New Orleans Republican.

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE UNITED STATES

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF NEW ORLEANS

NEW ORLEANS, FEBRUARY 17, 1877.

Cronin's nose or blood.

Death is catching the rear admirals.

A hotel keeper will d'hote on his table.

Mr. Moody likes Garibaldi for his enthusiasm.

A Wool monument is to be erected at Troy.

The bulldozers are somewhat cowed down.

Better times are coming and going always.

Insurance insures when the company is solid.

Sohlene seeks St. Louis, and will smile there.

Mr. Stephens gets better when Garibaldi gets worse.

Peter Cooper is confident that he will be recognized.

Mr. Justice Clifford continues to enjoy his breakfasts.

Some speculators will get cut by a corner on blue grass.

Lippincott has a new novel by Ouida called "Ariadne."

An attempt is being made to tax church property in Indiana.

The size of the Electoral Commission appears to be 7 by 8.

A man with a cast in his eye is not out of place in an iron foundry.

The jumping toothache gives great trouble to a man too lazy to jump.

No one has suggested the covering of the North Pole with blue glass.

All fashionable boarding houses in New York eat Iolanthe butter.

Mr. Blaine can not get away from Ben Hill by going to the Senate.

Had it been otherwise Watterson might have become Secretary of "Wah."

The centennial Krupp gun has gone off to Europe. It will never kick back.

Jim Fisk and Tweed were Dudley Field's clients before he engaged for Tilden.

A man may read political debates until forgets he has been to the centennial.

The eccentric genius who willed his body a medical college was a dead give away.

The *Courier Journal* says it will acquiesce, but thought things would turn out differently.

Potatoes are high enough in the market and popular estimation to be considered as luxuries.

When a hard headed man makes up his mind to hear opera bouffe, he will go if it takes a leg.

The old Postoffice in New York is to be used for religious purposes. That shuts Hewitt out.

In favor of rapid transit one New York man urges that the elevated track will be above the snow.

An enterprising colored man out of business bought a picture of Robert E. Lee and started a restaurant.

When a collector is told to call again, it is not so much that he is desired to come as that he should go.

Weston was a failure in Eng'and, but he will walk back in time to attend the annual cattle show of America.

The independent papers are squaring themselves. They are only impartial when there is doubt of success.

Miss Dudu Fletcher is the author of a new novel called "Kismet." This is why the readers do as they Dudu.

Darwin argues that birds have religious distinction. He would make Baptists of ducks and lay members of hens.

Ralph Waldo Emmerson will be seventy-five years old when the violets of next May get from under the snows of Concord.

When a man borrows money to buy a new hat, and takes half a holiday to wear it, he is leading up to solid enjoyment.

The Count Johannes knows of an instance where brains were useful on the field of honor. He is the proprietor of the knowledge.

The Nicholls police certainly ought to be paid by the men who put them on duty. Public spirit is too much at variance with bread and butter.

The Shah of Persia is building a railroad for the express purpose of going to church easy. He would make a gospel convenience of the Pullman car.

Andrew Jackson Davis is at work on a new map of the "Summer land," which is the Spiritualist's heaven. He has made some important changes in the geography of hereafter.

In New York charitable subscriptions become legal debts, according to a recent decision, and the collection can be enforced. Those who have been in the habit of heading lists to make others give will consider the matter.

Charles O'Conor obtained the job of assistant counsel to Dudley Field in the Tilden case by virtue of the great opinion he delivered to Mr. Reed, of St. Louis, regarding the President. The bar will fall down when Charles dies.

Brick Pomeroy said last week that his compositors and proof reader had placed him in "the ridiculous attitude of offending against the rules of grammar and the proprieties of common sense." The scoundrels had been following copy.

There must be a limit to the tiresome footrace which have so long been kicked back and forth between St. Louis and Chicago. A Chicago paper now says, "that a St. Louis belle, traveling in Europe, had a last made exactly like her foot; and she got it through the custom-house free of charge as a work of art, by pretending that it was a part of Bartholdi's colossal statue of Liberty."

THE HOUR AND ITS INDICATIONS.

