless element that would either seize upon the Federal government or open a condition of social and political disorder that must soon make this either a government of military force or a loose aggregation of political communities governed by no law and respecting no principle. From this political chaos nothing except the integrity of a few men in public position can rescue the country. We await their action with the hope that when the emergency shall have reached its crisis there will be enough courage and wisdom to prevent the wreck and ruin of all that freemen most value.

IT DON'T SEE THE DIFFERENCE.

The *Picayune* a few days since took the liberty of assigning to the REPUBLICAN opinions which had not been advanced by this journal, and employed the occasion to vaunt the superior devotion of the Democracy to the rights of the colored race. It said:

> On the contrary, the safety and strength of the Democratic party lies in the colored vote, and the black race will never be threatened with disfranchisement by any intelligent Democrat, even though he may have no higher object in view than the triumph of his party.

To spring from the support of the White League to the peculiar championship of colored suffrage is a leap which would make the most daring performer on the political trapeze shrink aghast. Those leaders of the Democracy who are still members of the White Man's party smile as they read this renunciation of their doctrine. They know that with the success of their designs the scribe who had written this submissive paragraph would either receive congratulation upon his adroit assumption of Republican principles, or the sack for having committed the party journal to such an humiliating recantation.

The suggestion that the Republican party meditates the disfranchisement of the colored voters is a perversion of fact, only to be accounted for from an ignorance of the constitutional amendments. There seemed to have been a suspicion in the minds of some very cautious Republicans that the Democracy might in some manner nullify the rights given the colored people. To ensure the right of suffrage and legal and political equality in other respects, a provision was embodied in the fourteenth amendment that if the right of suffrage shall be "denied or in any manner abridged"—except as therein stated—in any State, the basis of representation in the State in which such nullification of suffrage shall have occurred shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of the class so disfranchised shall bear to the whole number of voters in the State.

This provision has grown out of the sensitive, perhaps out of the suspicious care with which the Republican party has guarded the right of colored suffrage. It affects no man's right to vote. It leaves the civil and legal rights of the colored people as secured by the amendments. Were that provision of the constitution enforced the colored citizen would vote, or be voted for, as at present. He would hold precisely the same rights with white men in the State to which the provision might be applicable, but the State in which the colored citizen has been denied or abridged of his rights would find its basis of representation reduced by the deduction of the colored numbers from the federal numbers of the State. In Louisiana this provision would at once cut down the members of Congress and of the Electoral College one-half. The basis of representation being reduced from seven hundred and fifty thousand to three hundred and seventy-five thousand, the ratio of representation remaining the same as at present, Louisiana would have three instead of six Representatives in Congress, or five instead of eight electoral votes. Every colored citizen would have, however, the same right to vote, or to be voted for as a Representative. From this it will result that the right of suffrage will remain as at present. The civil and legal equality of all the citizens will be unchanged, but "the solid South" instead of representing those added members, may lose the representation of those whom it has bulldozed into submission. The *Picayune* admits that—

> The Democracy can not succeed without the electoral vote of the South as it now is, and that fact alone guarantees the black man his political rights.

It has even confessed:

> If in the last general election the South had been confined to the *ante bellum* vote Mr. Hayes would have won an easy victory.

From these quotations it will be apparent that the Democracy has succeeded in so nullifying and perverting the suffrage of the colored citizens as to insist upon it as an established fact. It opposed this right heretofore. Why the change? Because that political element, which, left free, would have opposed Democracy, has now been subjugated to the will of the Democracy. It is boasted that through the representative powers of the colored citizens, the Democracy can control the Federal government. It is confessed that but for the admission and addition of the colored representation, "Mr. Hayes would have won an easy victory." Not satisfied, however, with this triumph, the Democracy calls upon the colored citizens to certify that this has been done with their entire approval, and claims the right to represent this vote by virtue of this conquest of an intimidated and subjugated people. To this the colored citizens will never consent. They know that the White Leaguer is ambushed behind the conservative so-called, and will claim to wield the whole colored representation against the rights and interests of the colored citizens. The right of colored suffrage will then be controlled by those who claim that this is a white man's government. The limitation provided for in the amendment will be thus necessary to protect the right of suffrage in the colored citizen. With a Democratic Federal administration, legislature and judges, the colored member would disappear from Congress. Not a specimen of the colored representative would be preserved. It would be catalogued and preserved in the political museum as the fossil relic of an extinct political variety. The political serf of Democracy would have succeeded to the industrial serf, and the political master would hereafter, as heretofore, take control of the government in the right of those who were represented as members, while they could not represent themselves as men. While, therefore there can be no possible danger that the colored citizen can be deprived of the right of suffrage, provided it is cast as the Democracy may order, there is every danger that the solid electoral vote of the colored race will be captured and cast for the Democratic policy, which substitutes the political and social subjugation of the colored race for the servile bondage from which the Republican party has just delivered them.

