

THE LAST CHANCE

MEMBERS WANTED ELECTED

What is Needed at Odd Fellows Hall

DEMOCRATIC EMBARRASSMENT

and Nicholls in the Same Boat

MUST SINK TOGETHER

KENNEDY'S AMBITION

LABORS FOR NICHOLLS

HOPE OF REWARD

WINNING DEMOCRATIC ESTEEM

EMER GIVES AWAY HIS PAL

FIELD'S PROSPECTIVE REWARD

PEOPLE OF TILDEN REFORM

Wilmor as a White League Ambassador

NE TO BORE HAYES

SUFFERINGS FOR THE CAUSE

NER'S CONFESSIONS

do Good to the Republican Cause

to the New Orleans Republican

AMOROUS, February 21, 11:45 A. M.

major is current here that Messrs. Gibbils, Burke and others have sent

advice to the Nicholls managers in

Orleans to buy up some of the mem-

bers of the lower house of the legal

and get them seated in the bogus

assembly.

trio, abetted by several other

partisans, are impatient to be able

that although they have lost Gov-

Tilden, Nicholls has a majority in

House of the Legislature, and should,

there, receive recognition here.

the last mimic pretext on which they

but, will amount to nothing, since

Republican vote of Louisiana, which

Hayes President by reason of this

majority, can not logically be set

as it would have to be Nicholls

recognized.

Democrat here appreciate this em-

ment, but have no other resource,

therefore are perishing at this new

profitable trick.

that Packard received 613 votes

and that even those whose figures

under this have been recognized as

electors, is an insupportable

objection to the Democratic effort; more-

over, the decision that the returns of the

board can not be called in ques-

tion by Congress, leaves the Demo-

crats legitimate hope that a President

as State officers what Congress

do as to electors, to wit—go behind

the Constitution.

member of the legal Legislature

to the pleas of the Democrats

the Nicholls body, will find him-

self at work in an awkward predicament,

and the assembly he has abandoned in

fact, the only Legislature receiving

recognition.

per. Our money failed to seduce Wells,

Leviase, Marks and others. It is

believed here that it will be

important to tempt any of the legal

men from duty.

er who should sell himself would

by a knave, but would speedily

find that he had likewise shown him-

self to be the most comical rump of

the New Orleans.

is here to the effect that he of

members of the legal Legislature

may go for ten days, and mileage, if

day go over to the Nicholls body.

might have commended him to Til-

den, but he is not known to be able to

make a solitary claim upon the considera-

tion of Hayes.

ascertaining how ready Louisiana

is now are to affiliate here with

Hayes. They even admit that Hayes

is a very good President.

Governor Palmer confessed on the

Senate committee stand yesterday

went to that quadron ball, and

had an understanding with Little-

field, that he should receive for his perfidy

the sum of \$100,000.

Senator Wadleigh asked Palmer if

he was a specimen of Tilden reform

and if he had been a member of the

Legislature, would he have been

disfranchised, and what was the law

under which he was disfranchised?

Senator Wadleigh would be unanimous

in the opinion that the act of 1872 did

disfranchise the electors, and that

the revisory act of 1875 which

repealed the act of 1872, was

not in force in 1876. For that

proposition which made the Governor

the canvasser for the election, was

not in force in 1876, which expressly

provided a different tribunal for all

the cases, including the election of

electors, and was repealed by the

repealing clause of the act of 1875.

This act of 1875 purports to supply the

machinery for every public election in

the State by which the electors

are to be chosen, and which is

repealed by the revisory act of 1875.