We understand that Congress has assumed to confer upon the Electoral Commission the power to ascertain the electors appointed by the several States. Its action seems thus far to have been limited to ascertaining what are the votes, in order that they may be counted. The commission inquires who have been appointed by the States electors. It does not ask how or why they have been appointed. Under this apparent limitation of duty, we have a right to infer that the appointment of the Republican electors by the State of Louisiana will be found in conformity with the law of the State, and that this vote will be reported to be counted as it has been cast. Anchored fast on this principle to execute the constitutional will of the States, we can not conceive that the commission will drift from its position under any possible tempest which party violence may excite against it. The judges of the Supreme Court of the United States have been intrusted with the highest values—landed principalities, mines of incalculable wealth, stock transactions which involve millions, questions of character which fix the reputation of the most distinguished men or establish the rights of the humbler millions. These men are neither moved by the values concerned nor the indignation excited. They have passed in ordeal where the gifts of a single corporation would have surpassed the miserable scrapings of the campaign money barrel, and they can survey from the high and solid eminences of their office the empty and ephemeral rewards of the professional place-hunter. The constitution says: "The judges both of the Supreme and inferior courts shall hold their offices during good behavior." With a compensation of $10,500 per annum to the Chief Justice, and of $10,000 to the other members of the court, which can not be "diminished during their continuance in office," even by Democratic vengeance, we can not imagine any political inducement which could swerve any one of these men from the performance of a sworn duty. Let them look down from the bench upon some of the attorneys who strive to influence their opinion. Mr. Campbell, who once held a position on the United States court, abandoned his position, and is now a solicitor for the decisions of his former brethren. Mr. Carpenter, a former Senator, compelled by a sense of duty or a spirit of gain, now pleads for the defeat of a party and its principles, to which he has been indebted for the highest legislative honors it has been within its power to bestow.

It would seem to us that these judges are above and beyond the reward or the terror of the political parties now soliciting their award. We find another encouraging indication. It is the violence of the Democracy—their denunciation of judges who can not be bought or intimidated. It is the intimated purpose to waste by all the tactics of revolutionary debate the interval before the expiration of the executive term, so as to reopen and enlarge the excitement of a presidential contest for an indefinite period.

These indications of intended violence and fraud induce the belief that the Democracy despair of legal success and would precipitate another revolution. In this appeal from their own appellate tribunal, we can not fear the American people will sustain them. The Democracy will have had the opportunity to elect their President by popular vote. They have attempted to browbeat and intimidate the people. They have threatened to assemble at Washington to resist or counteract the inauguration of the people's choice. They have insisted on a novel and, in our opinion, an unconstitutional mode of deciding the will of the people. Now, if this decision shall be against them, and the Democracy shall appeal from the award of their own umpire, we do not believe the people of the Union, or even the solid South, will follow these desperate leaders. Such are, however, the indications at this moment. Judicial integrity and Democratic desperation seem in favor of the Republican cause. A few days, or even hours, will determine whether these indications are fallible. For ourselves we deem them of sufficient validity to believe that all Republicans may await the result with composure, if not with confidence.

PREPARING FOR AN INSURRECTION.

