THE NEW ORLEANS DAILY BEE.
DUFOUR & LIMET, PUBLISHERS,
No. 73 Chartres Street.
TERMS OF THE BEE:
Terms of Subscription—Daily, per annum, in advance, $14; half-yearly, $8; quarterly, $4.
Price of the paper—Single copies, 10 cents.
The Semi-Weekly, published every Tuesday and Saturday. Subscription $5 per annum, invariably in advance.
Rates of Advertising—Transient advertisements, twelve lines of the paper, first insertion $1 50 per square, for each subsequent insertion, 75 cents per square.
First, or Editorial Page, Transient Advertisements, each insertion, $1 75 per square.
Advertisements inserted at intervals, to be charged as new advertisements.
First or Editorial Page, Monthly Advertisements, each square, $75 per month.
Regular advertisers, who advertise largely, shall be allowed such discount from the above transient rates, as may be agreed upon. In no case shall such discount exceed 25 per cent.
All Business Notices of Advertisements to be charged 50 cents per line, each insertion.
All Transient Advertisements must be paid for in advance.
All Advertisements not marked for any number of insertions, will be published six times.
All bills with regular advertisers shall be rendered monthly.
NEW ORLEANS:
FRIDAY MORNING, JULY 16, 1869

TRY GEORGE ALCE'S CIGARS,
185 ..... Rampart Street 185

MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL NOT "OFFICERS."

The question as to the validity of Warmoth's appointments to the City Council having been taken up on appeal to the Supreme Court, it is no longer of immediate interest to our readers. Questions relating to the construction of the laws are, however, always in order, and as we think there ought never to have been any doubt as to the want of power in the Executive to appoint members of the City Council, we propose to show by precedent that members of legislative bodies were long ago decided not to be "officers" in the same sense that those holding executive and judicial positions are officers. "Office" is not the proper term to use to express the function exercised by a law maker, State or municipal. And the Aldermen of New Orleans are not "officers" and do not occupy "offices" such as are contemplated by the law under which Warmoth assumed to act. We learn from the parliamentary history of the country that the legislators are not "officers" in the sense of the Constitution, and it has been so decided in a very notable case—that of the impeachment of William Blount, United States Senator from the State of Tennessee, who was brought to trial at the bar of the Senate on the 17th of December, 1798, under that provision of the Federal Constitution, which declares, (Art II, sec 4) "The President, Vice President and all civil officers of the United States shall be removed from office on impeachment for and conviction of treason, bribery or other crimes and misdemeanors." It was contended on behalf of Mr Blount that, as a Senator, he was not a *civil officer of the United States*, neither was his Scatorship an "office," and, on argument, this plea was sustained and the case dismissed (4 January, 1799. In the impeachment proceedings against President Johnson this case was again brought up and conceded to be good law. The principle is that a United States Senatorship, and, by parity of reason, a seat in the United States House of Representatives, is not an "office," and a member of Congress not "a civil officer of the United States."

The Constitution of Louisiana makes a similar distinction. Article II says:

"No member of Congress during the term for which he was elected, nor for one year thereafter, shall be appointed to any civil office of profit under this State, which shall have been created, or the emoluments of which may have been increased during the time such Senator or Representative was in office."

There can be no misconstruction of this article. It is as much so to which there is an emolument attached—not a legislative office—not an Alderman, but an officer of the Executive Department or the Judicial Department of the State Government.

Article 52 says:

"No members of Congress, nor persons holding offices under the United States, or Heirs are two classes, viz: "Members of Congress and persons holding office. Members of Congress therefore do not hold office and are not termed officers.

Then again article 61 says:

"The Governor shall have power to fill vacancies that may happen in the offices of the Senate, *by granting commissions*, &c.

This article shows that the vacancies in office which the Governor may fill are those which are held by *commission*, such as the Judges of the Supreme Court. The Aldermen of New Orleans do not receive their functions under a commission from the Governor. They are always elected by the people and hold their commissions from them.

Article 62 says:

"All civil officers shall be removable by an address of the Senate and House of Members elect to each House of the General Assembly."

No one will pretend that any member of the City Council of New Orleans is removable by the Legislature, under this article. The City Charter provides for this.

We think all these articles of the Constitution show that the words "civil officer" and "officer" used therein, never refer to members of the City Council of New Orleans, and cannot by any strained construction be made to include them.

These citations might be multiplied, but it is unnecessary. No one who investigates the subject can come to any other conclusion that that to which we have arrived.

A book by General Lee will awaken such special interest, that we are glad to call attention to it. The University publishing Company of No. 1 Bond street, New York, announce that they have now in press, and will issue in a few weeks, "Memoirs of the War by Gen Henry Lee, thoroughly revised and corrected by Dr R. H. Lee, who has added, also, an entirely new biography of his father, prepared by him from private and personal materials never before used. It will be a large and handsome octavo volume, illustrated by new steel portraits of Gen Henry Lee and Gen Nathaniel Greene, beautiful steel engravings of "Marion Crossing the Pedee," and the "Surrender of Cornwallis, and five original maps and plans. Our readers need not be told that this is a work of great interest and value. It is the standard history of military operations at the South during the revolutionary war, and as such is a book which every reading man should possess, but its interest and value are both greatly enhanced by Gen Robert E. Lee's thorough revision and correction, and by the valuable biography of his father which he has written and added to it.