The demand, therefore, that the basis of representation in certain States shall be reduced in conformity with the constitutional amendments may be expected to come from the petition of the colored citizens. This will be done to protect themselves against oppression. It will be done to guarantee to them the right of free will suffrage and other rights, which they can alone expect from the continuance of the Federal administration in the hands of the Republican party. The Democratic organ, therefore, in discussing the question has wholly lost sight of the constitutional amendment quoted by us. It confounds representation with suffrage. It does not see that to secure suffrage the colored people must themselves demand that a misrepresentation which replaces them in practical bondage shall be rendered impossible by being repealed.

THE WEST AND THE EAST.

The extraordinary and unnecessary assault made by Senators Conkling and Edmunds upon the usage of a century can be accounted for on but one supposition. It is that New York and New England are not willing to see the patronage of the government pass into Western administration. The decided action and elaborate speeches of these gentlemen render it probable that the electoral bill was suggested and framed with a view to their support. They have certainly stepped on the quarter deck and taken command so soon as it was launched and fitted for service. We do not say that these Senators have gone back on the Republican party. They have reversed the action of the government, and aided in a usurpation of power by the legislative department which the constitution never intended. They have substituted the umpirage of one man called a judge, under the obligation of an extra-judicial and therefore empty oath, in place of a sworn officer who, George Washington certified, was chosen "for the sole purpose of receiving, opening and counting" the electoral vote, and from whose umpirage George Washington received his commission as the first President of the United States. We do not intimate that Senators Edmunds and Conkling may not have differed honestly from their party, but we can not see that they have been justified in aiding to get up and put through a scheme which may defeat the will of the people, and, under pretext of securing peace, to awaken an excitement greater than that which they propose to allay.

The fate of the electoral bill is at the moment uncertain. The Democratic journals which two days since affected to be sanguine of its success seem suddenly struck with doubt, and the extremely reticent reports of Congressional opinions would induce us to believe that the bill is regarded by the Republicans as a special phase of that conspiracy which has made a solid South, and bulldozed Republican Legislatures and spread the net of this bill to catch the doubts or designs of a few halting Republicans. In this view the passage of the electoral bill is in doubt. Senators Whyte, of Maryland, and Stevenson, of Kentucky (Democrats), last session distinctly claimed the power of the Senate President to count the electoral vote. Should they stand by their position, they can not vote for the bill. It is not supposed that Senators Edmunds and Conkling will carry off other Republicans. In the House the Democracy is triumphant, and taunt the Republicans with an abandonment of the powers heretofore assumed for Congress.

We can see little other motive for the course pursued by the eminent Republican Senators, except that which determined the whole railroad system at the North to support Mr. Tilden. It is an apprehension that the West will set itself free from Eastern dictation; under other circumstances it would be supposed that New Orleans would have sided with the West. Party discipline and dictation, however, render this at present impossible. The Democracy has deserted its natural allies to go over to its commercial rivals and enemies. Anyway, the two great sections are now in open combat. We are with the West.

THE ELECTORAL BILL AND ITS CHANCES.

Every indication points to the probability that the electoral bill will constitute a party issue. It will, therefore, be fought, if necessary, with all those parliamentary resources which insure the deliberate examination of a measure of so much importance. It will be even necessary to employ the tricks and traps with which the Democracy have embarrassed the passage of Republican measures during so many years past. This opposition will be, however, greatly aided by the provisions of the electoral bill, on Tuesday next. Each house is to appoint a committee of five members. On the same day four justices of the Supreme Court of the United States shall assemble as an elective commission, and choose a fifth Associate Justice as the president [of the] commission.

Should it be the policy of the op[position] to postpone the passage of this [bill until] after the date fixed for putting [it into] effect, it will require nothing [more than] to do so. A thorough di[scussion,] which can not be prevented [in the] Senate by the previous quest[ion, would] require that a question debated [for] three months at the last session [shall be] voted on intelligently at this [session.] Should the date of organizing [the elec]toral commission be changed [it will be] necessary to ascertain and app[oint the] judges and the fair investigatio[n of] the disputed questions which wil[l be sub]mitted to the commission, wil[l render] their report before the fo[urth of] March impossible. We may add t[hat when] the Republicans shall see the [full extent of the] dangerous scheme for defeating w[hat they] believe to be the will of the peo[ple, a] great Western surge which is [now rising] will rise and make itself heard [above the] laughter and "yells" of a tri[umphant] Democracy. It will sweep from th[e statute book] the arrogant decree of a dying [and de]parting majority in Congress. It [will stand] by and declare the constitution [supreme,] and rebuke the revolutionary sp[irit which] would spread sectional and [partisan] strife instead of universal peace [through]out the Union. We may sum [up our im]pression of the situation by sa[ying that] the electoral bill does not at pr[esent pro]mise to become the law of the [land, and] that the next President, like the [first, will] be seated upon the count of th[e electoral] vote by the President of th[e Senate] elected for that purpose.