The arrest of the Nicholls pronunciamento just where it stood, with an order forbidding further movement was announced as dependent for further execution upon the report of the congressional committees which had assumed for the first time to decide the legality of an election conducted under the laws of a State. Both parties awaited this result, and there was no one who, in public or private, expected either Mr. Packard or Mr. Nicholls to assert any claim to office till after Congress should have decided in favor of Hayes or Tilden. If the vote of Louisiana should have been counted for Hayes it must have been on the basis of the Returning Board report. If in favor of Nicholls, it must have been on the outside count set up and claimed by the Central State Democratic Committee. No one in public or private has pretended that any right in either Nicholls or Packard could survive a decision by Congress adverse to the claim of either. The unexpected agreement of both houses of Congress and of both parties to determine this question of legality by a commission, afforded the President a far more conclusive authority than the report of a committee of a single house of Congress could have done. He seems, therefore, to have awaited this decision, and we may apprehend that with the concurrence of all the departments of the Federal government in the legality of the Louisiana election all parties should be content. It would seem, however, from the indications that this is not now to be expected. The Democracy, apprehending that the decision of the commission will affirm the legality of the Returning Board report, seems preparing to fall back upon the revolutionary programme interrupted by the executive order. They have already filed a caveat against that decision being accepted as decisive of the legality of the State elections. Thus Representatives Ellis, Gibson and Levy assert that the Nicholls government is not necessarily involved in the affirmation of the Returning Board certificates. They add, "It will be maintained." Who will maintain it we can not tell. The President of the United States might have done so, and might still do so, had he chosen to take such responsibility, but he has expressly devolved this decision upon Congress, or upon the commission. Will the Nicholls government be maintained by the one hundred thousand brave Kentuckians who would install executive officers—as they might supply mules and pork for an army—by contract? Will Mr. Tilden or the Tammany ring aid their faithful allies in this matter? Alas! when the vote of Louisiana shall have been cast it will have lost all its value. Neither the State nor its interests will be regarded by the Northern politicians as of sufficient consequence to waste trouble or money about it. There comes also another intimation that the decision of the commission will be resisted if unfavorable to the Democratic party here. The *Picayune* reports:

> The feeling among the Conservatives and Democrats of the city is very strong at this time. The electoral bill was never indorsed by the Legislature. They feared the Greeks, bearing gifts, and looked with suspicion upon this measure which smacked of compromise. At one time the propriety of indorsing the bill was suggested by several members, but met with such disapprobation that the idea was dismissed.
>
> The opponents of this action said: "Wait until we see what will come of it!" and so the representatives of the people waited and watched the march of events at Washington, trusting to the justice of the Democratic cause. While there is a disposition towards desponding on the part of some, there is a conviction in the minds of others, which is energetically expressed, that no matter to what lengths of partisanship the Republican members of the commission may go, their decision can not work the upholding of Packard's government.

So the Legislature "feared the Greeks?" Who were the Greeks? The Democrats themselves introduced and with a Republican majority carried the electoral commission. Having taken the chances that the Republican government might be overthrown by such decision they seemed to have cautiously reserved the right of opposition in case the decision should be the other way, and now we learn that no decision of the electoral commission can "work the upholding of the Packard government."

It seems there were several members of the Legislature who "suggested the propriety" of indorsing "the measure which smacked of compromise," and that there is still "a disposition toward desponding, on the part of some," yet the majority have determined that the Republican government shall in no case stand. It is unnecessary to treat of the difficulties which stand in the way of resisting this possible decision. We will however state them succinctly. Should the State be driven under martial law by a Democratic insurrection, there would be a military Governor. It is most probable that he would coincide with the Republican appointing power. The Democratic Mayor and Administrators of New Orleans would be replaced by a post commander of the same political proclivities. The Legislature would have neither authority nor legality, and would disperse to their homes. The city of New Orleans, being the only garisoned city in the United States, under martial law and military government, deprived of legislative authority, would offer small inducement to capital or to immigration. It would stand again in commercial blockade as in the war, and this paralysis of trade would pervert the last of its trade to Eastern markets and outlets.

Such are a few of the possible consequences of Democratic ambition. There are others which we forbear to state, and we leave to the imagination of the people the possibilities of imprisonment, confiscation, the death of excellent, though excited persons, shot down by soldiery, whom, if slain in turn, the United States can replace at a few hundred dollars a head from Ireland or Germany. While the Democratic politicians would, therefore, involve the country in a new civil war to gain a political victory, we have too much confidence in the good sense of the American people in Louisiana to suppose they will be permitted to do so.

A THREATENED REBELLION.

The remark is published as coming from "a member of the commission," "It looks like the Democrats had been caught in a trap." It must be an odd sort of trap that the rat sets for himself, and yet this commission is the avowed work of the Democracy themselves. It is, however, natural that a marauder captured by any means should set about to relieve himself of the restrictions which his own inadvertence, or the justice of others, should have thrown around him. It is precisely thus that the Democracy seek to violate or nullify the decisions of a tribunal which they have caused to be appointed, and by which they pledged themselves solemnly to abide. We find, however, that this privileged order enters upon contracts to be executed so far as they may operate in their favor, but to be resisted so far as any advantage may result to the other party. Already we find the Democracy preparing to impede or nullify the decisions of their own join commission.