We are sure that this announcement, alone, is sufficient to give the book a very great sale, but when we add that Gen. Lee is personally interested in its publication, such a sale is made certain.

As we learn that the book is to be sold by canvassing agents only, those who desire to engage in the sale should make early application to the publishers.

We invite attention to the card of Mr. H. F. Given, cotton and sugar factor and general commission merchant, No. 11 Union street, which will be found in our advertising columns to day. Mr Given's experience in business and high standing in commercial circles afford a guarantee for the prompt, faithful and efficient transaction of all business matters in his line which may be entrusted to his management.

We acknowledge receipt of an invitation, through Brother Florimond, to attend the semi-annual examination at St Stanislaus Commercial College, Bay St. Louis, on the 20th and 21st inst, and a grand dramatic performance by the students on the 22d.

The Directors of the German Protestant Orphan Asylum, on State street, between Camp and Chestnut streets, Bloomingdale, have politely forwarded to us, through their Secretary, Mr Geo Stromeyer, an invitation to be present at the ceremonies of laying the corner stone of the Asylum on Sunday, July 18th, at 11 m.

THE MISSISSIPPI ELECTION.—*Washington*, July 14.—It is generally believed that there was a failure to fix the election in Mississippi at a time and day as the fourth Tuesday in November. This which was a concession to Mr Bentwell and such of the other members of the Cabinet who opposed the submission of the Virginia Constitution, with exceptions as to the test oath and disfranchisement clause. They do not look upon the result in Virginia in the same light as the President and the more moderate members of the Cabinet do. They fear that a similar result in Mississippi, which politicians generally are now almost prepared to admit would have a bad effect upon elections in the Northern States if the Mississippian were allowed to vote earlier. For this reason the election there was fixed for a day subsequent to the election in Pennsylvania and Ohio, which occur the second Tuesday in October. In both these States Governors and other State officers are to be elected, so it is deemed of great importance that the Republican ticket should triumph in both. Pennsylvania Republicans have already admitted that they have an up hill business of it by at this early day making appeals to the Federal Administration to do something for them. In this state of the case, to permit an election in Mississippi, with the probabilities all on the side of a Conservative Republican success, at any time shortly preceding the Pennsylvania and Ohio elections, would be very much like using a weapon to defeat themselves.

This is the whole object in fixing the Mississippi election so late in November. It is understood that some members of the Cabinet, on Friday, made slight objection to making an exception of the test oath clause, but as the President and been set to the Virginia case, it would have been inconsistent to deny the privilege to Mississippi. Under the law the President has the power to order the election in the unreconstructed States where and how he pleases, but he consults his Cabinet, for the purpose (to use a homely phrase) of "keeping peace in the family."

It is said that George Peabody designs to administer upon his own estate, and will leave nothing for heirs or tax gatherers to quarrel about.

Gen. Sherman says the Indians are generally doing well under the new policy of the Administration, and don't steal more than their share of cattle.

The New Orleans Bee.

OFFICE 73 CHARTRES STREET. NEW ORLEANS, FRIDAY MORNING, JULY 16, 1869. 42d YEAR—Vol. XLII.—Whole—14,804

The Texas Bond Case.

We published three months ago the principal portions of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Texas bond case, in which the majority of the Court held that Texas had not been taken out of the Union by her act of secession and that she was still a State in the Union and competent as such to appear as a party to a suit in the Supreme Court. Chief Justice Chase was the organ of the Court on that occasion. There was a dissenting opinion delivered by Justice Grier in which he uses this language:

"I do not consider myself bound to express any opinion judicially as to the constitutional right of Texas to exercise the rights and privileges of a State of this Union, or the power of Congress to govern her as a conquered province, to subject her to military domination and keep her in quiet. I can only submit to the fact as decided by the political position of the Government, and I am not disposed to join in any case of judicial subtlety to prove Texas to be a State of the Union, when Congress has decided that she is not. *It is a question of fact, I report, and not of law.* Politically Texas is not a State of this Union. Whether rightfully out of it or not, is a question not for the Court, and *I am not called on to confute a fact with syllogisms.*"

We publish the whole opinion believing the doctrine of Judge Grier is sound and the logic unanswerable and therefore well worthy of perusal. Justices Swayne and Miller concurred with him so far as concerned the inoperacity of the State of Texas, in her present condition to maintain an original suit in the Supreme Court of the United States:

MR JUSTICE GRIER'S OPINION.