IMPORTANT TO GAS CONS[UMERS]

Reduction in Price from $3 50 ... Net.

OFFICE OF NEW ORLEANS GASLIGHT [COMPANY,]
New Orleans, November [...]

In accordance with the conclusion [of the Board] of Directors at their last annual m[eeting, held] February 7, 1876, the price of gas will [be reduced] in the districts supplied by this com[pany, on and] after January 1, 1877, to THREE DO[LLARS PER] THOUSAND CUBIC FEET; and a furth[er discount] of TEN PER CENT will be allowed [for prompt] payment, as heretofore, upon all [bills] wherein the consumption of gas exce[eds ...] feet.

By order of the Board:
no14 3m 2p V. VALLOIS, S[ecretary.]

REDUCTION IN PRI[CES.]

MME. ROSA REYN[...]

9............Chartres street...

Offers the balance of her

FALL AND WINTER ST[OCK]

OF

ELEGANT PARISIAN BONNETS, HA[TS, FEATH]ERS, FLOWERS, ETC.

At greatly reduced prices and regar[dless of cost,] to make room for a magnificent [...]

SPRING MILLINER[Y]

Expected next month.

LADIES DESIRING TO SECURE [...]

Should not fail to call early

No. 9 Chartres stre[et.]

oc8 6m Su Tu Sa

PROCLAMATION

BY THE

KING OF THE CA[RNIVAL.]

WAR DEPARTMEN[T]

For the purpose of celebrating the [...] Fete Day of His Blessed Majesty [...] manner, the usual Gala Procession w[ill ...] in due time. His Majesty, howeve[r, ...] and ordained certain conditions [...] department, which conditions are [...]gated for the information of His [...] subjects.

First—No promiscuous maskers [...] to join or participate in the Royal [...]

Second—Organized bodies of m[...] gladly received and assigned posit[ions ...] tion to this department, to be mad[e ...] February 6. Applications to stat[e ...] a mounted or on foot. Address [...] 974, Postoffice.

Third—No advertising vans, or [...] such a character, will be allowed [...]

GOD SAVE THE KING!

WA[...]
Earl Marshal of [...]

Official:
ESPY, Seventh Secretary.
Carnival Palace, New Orleans, Ja[...] 1877, and the one thousand [...] Majesty's reign.

TO THE PUBLI[C.]

From this date, MR. EUGENE [...] no longer in my employ, is not au[thorized to col]lect for me.

MME. J. [...]
Fur[...]
Corner Barracks and [...]
New Orleans, January 20, 1877.

BANKS AND BA[NKERS.]

CITIZENS' SAVINGS BA[NK,]
GRUENWALD HALL

Does not discount commercial [paper, confining] itself strictly to the receipt and [investment of] SAVINGS. A detailed statement [of assets and] liabilities is at all times accessible [...]
Interest SIX PER CENT from da[te ...]
Directors—J. L. Gubernator, T[...] W. Burbank, M. Benner, A. S. Bad[...]
J. L. GUBERNAT[OR ...]
M. BENNER, Cashier.

NEW ORLEANS
SAVINGS INSTIT[UTION,]
156............Canal Street.

OFFICERS:
D. URQUHART, President.
THOMAS A. ADAMS, First Vice [President.]
THOMAS ALLEN CLARKE, Second [Vice President.]
CHARLES J. LEEDS, Third Vice [President.]
CHARLES KILSHAW, Treasurer.

TRUSTEES:
Thomas A. Adams, George [...]
Thomas Allen Clarke, John [...]
Charles J. Leeds, Christ[...]
Samuel Jamison, Carl [...]
A. Moulton, T. L. B[...]
E. A. Palfrey, David [...]
Interest allowed on deposits.

INSURANC[E.]

NEW ORLEANS
INSURANCE CO[MPANY.]
CORNER OF CANAL AND CA[MP STREETS.]
Established in 1[...]

Capital...........
Assets a[t fa]ir market value....
Income f[or] the year 1876.........

This company insures fire, [...] risks; issues marine policies, pa[yable in] case of loss.

J. TUYES, President.
A. SCHREIBER, Vice P[resident.]
J. W. HINCKS, Secret[ary.]

Directors.
Ernest Merilh, A. [...]
Placide Forstall, A. [...]
E. Gally, J. T[...]
Charles Lafitte, W. [...]
W. Van Benthuysen, D. [...]
Pierre Poutz. D. [...]