1. We find the same assumption of exclusive right on the Democratic side, and the same imputation of Republican fraud which has been manifest throughout the whole presidential campaign.

The Washington correspondents accredited by the Democratic press of the city, intimate that the Democratic leaders are preparing to fillibuster aga'nst the decision of the commission on the ground that its decisions are partisan. Here are some specimens of this talk:

> The Republicans want to run the sworn commission in a strict party groove, carrying everything by eight to seven.
>
> The Democrats are indignant and disgusted at the infamous division of the commission.
>
> It is a decision in favor of Hayes, covered up by a lying pretense in regard to law.
>
> The majority of votes in Florida had been discarded even by the majority of the commission, to make room for party fraud and the dirtiest tricks of chicanery.
>
> The Senate rushed in haste to grasp the four stolen votes of Florida handed them by the eight Republican commissioners.

In the Louisiana case "most Democrats fear another party vote by the commission disregarding all law and adopting all the frauds" alleged against the Returning Board. This coarse slander of the motives of a majority of the commission has been given to the public by one Democratic organ. The Washington correspondent of the Democratic organ proper says:

> The Democrats have determined not to yield to the verdict of the tribunal in case its action in regard to the vote of Louisiana is marked by the same dense and desperate partisanship that characterized its action in the Florida case.

The organ itself says:

> The Electoral Tribunal might have pacified the country by discarding all partisanism and pronouncing judgment in accordance with the constitution and the highest principles of truth and justice. A thousand such tribunals could not quiet the country through a crime.

So there is to be no more acquiescence in the decision of the national returning board, if it shall prove adverse to the demands of Democracy, than there has been in that of the State boards under similar circumstances. The national commissioners are defamed in almost the same language with the Republican members of the Louisiana board, and were the power of the House adequate we should expect to see Judge Bradley and Senators Morton and Edmunds imprisoned in a crypt, and required to confess that they had covered up a decision in favor of Hayes "by a lying pretense in regard to law."

We have, in the position of the *Democrat*, the same arrogant assumption which distinguishes the acts of the Democratic party. The commission is held to pronounce judgment "in accordance with the constitution and the highest principles of truth and justice." And who is to say what is the constitution and the principles presented? The Democracy is one party to the question. Why should not, then, the Republican party throughout the Union send a committee to inquire of these Democratic oracles the principles upon which alone this decision should be presented. If one party is always wrong, and another party is always right; if one party must always submit to the law while the other will only submit when the law meets its approval, then have we an infallible orthodoxy, expounded by an order privileged to construe and execute the law, and then are all others serfs bound to obey the will of an aristocracy and heretics condemned to expiate their political errors by such penalties as their political superiors may indicate and impose.

All this, however, points to evasion and resistance on the part of the national Democracy to any decision which a tribunal instigated by themselves may pronounce contrary to the will and interests of the Democracy.

Should the Republicans succeed in having the will of the people, as ascertained at the polls, confirmed by the impartial adjudication of the men chosen for their superior ability and integrity, pass into the legal organization of the government, we shall regard it as a miracle. We remember what violence the Democracy has committed at the South; what frauds it has perpetrated in New York and attempted to perpetrate here. How an armed occupation of Washington City has been threatened with a purpose to install and maintain Mr. Tilden by force—how the Democracy have tendered the commission as a mode and means of success, and how it has now announced by some among them that unless that decision shall be what they approve they will fall back upon their reserved right of revolutionary opposition. We should regard the peaceful inauguration of President Hayes as a piece of good fortune on the part of the Republican party which can only be due to the perfect good faith in which they have acted. They have submitted their claims not merely to the United States, but even to an appellate tribunal at the instance and with the approval of their opponents. The American people will see and judge, and the Democracy will find that the same nation which has elected a President can place and maintain him in office.

In the meantime we can only regard the conduct of the Democracy as inspired by a purpose to seize the government under color of law, and, failing in that, to organize a rebellion and throw the government into anarchy. We have a hope that they will not succeed in the first object and a settled conviction that they can never succeed in the second.