The State of Texas vs George W. White and others—bill in Equity.—Mr Justice Grier dissenting, delivered the following opinion:

I regret that I am compelled to dissent from the opinion of the majority of the Court on all the points raised and decided in this case. The first question in order is the jurisdiction of the Court to entertain this bill in behalf of the State of Texas. The original jurisdiction of this Court can be invoked only by one of the United States. The Territories have no such right conferred on them by the Constitution, nor have the Indian tribes who are under the protection of the military authorities of the Government. If it has been urged that Columbia is a distinct political society, and is, therefore, a "State" according to the definition of writers on general law. This is true; but as the act of Congress obviously uses the word "State" in reference to that term as used in the Constitution, it becomes necessary to inquire whether Columbia is a State in the sense of that instrument. The result of that examination is a conviction that the members of the American Confederacy only are the States contemplated in the Constitution. The House of Representatives is to be composed of members chosen by the people of the several States, and each State shall have at least one representative. The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State. Each State shall appoint, for the election of its Senators, a number of electors equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives. These claims show that word "State" is used in the Constitution as designating a member of the Union and excludes from the term the signification attached to it by writers on the law of nations. Now we have here a clear and well-defined test by which we may arrive at a conclusion with regard to the questions of fact now to be decided. Is Texas a State, as it represented by Senators chosen by the people of that State and received on the floor of Congress? Has she two Senators to represent her as a State in the Senate of the United States? Has her voice been heard in the late election of President? Is she not now and government as a conquered province by military force? The act of Congress of March 26, 1867, declares Texas to be a "rebel State," and provides for its government until a legal and republican State Government could be legally established. It constituted Louisiana and Texas the Fifth Military District, and made it subject, not to the civil authority, but to the "military authorities of the United States." It is true that no organized rebellion now exists there, and no hostile force of the United States now exercise jurisdiction over the people of that province. But this is no test of the States being in the Union. Dakota is no State, and yet the courts of the United States administer justice there as they do in Texas. The Indian tribes, who are governed by military force, cannot claim to be States of the Union. Whence does the condition of Texas differ from these? Now, by assuming or admitting as a fact the present status of Texas as a State out in the Union politically, I feel bound to protest against any charge of inconsistency as to the judicial opinion heretofore expressed as a member of the Court, or silently assented to. I do not consider myself bound to express any opinion judicially as to the constitutional right of Texas to exercise the rights and privileges of a State of the Union, or the power of Congress to govern her as a conquered province, to subject her to military domination and keep her in quiet. I can only submit to the fact as decided by the political position of the Government; and I am not disposed to join in any case of judicial subtlety to prove Texas to be a State of the Union, when Congress has decided that she is not. It is a question of fact, I report, and not of law. Politically, Texas is not a State in the Union. Whether rightfully out of it or not, is a question not for the Court, and I am not called on to confute a fact with syllogisms. But only reading now the fact to be as judicially assumed by my brethren, the next question is whether she has a right to repudiate her contracts? Before proceeding to answer this question we must notice a fact in this case that was forgotten in the argument. I mean that the United States are no party to this suit, and refusing to pay the bonds because the money paid would be used to advance the interests of the rebellion. It is a matter of utter insignificance to the Government of the United States to whom she makes the payment of these bonds. They are payable to the bearer. The Government is not bound to inquire into the *bona fides* of the holder, nor whether the State of Texas has parted with the bonds wisely or foolishly. And although by the Reconstruction acts she is required to repudiate all debts contracted for the purposes of the rebellion, this does not annul the acts of the State Government during the rebellion, or contract for other purposes, nor authorize the State to repudiate them. Now, whether we assume the State of Texas to be judicially in the Union (although actually out of it) or not, it will not alter the case. The contest now is between the State of Texas and her own citizens who seek to annul a contract with the respondents, based on the allegation that there was no authority in Texas to contract for the purpose of carrying on the rebellion. Having relied upon one judicial fiction, namely, that she is a State in the Union, she now relies upon a second one, which she wishes this Court to adopt, that she was not a State at all during the five years that she was in rebellion. She now sets up the plea of nullity, and asks the Court to treat all her acts during the disease as void. We have had some very astute logic to prove that judicially she was not a State at all, although governed by her own Legislature and Executive as "a distinct political body." The ordinance of secession adopted by the Convention on the 18th of February, 1861, submitted to a vote of the people, and ratified by an overwhelming majority. I admit that this was a very ill-advised measure. It was the act of a government not of a sovereign State, and the verdict on the trial of this question, by battle—Prize cases, 2 Black 635—has been against the secession movement. But that verdict did not settle any question not involved in the case. It did not settle the question of her right to plead legality, or set aside all her contracts, made during the pending of the trial, with her own citizens, for food, clothing or medicines. The same organized political body, exercising the sovereign power of the State, which required the indorsement of these bonds by the Governor, also passed the laws authorizing the disposal of them without such indorsement. Use cannot, like the chameleon assume the color of the object to which she adheres, and ask the Court to involve itself in the contradictory position that she is a State in the Union and never was out of it, and not a State at all for four years, during which she acted and claim to be held organized political body, exercising all the powers and functions of an independent sovereign State. Whether a State *de facto or de jure* she is estopped from denying her identity in dispute with her own citizens. If they have not fulfilled their contracts, she can have her legal remedy for the breach of it in her own Courts. But the case of Hardenburg differs from that of the other defendants. He purchased the bonds in open market, *bona fide*, and for a full consideration. Now, it is to be observed that these bonds are payable to bearer, and that this Court is appealed to as a Court of Equity. The argument to justify a decree in favor of the commonwealth of Texas as against Hardenburg, is simply this: these bonds, though payable to bearer, are redeemable fourteen years from date. The Government has exercised her privilege of paying the interest for a term without redeeming the principal, which gives an additional value to the bonds. *Ergo*, the bonds are dishonored. *Ergo* the former owner has a right to resume the possession of them, and reclaim them from a *bona fide* owner by a decree of a Court of Equity. This is the legal argument, when put in the form of a logical sorites, by which Texas invokes our aid to assist her in the perpetration of a great wrong. A Court of Chancery is said to be a court of conscience; and however astute may be the arguments introduced to defend this decree, I am only say that, neither my reason nor my conscience can give assent to it. Of course, I am justly convicted by my brethren of an erroneous view of both; but I hope I may say, without offense, that I am not convinced of it.