But, more conclusive than all this is

the fact that in section two it is

expressly declared that the return-

ing board for the electors in the

State, and you have to simply disregard

the express wording of the act, without

any authority for so disregarding it,

or else you have got to treat this

law as a nullity. How can you

preserve and yet in force that

provision of the act of 1875, revising

that of 1872, which provides for

filling the Electoral College

consistently with the revisory

act of 1875? I answer, first of

all, that is an exceedingly benign

construction of the law, and never

dealt by a new act unless expressly

repealed, and secondly, that it is

impossible for the two acts

to stand together, and in using

this language I am but repeating

the words of the Supreme Court

in the case of *Ex parte*. Another

reason for the revisory act is

that in cases of doubt, a revisory

act is to be construed as if it

had been passed at the same

time as the law which it revises.

I now come to the point that I

have mentioned in my last

article, and that is the

question of the revisory act of

1875, which provides for filling

the Electoral College consistently

with the revisory act of 1875.

I answer, first of all, that is an

exceedingly benign construction

of the law, and never dealt by a

new act unless expressly repealed,

and secondly, that it is impossible

for the two acts to stand together,

and in using this language I am

but repeating the words of the

Supreme Court in the case of

Ex parte. Another reason for the

revisory act is that in cases of

doubt, a revisory act is to be

construed as if it had been

passed at the same time as the

law which it revises. I now

come to the point that I have

mentioned in my last article, and

that is the question of the

revisory act of 1875, which

provides for filling the Electoral

College consistently with the

revisory act of 1875. I answer,

first of all, that is an exceedingly

benign construction of the law,

and never dealt by a new act

unless expressly repealed, and

secondly, that it is impossible

for the two acts to stand

together, and in using this

language I am but repeating

the words of the Supreme Court

in the case of *Ex parte*. Another

reason for the revisory act is

that in cases of doubt, a

revisory act is to be construed

as if it had been passed at the

same time as the law which it

revises. I now come to the

point that I have mentioned

in my last article, and that is

the question of the revisory

act of 1875, which provides for

filling the Electoral College

consistently with the revisory

act of 1875. I answer, first of

all, that is an exceedingly

benign construction of the law,

and never dealt by a new act

unless expressly repealed, and

secondly, that it is impossible

for the two acts to stand

together, and in using this

language I am but repeating

the words of the Supreme Court

in the case of *Ex parte*. Another

reason for the revisory act is

that in cases of doubt, a

revisory act is to be construed

as if it had been passed at the

same time as the law which it

revises. I now come to the

point that I have mentioned

in my last article, and that is

the question of the revisory

act of 1875, which provides for

filling the Electoral College

consistently with the revisory

act of 1875. I answer, first of

all, that is an exceedingly

benign construction of the law,

and never dealt by a new act

unless expressly repealed, and

secondly, that it is impossible

for the two acts to stand

together, and in using this

language I am but repeating

the words of the Supreme Court

in the case of *Ex parte*. Another

reason for the revisory act is

that in cases of doubt, a

revisory act is to be construed

as if it had been passed at the

same time as the law which it

revises. I now come to the

point that I have mentioned

in my last article, and that is

the question of the revisory

act of 1875, which provides for

filling the Electoral College

consistently with the revisory

act of 1875. I answer, first of

all, that is an exceedingly

benign construction of the law,

and never dealt by a new act

unless expressly repealed, and

secondly, that it is impossible

for the two acts to stand

together, and in using this

language I am but repeating

the words of the Supreme Court

in the case of *Ex parte*. Another

reason for the revisory act is

that in cases of doubt, a

revisory act is to be construed

as if it had been passed at the

same time as the law which it

revises. I now come to the

point that I have mentioned

in my last article, and that is

the question of the revisory

act of 1875, which provides for

filling the Electoral College

consistently with the revisory

act of 1875. I answer, first of

all, that is an exceedingly

benign construction of the law,

and never dealt by a new act

unless expressly repealed, and

secondly, that it is impossible

for the two acts to stand

together, and in using this

language I am but repeating

the words of the Supreme Court

in the case of *Ex parte*. Another

reason for the revisory act is

that in cases of doubt, a

revisory act is to be construed

as if it had been passed at the

same time as the law which it

revises. I now come to the