KELLOGG'S CERTIFICATE.

The *Picayune* argues the illegitimacy o the State certificate signed by Governor Kellogg. It says:

> They mean to hide behind Kellogg's certificate. But Kellogg is not the Governor of Louisiana—never has been.

How have Messrs. Ellis, Gibson, Levy and others managed to hide behind this insufficient screen? On what ground do they hold their seats and draw their pay in Congress? It would seem that State rights Democrats should maintain the right of a State to decide upon the validity of its own commission, and when it has decided to recognize the authority of a Governor by its own act, whether of compromise or otherwise, it should not be permitted to the Federal government to invalidate the act of the State itself. Governor Kellogg announced by proclamation the elections of 1874 and 1876. He has certified the commissions of Representatives and officers elected under them, and to suggest that the Federal government should except to the legality of a State government which the people of a State have accepted is a violation of every principle that Calhoun or Davis ever laid down for the government of their party. If the certificate of Governor Kellogg be worth nothing, upon what authority do Messrs. Levy, Gibson and Ellis telegraph:

> Every precaution and preparation has been taken for the Louisiana case. If one spark of fairness remains in the commission, Tilden is safe. The Nicholls government is not necessarily involved. It will be maintained.

If the certificate of Governor Kellogg be invalid this telegraphic assurance would have no more weight than if it had been signed by Observer, Buel, Bijou or Burke. Unhappily for the Democracy the Republicans have more respect for the rights of the States than the pretended friends of the States, the Democracy. Judge Bradley, standing true to the doctrine of State rights, is denounced by those who have bartered away those principles for a chance at the spoils of office. The certificate of a Governor who has closed his term in the presence and under the acknowledgment of a body of Democratic members is good enough for such State rights men as compose the Republican side of the grand electoral commission.

HOW SENATOR CONKLING WAS MISLED

The Cincinnati *Times* adverts to the assertion of Senator Conkling that the—

> Presiding officer of the Ohio Senate merely opened the certificates, and that the two houses of the Legislature together proceeded to count the votes.

And then appealed to Senator Thurman, of Ohio, to know, "Am I right in that?" To which that Senator answered, "That is right, as to the Governor."

The *Times* then goes on to prove that such was not the fact, and proves that the State election of 1851, held under the constitution of 1802, and which furnished the precedent relied on by Mr. Conkling, contradicted the application of this precedent. That constitution provides:

> The returns of every election for Governor shall be sealed up and transmitted to the seat of government by the returning officers, directed to the Speaker of the Senate, who shall open and publish them in the presence of a majority of the members of each house of the General Assembly; the person having the highest number of votes shall be Governor, etc.

In the case cited the *Times* says the Whig candidate had the majority on the face of the returns and the Democratic Legislature insisted on going behind the result and taking from the President of the Senate the performance of this constitutional duty. They were defeated. The constitution was sustained, and the Whig candidate was inaugurated.

How far the perverted example of Ohio may have influenced the vote on the passage of the Electoral Commission we have no means of knowing. The fact remains that Mr. Conkling misunderstood, and therefore misstated, the history of this precedent, and the senatorial representative of Ohio bore what proves to be false witness to the misstatement. Upon referring to the political history of Ohio, we find a strict analogy between the mode of choosing the presidential electors, as provided by the constitution, and the resolution explanatory thereof and the text of the constitution of Ohio. This State constitution was adopted November 1, 1802, presented to Congress January 7, 1803, and was admitted into the Union the nineteenth of February, 1803. The mode of deciding the validity of the State election in Ohio was, therefore, in exact conformity with the process of electing the first Presidents of the United States, as has been shown in these columns and elsewhere. It was certainly very careless in Mr. Conkling to have stated the mode of election differently from what it was, while the ignorance or bad faith of Mr. Thurman was unpardonable. The only effect of a reference to the matter at this time will be to teach Republicans the importance of verifying an assertion in some other manner than by appealing to a Democrat to testify against the interests of the party.

THE PRINTING NUT.