MR JUSTICE SWAYNE'S OPINION.

Mr. Justice Swayne delivered the following opinion:

I concur with my brother Grier as to the incapacity of the State of Texas, in her present condition, to maintain an original suit in this court. The question, in my judgment, is one in relation to which the Court is bound by the action of the legislative department of the Government. Upon the merits of the case I agree with the majority of my brethren. I am authorized to say that my brother Miller unites with me in those views.

The Chinese In America.

SPEECH OF A CHINAMAN IN CALIFORNIA.—At San Francisco, a few days ago, Senators Wade and Conkling and the House Committee of Ways and Means met with the representatives of the six Chinese Companies of this city and several of the leading merchants and bankers. There was an interchange of compliments and sentiment, and one of the Chinese representatives, Ping Tang, delivered the following speech, which has not been before reported:

Gentlemen: It gives me, and all Chinese merchants of San Francisco, great pleasure to meet honorable Senators and members of Congress of the United States. We are made very happy by seeing you here, for we can explain to you our wishes and the wants of our people. Our Government took pleasure in appointing an American Ambassador, to make treaties with Foreign Powers, and we are satisfied with your treaty with our nation, but want the just protection it promises us.

America is probably better known to the Chinese people than any other country, because many of our people have lived here, and written home faithful accounts of this country.

China has a very old nation, but our people have learned many new things from Americans. The population of China is very large, and intercourse between our countries will be very intimate, if we have just laws to protect us. You probably know that we have very rich merchants and bankers in China, but we cannot advise them to risk their capital here when their agent cannot testify in your Courts, for like your own capitalists they wish to know that their property is protected and secure to them before parting with it. Much gold and silver is hoarded in China which might be used profitably here, if the Chinese felt sure we had full and proper protection.

We merchants have tried to be honest and fair in our dealings with your merchants here, and have paid our debts to Americans as scrupulously as to our own people. The managers of some of your largest San Francisco firms, engaged in trade with China, who have trusted us for hundreds of thousands of dollars at a time, without security, are here to prove the truth of what I say. We have introduced your grain and other American produce into China, and labored to establish a trade, which, if properly encouraged, must prove of great value to this country. We hope you will pass a law doubling the Government pay of your line of China steamers, and oblige them to run each way twice a month, for we feel certain that the cost will be small, when compared to the benefits your country will receive. Captain E. Dridge will tell you how much of their freight and passage money is paid by our people—and should you increase the number of trips, we will do all in our power to support this line, and the insure its success.

At the banquet given in this city before the sailing of the Embassy to Foreign Countries for China, I made a speech full of congratulations on the commencement of this great enterprise. All Chinese felt very happy, because we thought it would make our nations better acquainted, and we hoped you would, by knowing us, learn to like us, and be willing to protect us from some evils we now suffer, and which we think unjust.

We think your special tax, collected only from Chinese miners, is not according to our treaty with your Government. We are willing to pay taxes cheerfully, when taxed equally with others. We think your special taxes collected from each Chinaman for coming into this State is not right, if the object is to raise a revenue for the benefit of the State, the part of jurisdiction in this case, it must appear that Columbia is a State. On the part of the plaintiff it has been urged that Columbia is a distinct political society, and is, therefore, a "State" according to the definition of writers on general law. This is true; but as the act of Congress obviously uses the word "State" in reference to that term as used in the Constitution, it becomes necessary to inquire whether Columbia is a State in the sense of that instrument. The result of that examination is a conviction that the members of the American Confederacy only are the States contemplated in the Constitution. The House of Representatives is to be composed of members chosen by the people of the several States, and each State shall have at least one representative. The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State. Each State shall appoint, for the election of its Senators, a number of electors equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives. These claims show that word "State" is used in the Constitution as designating a member of the Union and excludes from the term the signification attached to it by writers on the law of nations. Now we have here a clear and well-defined test by which we may arrive at a conclusion with regard to the questions of fact now to be decided. Is Texas a State, as it represented by Senators chosen by the people of that State and received on the floor of Congress? Has she two Senators to represent her as a State in the Senate of the United States? Has her voice been heard in the late election of President? Is she not now and government as a conquered province by military force? The act of Congress of March 26, 1867, declares Texas to be a "rebel State," and provides for its government until a legal and republican State Government could be legally established. It constituted Louisiana and Texas the Fifth Military District, and made it subject, not to the civil authority, but to the "military authorities of the United States." It is true that no organized rebellion now exists there, and the military authorities of the United States now exercise jurisdiction over the people of that province. But this is no test of the States being in the Union. Dakota is no State, and yet the courts of the United States administer justice there as they do in Texas. The Indian tribes, who are governed by military force, cannot claim to be States of the Union. Whence does the condition of Texas differ from these? Now, by assuming or admitting as a fact the present status of Texas as a State out in the Union politically, I feel bound to protest against any charge of inconsistency as to the judicial opinion heretofore expressed as a member of the Court, or silently assented to. I do not consider myself bound to express any opinion judicially as to the constitutional right of Texas to exercise the rights and privileges of a State of the Union, or the power of Congress to govern her as a conquered province, to subject her to military domination and keep her in quiet. I can only submit to the fact as decided by the political position of the Government; and I am not disposed to join in any case of judicial subtlety to prove Texas to be a State of the Union, when Congress has decided that she is not. It is a question of fact, I report, and not of law. Politically, Texas is not a State in the Union. Whether rightfully out of it or not, is a question not for the Court, and I am not called on to confute a fact with syllogisms. But only reading now the fact to be as judicially assumed by my brethren, the next question is whether she has a right to repudiate her contracts? Before proceeding to answer this question we must notice a fact in this case that was forgotten in the argument. I mean that the United States are no party to this suit, and refusing to pay the bonds because the money paid would be used to advance the interests of the rebellion. It is a matter of utter insignificance to the Government of the United States to whom she makes the payment of these bonds. They are payable to the bearer. The Government is not bound to inquire into the *bona fides* of the holder, nor whether the State of Texas has parted with the bonds wisely or foolishly. And although by the Reconstruction acts she is required to repudiate all debts contracted for the purposes of the rebellion, this does not annul the acts of the State Government during the rebellion, or contract for other purposes, nor authorize the State to repudiate them. Now, whether we assume the State of Texas to be judicially in the Union (although actually out of it) or not, it will not alter the case. The contest now is between the State of Texas and her own citizens who seek to annul a contract with the respondents, based on the allegation that there was no authority in Texas to contract for the purpose of carrying on the rebellion. Having relied upon one judicial fiction, namely, that she is a State in the Union, she now relies upon a second one, which she wishes this Court to adopt, that she was not a State at all during the five years that she was in rebellion. She now sets up the plea of nullity, and asks the Court to treat all her acts during the disease as void. We have had some very astute logic to prove that judicially she was not a State at all, although governed by her own Legislature and Executive as "a distinct political body." The ordinance of secession was adopted by the Convention on the 18th of February, 1861; submitted to a vote of the people, and ratified by an overwhelming majority. I admit that this was a very ill-advised measure. It was the act of a government not of a sovereign State, and the verdict on the trial of this question, by battle—Prize cases, 2 Black 635—has been against the secession movement. But that verdict did not settle any question not involved in the case. It did not settle the question of her right to plead legality, or set aside all her contracts, made during the pending of the trial, with her own citizens, for food, clothing or medicines. The same organized political body, exercising the sovereign power of the State, which required the indorsement of these bonds by the Governor, also passed the laws authorizing the disposal of them without such indorsement. Use cannot, like the chameleon assume the color of the object to which she adheres, and ask the Court to involve itself in the contradictory position that she is a State in the Union and never was out of it, and not a State at all for four years, during which she acted and claim to be held organized political body, exercising all the powers and functions of an independent sovereign State. Whether a State *de facto or de jure* she is estopped from denying her identity in dispute with her own citizens. If they have not fulfilled their contracts, she can have her legal remedy for the breach of it in her own Courts. But the case of Hardenburg differs from that of the other defendants. He purchased the bonds in open market, *bona fide*, and for a full consideration. Now, it is to be observed that these bonds are payable to bearer, and that this Court is appealed to as a Court of Equity. The argument to justify a decree in favor of the commonwealth of Texas as against Hardenburg, is simply this: these bonds, though payable to bearer, are redeemable fourteen years from date. The Government has exercised her privilege of paying the interest for a term without redeeming the principal, which gives an additional value to the bonds. *Ergo*, the bonds are dishonored. *Ergo* the former owner has a right to resume the possession of them, and reclaim them from a *bona fide* owner by a decree of a Court of Equity. This is the legal argument, when put in the form of a logical sorites, by which Texas invokes our aid to assist her in the perpetration of a great wrong. A Court of Chancery is said to be a court of conscience; and however astute may be the arguments introduced to defend this decree, I am only say that, neither my reason nor my conscience can give assent to it. Of course, I am justly convicted by my brethren of an erroneous view of both; but I hope I may say, without offense, that I am not convinced of it.