The reformers are blocked on their first attempt at reform. They can not agree on the printing bill, though every cheap politician in the State not only believes he knows all about printing, but that the alpha and omega of reform are to be found in making the public printer work as nearly for nothing as possible. The *Democrat* approves a law not essentially different from the one now in force. The great reform consists in a change of the printer. The *Picayune* does not care so very much for cutting down prices, though economy is at all times desirable. But it is solicitous that the public advertising be done by a respectable paper having the "largest circulation." Of course there is but one such paper in the State, according to the notion of the *Pic*, and thus the question is simplified. The *Times* goes in for poor, cheap printing, and would destroy the noble profession by ratting. Rather than let its rival, the *Democrat*, run off with this coveted prize, it would doubtless *promise* to do the work for nothing.

The people will learn at last that there is a good deal of humbug in the high sounding pretensions of these self-constituted reformers. The numerous plans which have been broached to save immense sums for printing are all deceptive for the reasons:

First, the State printer does not now make tempting profits, and second, neither of our virtuous contemporaries would have the prices reduced so long as there was the least chance that the contract would fall to his establishment.

If the Democrats have the power to control the public printing they had better let the law stand and divide the profits among their three hungry organs. If the gains are as great as they have declared them to be, there ought to be enough to satisfy reasonable people. Such a plan would effectually shut out the REPUBLICAN as a competitor under the system to award the task to the lowest bidder.

Unless the State pays better in the future than it has for the past eight years, there will be no great fortune made at public printing at any price. Nixon failed with the State printing on his hands. He asked the State to give him fifty odd thousand dollars to make his warrant account even. This was refused, and away went all his profits, besides a good deal of his capital. This rate has been kept up pretty well every year since.

"UNAUTHORIZED AND UNKNOWN."

We think not many people in this city will agree with General Nicholls in characterizing the individuals who projected and promoted the antics of Momus as obscure and without authority. They may be unknown to General Nicholls and country gentlemen generally, but the citizens of New Orleans understand that one of the companies of the White League was responsible for and authorized the parade. Whether Mr. Nicholls knew this or not, it was deemed wise and politic, at this peculiar crisis, to send the following dispatch to Washington:

> Colonel E. A. Burke, Washington, D. C.:
>
> The sentiment of the whole community is opposed to what occurred at the celebration Thursday. It was the act of a few private individuals, entirely unauthorized and unknown, and universally condemned and regretted. FRANCIS T. NICHOLLS.

Deputy Marshal Stockton dispatched a much more elaborate account of the affair which the *Picayune* characterizes as "a small effort on the part of a small man to create political capital out of the humors of the carnival."

General Nicholls has stated that the "humors" are "universally condemned and regretted," but we do not see that he is included in the category of "a small man" trying to create capital, etc.

Unfortunately the truth of history does not bear General Nicholls out in his assurances to Mr. Burke. The people were nearly all dissatisfied because they had to wait till midnight to see the promised free show, and when it came along there were very few who saw in it anything like an intelligible idea. But when they read in the papers the next morning that it was a slur upon the President and other prominent officers of the government they warmed toward it, and even forgave its designers for their failure to come to time on Thursday night. As soon, however, as the Republicans manifested their indignation, it was deemed politic to administer a little mild censure. General Nicholls' condemnation is the most vigorous we have seen.

THE MINORITY LOUISIANA REPORT.

In Spite of Armed Force Louisiana Was Fairly Carried for Hayes.

Representatives Hurlbut, Townsend, Danford, Crapo and Joyce have made their minority report in the Louisiana investigation, concluding as follows:

> For the first time in the history of this country it has been attempted to destroy the lawful and formal expression of the State, in the election of President, by assuming the power in the House of Representatives to examine into any and all polls, and to purge the election, to make itself the returning board, and determine by a partisan vote what Louisiana ought to have done. We regard it as the most fatal attack ever attempted upon constitutional rights; as a gross usurpation of power; as subjecting in its natural development the entire question of the election of President to the will or decision of the House of Representatives. What has been attempted by the Democratic House in Louisiana may be done on the same principle by some other dominant party in any other State whose vote may be in the way of their party candidate. The cry of fraud is quickly raised and is readily repeated, and far too easily believed. Evidence is always ready to support that or any other charge, if great political advantage is to be gained. The only way to preserve the just balances of power is to stand by and support the formal, deliberate and lawful decisions of the tribunal constituted for the purpose, ordained under the constitution by the highest State authority, by laws which have been expounded and sustained by the proper supreme courts. Any other course is to constitute guess work for legitimate decision, the rule of mobs for the orderly processes of law, the control by the House of Representatives, whose days are numbered, for the determination made by the people themselves in due and regular form, chosen by themselves. Passion and prejudice will wear themselves out in time; wild declamation of intemperate orators will soon be forgotten; rash assertion of party presses will pass from men's minds, and then this case of Louisiana will, perhaps, be fairly considered, and the verdict of thoughtful men will be that the Democratic party of that unhappy State are justly to be held responsible for continuous and organized attempts to annul by force the clear will of the majority. The same calm judgment will declare that the laws of 1870 and 1872 were necessary safeguards against such organized illegal forces, and should be approved by all who believe in the supremacy o law; that this much abused Returning Board acted in the spirit of the law creating them, and that their determination is final in the matter. Holding these views, the minority submit them, and do not propose to follow its details in an unauthorized dissection of the whole, made from partisan and biased information by the majority of the committee, but to stand upon the established law and the deliberate results of the constitutional action of sworn officers of the State, solemnly done, performed and promulgated with all the sanctions of law.

The minority report on the Louisiana case closes as follows:

> "The undersigned submit herewith reports of the minority members of the subcommittee, and close this report by offering the following resolution:
>
> "*Resolved*, That the election held for presidential electors in Louisiana, the seventh of November, 1876, was examined into, determined, declared and promulgated by the proper authorities of said State, under all forms of law, and in conformity with the constitution of the United States."

Precedents in the Oregon Case.

A Washington special to the Cincinnati *Times* of February 4 says:

> The Republican counsel before the electoral tribunal have had their attention called to two decisions, one by Judge Strong when he was State judge in Pennsylvania, and the other by Judge Field, when State judge in California, both of which have a direct bearing on the Oregon case. The decision of Justice Field will be found in the tenth and thirteenth California reports, and that of Justice Strong in the fifty-sixth Pennsylvania report. Both decisions are to the effect that the English practice can not be applied to our system, and that an election in the United States can not be awarded to a minority candidate.

The Democracy Off Its Feet.

A Washington special, February 3, to the New York *Graphic* says:

> The Democrats here are very much disgruntled over the decision of the tribunal. They say the Republicans have so far beaten them all through this contest by superior pluck and *finesse*. It is now openly charged that the election of Judge Davis to the Senate from Illinois was part of a cunning scheme by Chandler to keep a Democrat off the tribunal and necessitate the selection of a Republican in his place. Old Democrats say they are very much puzzled, for here is a Republican majority affirming the doctrine of State rights, and a Democratic minority insisting that the central government shall go behind State returns. They acknowledge the Democratic position is illogical.

David Dudley Field.

A letter from Washington to the land *Leader*, February 5, says:

> David Dudley Field's name was from the rolls of the New York ciation a couple of years ago for unbecoming a gentleman and a law he is just beginning to play tric which would tempt any but an ex erate Congress to follow the examp Bar Association. In the committ Judge Lawrence produced a pamph ing the imprint of a private p firm in this city with the title, "T relating to Louisiana and Florida the Committee of the House of Re tives on the Powers, Duties and P of the House of Representatives i ing the Electoral Vote—Hon. J. Knott, chairman. From the note Official Reporter."
>
> Mr. Lawrence asked the chairman authorized the printing of the tes any such form. Knott replied th not; that he had no knowledge of done, that this was the first intim had of it. Judge Lawrence then s opinion it was a violation of the ru House, of all precedent in commit tice, and an act of gross disrespe chairman and the committee. Mr. of Illinois, a Democrat, said he ag Judge Lawrence. Mr. Lawrence ther, that no member of the com clerk had any right to give the offi of the stenographer's notes to an for any purpose, and proposed tha mittee proceed to discover how lication has been made.
>
> Mr. Field became very red in and moved that the room be clea did not want any witnesses of his The reporters were then driven ou committee sat in secret session fo hour. The pamphlet contained from the testimony of Democratic without their cross-examination o timony in rebuttal, being entirely but pretending to be complete. had it prepared secretly and pre fore the Electoral Commission as the Democratic record. Through ber of the commission the fact Judge Lawrence's knowledge. Th entirely destroyed Field's influ the commission and will greatly the Democratic case. Even such as Proctor Knott denounce Field but excuse it on what Madde "broad moral grounds," because is not familiar with congressional tee usage.
>
> In their secret session Field wa very wholesome verbal chastis Professor Seelye, Sparks and othe made a very humiliating apolog committee, explaining, as Knott he was not familiar with the cu insisting that had he suspected s was not perfectly proper he w been the last man in the world taken it. He begged the com overlook the offense this time, solemnly not to be guilty of a honor again. So its action w Field expressed a wish that t might not be made public or pl the records of the committee, and quest it was stricken off. It is th however, that his crocodile tea not have influenced the commit much leniency, and that they least have let his dishonor bee matter of record. Professor S been in a state of violent indig several days at Field's conduct, marked this evening that having himself he felt better. Being ask had relieved himself, he declined saying it was a committee secret.