The Kings that Rule Us.

FROM Fourth of July oration at Xenia, Ohio by Hon. Clement L. Vallandigham:

Last fall a distinguished journalist sent me to Washington, with instructions to look impartially at the transactions there, and write the truth regardless of consequences. I did my best to comply with his request. I strove to lift myself above partisan considerations and feelings, and to print a false statement of all that could be seen. I say it now as I wrote it then, with a sickened heart, that we have the most corrupt Government on the world. It is run by rings. There is no money interest in the land that is without its ring in Washington. They fill the hotels; throng the avenue, and crowd the lobbies. The old Greek, with his fabled lantern would die exhausted in his search for one honest man. I would exhaust my honest and your patience were I to attempt even to enumerate these lobby-rats. We have the railroad rings, the land jobbing rings, the Indian Bureau rings, whisky rings, the profiteering rings, that branch off in every conceivable direction. All these rings are interlocking, cousining, hobnobbing, and, through wine and women, buying without question.

I do not wish to be understood as charging that a majority of our Representatives in Congress are dishonest men. On the contrary, I was surprised to find that, living in this atmosphere and under these influences, there were so many who could still blush. Let me say, without fear of successful contradiction, that adding the incapable to the corrupt, and they make the majority. What better can you expect under our system of election? The question is no longer, "Is he capable, is he honest, is he a friend to his country?" It is, on the contrary, "Is he duly nominated by my party, and is he sound on my peculiar principles?"

Not the least disheartening part of all this is to be found in the utter indifference with which the public at large regard all this. It is no longer a shame to steal. It has ceased to be a dishonor to defraud. I saw Senators who came to Washington with scarcely more than enough to pay boarding house bills, rolling over the street in splendid equipages, and entertaining sobriety in palatial residences. They have now millions, are, and not only tolerated, but followed, flattered, sought, and sued by men and women who would be honored were it in fashion to be ashamed of their virtue; and if you turn from men who have made their fortunes out of their places, it is to stare at men who have bought their way in. These Senatorial chairs are put up at auction, and knocked down to the highest bidders. The longest purse drains the opponent, and the Hon Ingot or the Hon Greenback stalks in with just brains enough to make up, through a sale of votes, the money he has expended in securing his seat.

THE PRESIDENTIAL FIELD—MR. SEWARD AT SACRAMENTO—HIS PLATFORM.—On Mr. Seward's arrival at Sacramento, he was received by a great crowd with Governor Haight at its head, and in reply spoke as follows:

Fellow citizens of the United States and fellow citizens of California:

"Lives there a man with soul so dead,
Who never to himself hath said,
This is my own, my native land?"

He referred to our country as one especially calculated to awaken this sentiment, and said that his motive for coming hither was to see for himself his native land, the whole of it, from New York to Alaska. He had been recommended to remain quiet at his home in Auburn, but what that had seen his country expand from the banks of the Mississippi to the shores of the Pacific, could be content to die without seeing its most remote confines? He came not to see, but to ask his fellow-citizens to receive any. He was now, as he had ever been, independent. Who had a better right? Acknowledging with courtesy attention shown him, he received it on one condition. He had in early life placed before him as a thing to be studied and followed, the rule to make a speech. He flattered himself that in times past he had succeeded in making a few. Now his rule was to make a speech without any—not to make a speech. He would not now make one, and he made none. I have come to you—among you if you are for the country and the whole country, to the territories, if you desire, I will go in that. *If you are for preserving what we have and adding to it whatever may be properly annexed, I am with you.* I am for no party, and I am for any party who are not for adding whatever God has designed to be part and parcel of the republic, I am not with them.

CHINESE LABORERS FOR THE SOUTHERN STATES.

A contract has been made in San Francisco, the *Chronicle* of that city says, for the supply of twenty thousand Chinese laborers, to be employed as plantation hands in the State of Tennessee. The very faithful and intelligent manager of the Chinese laborers performed their work in constructing the Central Pacific Railroad has attracted attention to this unimpeached class of rough laborers. It is understood that the passage of laborers will be paid by their employers, and they will be paid $20 per month. Another force of twenty-five thousand is being contracted for to proceed to the State of Mississippi.