Matters on the Rio Gran

The following is contained i from Brownsville to the Galve dated February 8:

> General Revueltas crossed over Brown this morning. He was se Point Isabel in an ambulance, cort of United States soldiers. he would get on the train at packery three miles from town afraid to pass through Brown knows he deserves castigation at of the Americans.
>
> He paid his private debts in cu paper worth one cent on the do Matamoros market. Some of hi their debts in horses. The ca going is not known; but one th tain, he left to avoid accounti acts to General Canales.
>
> It is reported that General Fu position in Durango assumed by in Matamoros. He declined to except upon an order direct from turned over the command to next in rank and started with report to Diaz in person. Wh way he was taken and shot. It is that this report has expedited the of Revueltas. It is generally b is going to join Iglesias.
>
> From the same source, Febru
>
> Mexicans affirm that the order pretended to have from Genera forged. Mexicans say Revuelt with him from $40,000 to $80,000 been stolen from residents of An affidavit was made against hi robbing in Mexico and bringing property into Texas. The p ready to be telegraphed to Rock arrest, but a telegram announc steamer had been gone a few m
>
> February 10:
>
> Captain Cristo has been p come to this side. General landed at Brazos Santiago from can war vessel Mauricio. He this evening's train. He was depot by a deputation of Mexi and was received on the Mexi the military and a large conco zens, with music, etc. He was by Senor Arguelles, and came General Diaz to take command of the Bravo. The Diaz men General Blanco was Minister of President Juarez, and is an and able officer.
>
> Diaz's authority is now und the country is quiet.
>
> General Cortina is at his r from Matamoros.

A Mysterious Murde

We learn that about the t January a man accompanied by rived at Jefferson and took day or two after, it seems, he to ride, and whether he return did not learn. At all events last her body was found some of town with a bullet through th

We also learn that a large rew offered by the citizens of Jeff apprehension of the murderer.

He has been described to us dark complexion, black eyes very large, thick lips, black hai tache, pug nose very wide thumbs short and stubby, ab nine inches high. He was dre and wore a black chincilla black hat with rim rolled and He looks like a Jew and, it is th two diamond rings. He had a covered trunk, marked under t Moore" or "Mohr," New Orlean

It appears that both the ma were entire strangers in Jeffer tive for the murder can —*Shreveport Times.*

Conkling Fading.

The Apollo of the Senate, th some and elegant Roscoe Conk ing, still fading," and bleached who stays out too late after th down. The close confinement w eyes, I presume, gives him this pearance; but his knees, also, Last winter he was one of the b ing men in the Senate chamber mild and considerate, always June morning, and never fail man" when he sent in a card. red necktie he wears, I though fashionable shade, but John said it didn't blend with the ranged in artistic rows all aro of the Senate, they were ca doesn't reflect its rosy hue up thereby dispelling the gloom. happy, miserably unhappy, away at everything and eve crosses his path. Possibly th convention last May had so with the change that has c spirit of his dreams; politica have that effect sometimes.—*Correspondence St. Louis Rep*