ST. MARY PARISH.—The *Planters' Banner* of the 14th has the following:

THE CROPS.—The crop of cane and corn generally look well in this parish, notwithstanding the superabundance of rain in the last thirty days. A few of the crops are not promising, on account of rotten seed cane and a bad stand. The planters are doing their level best between showers to clean out their crops, and some of them have succeeded in laying by both cane and corn in good order. But the rains have annoyed them seriously, and will doubtless reduce the generally yield of sugar below the figures made by most of our planters in June.

SLACKING OFF.—There is still great complaint by many of our planters of the faithlessness of portions of their hands in leaving them to loaf in our villages, or to hire with other men, when the crops press for labor, and the laying by season is rapidly drawing away. These things warn the people of the rapid decay of the present field labor on which the landholders depend. This driver the people to send agents to Europe and Asia to inquire for laborers to supply the places of those who are passing away.

BY TELEGRAPH.

(To the New Orleans Bee.)

FROM WASHINGTON.

The President Gone to Long Branch.

Proclamation for the Texas Election.

Instructions for Suppressing Filibustering.

Indictments for Violation of the Usury Laws.

Appointments by the President.

Robbery of Wells, Fargo & Co's Express.

FROM EUROPE.

Miscellaneous Intelligence.

WASHINGTON ITEMS.

Washington, July 15.—The President and family, Postmaster General and wife, and ex-Secretary Boutwell, left this evening on the Pennsylvania Railroad for Long Branch.

Wm. C. Vermilye, which has been appointed Collector of Internal Revenue for 3d Mississippi district, vice Willie suspended.

Internal revenue receipts to-day $700,000.

The President to-day issued a proclamation designating the 30th of November for the vote on the constitution adopted by the Arkansas convention on the 15th of June. No exceptions have to be voted on, the votes being for or against the constitution solely.

The District Attorney and Marshal of New York have been severally instructed at any and all hazards to enforce the neutrality laws and break up expeditions against Cuba. They are empowered to call on the army and naval forces to carry out the law and prevent the departure of hostile expeditions. Gen McDowell and the Admiral in charge of the Navy Yard have been directed to respond to any call made in pursuance of the above instructions.

In Henry Stanton's case the accounting Receiver of Public Moneys in New Orleans.

MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE.

Memphis, July 15.—The Mississippi Valley Navigation Company organized to-day in the Labor Convention. Capital stock to be $100,000. The privilege to double the amount of the stock was granted. The Committee on Petition to be in Louisiana, Kentucky, Mississippi, Alabama and Arkansas.

Gen. Clayton, of Arkansas, states that $200,000 in bonds voted the Little Rock and Fort Smith will shortly be turned over to the officers of the road. Large shipments of iron are being received, and the work is going on rapidly.

The County Democratic Convention met to-day and nominated John Gribbins to the State Senate, Wm. J. Townsend and Samuel H. Jones Representatives, and R. S. Sheffard, Sheriff 3d district.

St. Louis, July 15.—New Mexico advices state the Indians are still troublesome on the Santa Fe mail route. The crops are good. None of the newly appointed Indian Agents have yet arrived in the territory.

A Helena, Montana, dispatch says the Wells, Fargo & Co's coach was robbed of $7,000 gold on Monday.

New York, July 15—It is said that W. N. Sandford, the defaulting Cashier of the Central National Bank, left Boston last week for Europe.

The steam gunboats Severn, Hartford, Wasauda, Dorsett and Swatara are rapidly fitting at this Navy Yard for immediate service.

Eleven indictments for violation of the Usury laws were found against prominent bankers and brokers this morning by a grand jury. The arrests will probably be made to-morrow.

Augusta, July 15—The crops are suffering from the extreme heat and drought.

The examination of the Fenian case at Macon is postponed till Friday, awaiting the presence of witnesses.

New York, July 15—District Attorney Pierrepont, at the instance of the information from the Government, has taken measures with the naval officials here and the military in the surrounding forts to prevent the form alone departure of further filibustering expeditions.

COMMERCIAL.

OFFICE OF THE BEE,
THURSDAY-EVENING, July 15, 1869.

COTTON.—The reported sales to-day were confined to 28 bales, but we heard of 120 bales more having changed hands, which we could not authenticate.

We also heard of nearly 500 bales, having been shipped by factors, reported yesterday for sale accordingly. There was some inquiry, and 30½c was refused for a lot of 250 bales classing nearly low ordinary, which the factors were held 31½c. The actual sales included some trifling lots same description at 30c. Nothing has transpired yet to establish quotations, which have not been given definitely since Monday, but when low ordinary was quoted at 25½@ 26c, ordinary at 27½ to 28c, good ordinary at 29½ to 30c, low middling at 31 to 31½c and middling at 32½ to —c.

COTTON STATEMENT.

Stock on hand September 1st, 1868, bales	
Arrived since last statement	27,517
Previous receipts	82,552
Additional sales from year's samples, waste, etc	3,115
Cleared to-day	196,719
Cleared previously	82,552
Stock on hand and on shipboard	3,520

To-day's exports were to Liverpool. Receipts proper since Friday evening 128 bales, against 839 corresponding time last week.

FREIGHTS.—Foreign freights are without any animation but rates are fully sustained at better than nominal. Coastwise business is extremely dull and rates by the regular steamers are easy We quote:

By steam: Cotton to New York 5c; to Liverpool 5d per lb. Tobacco to Liverpool 40s per hhd. Flour to do 3s 6d per bbl.

By sail: Cotton nominal. Tobacco to Liverpool 32s 6d to 35s per hhd; to London 40s; to Havre 40f; to Bremen 35s per hhd. Grain to Liverpool 7c to 10d per bushel. Oil Cake to Liverpool 22s 6d per ton. There are only two disengaged vessels in port.

SUGAR AND MOLASSES.—Only 22 hhds Sugar sold to-day, and 45 barrels were sold at 12½c for prime. In Molasses a lot of 14 bbls fermenting, light boiling, sold on private terms. There were no other lots on the landing. City Refinery Sugar is selling at 11½ to 15½c per lb for yellow clarified; 15¾ to 16½c for white and 17 to 17½c for crushed and powdered; and City Refinery Molasses at 55 to 60c per gallon for Cuba rebolled, 65 to 80c for Louisiana do., and $1 for golden syrup.

AMERICAN PRODUCE.—PORK WEST.—The steamer Alaska, from Cincinnati, has arrived since our our review of yesterday.

FLOUR.—We again note a quiet but firm market, with a limited demand for the best Ohio, Illinois and lower grades. Descriptions desirable for bakers' use are in good request.

The principal sales of Western embrace 1500 bbls, of which 150 fine at $5, 100 do at $5 50; 200 superfine at $6, 175 and 381 double extra at $6 50@ 8; do at $6 60; 100 do in mixed at $6 75; 150 treble extra at $7 10, and 100 choice extra at $9 per bbl. In addition to the above, considerable was done in a jobbing way at the foregoing prices.

Later.—After the close of business a sale of 600 bbls low treble extra was reported at $6 80 per bbl.

CORN—Is scarce, and the market is very firm with a further upward tendency in prices. 300 sacks white sold at $1 15 per bushel.

OATS—The supply on the landing is light, but the week's store is fair. 50 sacks sold to-day at 78c per bushel.

BRAN—The market is dull. 100 sacks sold at $1 05, and 100 at $1 07½ per 100 lbs.

HAY—The market is well supplied, but is dull at $26 to $27 per ton for prime, and $25 for for choice Western.

PORK—Least evening, not reported, 225 bbls foll weight mess sold at $34 37½ per bbl. To-day 26 bbls do sold at $34 50 per bbl. It is retailing at $34 75 to $35 per bbl

BACON—Only a limited retail business is doing at 15c per lb for shoulders; 18½c for clear rib sides, and 19c for clear sides.

DRY SALT MEAT—A lot of 5 casks shoulders sold, to arrive, at 14½ per lb. They are retailing at 14¾ to 15c.

BEEF—Is in good demand at 20 to 21c per lb for western, and 22c for Northern.

LARD—The stock is light. There is some inquiry at prices ranging from 23 to 24c per lb. Tierces are quoted at 19½ to 20½c; kegs 21½ to 22½c.

TALLOW—We noticed further sales to-day of 119 tierces Texas at 10½c, and 20 tierces City rendered at 10¾. The demand is for Liverpool.

CHEESE—The demand is still confined to the local trade, and the supply is ample. We quote Western Reserve 14 to 16c, factory 16 to 17c, Northern cream and English dairy 15 to 17c per lb. Inferior descriptions irregular and nominal.

SALT—The demand for Liverpool Salt is good and prices are firm. The dealers rates are still $2 30 to $2 35 per sack for coarse, and $2 35 to $2 40 for fine; large lots from warehouse 10c per sack less. Turk's Island in moderate request and in good demand, and none in first hands. It is quoted at 50 to 60c per bushel.

WHISKEY—The speculative movement continues and factors are asking $1 12½ to $1 15 per gallon for Western and $1 10 for Louisiana. The supply is light. Southern Spirits firm at $1 15 per gallon. No high wines offering. Yesterday, not reported, 100 bbls Western sold at $1 07½, and 100 at $1 10 per gallon.

Cattle Market.

NEW ORLEANS, July 16, 1869.

Arrived yesterday—281 Texas Beeves, 99 Calves and Yearlings.

Stock—122 Texas Beeves, 191 Calves and Yearlings and Hogs.

Sales—1385 Texas Beeves, 289 Calves and Yearlings, 176 Hogs, 173 sheep and 9 Milch Cows.

Texas Beeves, corn fed, gross, ₩ lb net	— @ —	00
Texas Beeves, corn fed 22 quality, ₩ head	— @ —	00
Texas Beeves, 1st quality, ₩ head	35 00 @ 45	00
Texas Beeves, 2d quality, ₩ head	25 00 @ 30	00
Texas Beeves, 3d quality, ₩ head	10 00 @ 20	00