NEW ORLEANS DAILY BEE.
DUPUY & LIMET, PUBLISHERS,
No. 92 Chartres Street.
TERMS OF THE BEE.
Terms of Subscription—Daily, per annum, in advance, $10; half-yearly, $6; quarterly, $4.
Price of the paper—Single copies, 10 cents.
The Semi-Weekly is published every Tuesday and Saturday morning. Subscription, $5 per annum, five dollars in advance.
Rates of Advertising—Business advertisements having the run of the paper, first insertion, $1 per square; each subsequent insertion, $0 per square.
First, or Editorial Page, business advertisements, $2 each insertion, $5 per square.
All advertisements inserted at intervals to be charged as new each insertion.
Fifth, or Editorial Page, monthly advertisements, $10 each square, $35 per month.
Regular advertisers, who advertise largely, shall be allowed such discount from the above named transient rates as may be agreed upon.
No no cuts shall such discount exceed 25 per cent.
Business Notices of Advertisements to be charged 25 cents net per line, each insertion.
Transient advertisements must be paid for in advance.
All advertisements not marked for a fixed number of insertions, will be published six times.
Bills with regular advertisers shall be rendered monthly.
Semi-Weekly Edition.
TERMS—PER YEAR.....$6
NEW ORLEANS:
SATURDAY MORNING, JUNE 11, 1870

The New Orleans Bee.

OFFICE 73 CHARTRES STREET. NEW ORLEANS, SATURDAY MORNING, JUNE 11, 1870. 43d YEAR—Vol. XLIII.—Whole—15,083

Mr. Justice Bradley's Decision.

Our space is worthily occupied to-day by one of the most luminous expositions of American constitutional law which have ever emanated from any court, State or Federal. Not Chief Justice Marshall, nor the illustrious Story ever uttered grander principles than did Mr. Justice Bradley yesterday from the Bench of the United States Circuit Court. It was indeed high time that such doctrines should be enunciated in our hearing, and that a great landmark should be set up in the place from whence such departures have been taken from sound law. We were glad to see so large an assemblage of lawyers and citizens to listen to the teachings of so experienced and learned and profound a jurist as Mr. Justice Bradley undoubtedly is.

We commend this splendid production to our readers, and are sure they will be richly repaid by giving it an attentive perusal.

Death of Charles Dickens.

The telegraph brings us the mournful intelligence of the death of the great English novelist—a man whose name is a household word in every civilized country throughout the globe, and whose genius has added such lustre to the annals of English literature. The death of such a man is more than a national loss, for the works of this great public teacher are found in the dwellings of the rich and the poor of all nations, as well those of the Western as of the Eastern Hemisphere—on the banks of the Mississippi—on the Pacific coast—and the countries bordered by the Indian Ocean. Mr. Dickens' best title to fame and to the gratitude of those for whom he wrote and labored, is that he was a friend of the poor and the oppressed. We regard him as having been more than a writer of novels, for his aim was not merely to amuse his readers, but to benefit his kind. The amelioration which have been effected in the interest of the humbler classes of the population of England are largely due to the exposures of their wrongs which Mr. Dickens made through the medium of his books. Mr. Dickens was by far the most eminent novelist of his time, but he was more; he was a philanthropist and a statesman, whose influence will be felt for ages yet to come.

Our cotemporary the *Picayune* and ourselves have published the name of our friend, Col. C. S. Girardey, the well-known auctioneer and real estate agent, as one of the defendants in the suits of Mrs. Gaines.

This was a mistake on the part of the reporters, who intended to say *Lizardi* and not *Girardey*.

Mrs. Gaines requests us to say that she is entirely satisfied with the opinion and decrees of Mr. Justice Bradley in her suits against the city of New Orleans and others, delivered in the U. S. Circuit Court day before yesterday.

THE JACKSON RAILROAD.—The hours for departure of passenger trains on the New Orleans, Jackson and Great Northern Railroad have been changed.

These trains on and after June 12 will leave at 7 A. M. and 4:15 P. M.

See advertisement of T. S. Williams, General Superintendent.

SAILING OF THE BIENVILLE.—The steamship Bienville, Capt. Baker, sailed last evening for New York via Havana, with a full freight and the following list of passengers:

E. A. Hanner, Miss Brady, Mrs A Benjamin, Mrs R Wooster, Mrs E Morris and infant, Mrs Brock, R Pringle, Mr Fenner and family, Chas Fraser, Mrs Fair, Mrs Hall, Mrs Moore, Mr Bocquet and two children, Miss Wilson, Mrs Noth, Jos Hernandez, Mrs Ingle, J Rickett, M W Holmes, Mrs Sears and two children, Mrs Elliott and sister, Mrs Randolph, Miss Randolph, Miss Sears, Miss L Adams, Mrs C Adams, Mrs Foster, R D Harrison, and 19 steerage.

THE FIFTEENTH AMENDMENT. After twenty years of experiment, and fifteen changes in the ingredients, Phalon has the pleasure of announcing that his VITALIA, OR SALVATION FOR THE HAIR, is a perfect article, capable of infallibly restoring gray hair to its primary color, and without failure. Sold by all druggists and fancy goods dealers.

CITY INTELLIGENCE.

City Council.—An adjourned meeting of the Council was held last evening, Messrs. Bonzano, Delamire, Shaw and Winn, Ward present, and acting Mayor Emley presiding.

A proclamation from Acting Mayor Emley was read and approved, setting forth that the City Attorney has made application to the Eighth District Court for a dissolution of the injunction granted in that Court in the matter of the controversy between the Butchers' Association and the Slaughter House Co. (See report elsewhere of the motion by the City Attorney to dissolve the injunction), and urging all good citizens to pay due respect to the processes of the courts, and admonishing all agents and employees of the city to abstain from any act that the injunction until the same shall have been decided upon finally by the courts.

Agreeably to a petition from property holders on Bienville street, a resolution was offered and adopted that the name of that street, from Claiborne street to the Metairie Ridge, be changed to Bienville Avenue.

A resolution authorizing a slight change in the route of the large line of the City Railroad Company was read a first time and laid over.

The order of disposition was made of a resolution authorizing proposals to be received for repairing and keeping in repair the streets of the First, Second, Third and Fourth Districts.

And of a resolution instructing the Mayor to enter into a contract with the Algiers Gas Company for lighting Algiers and McDonoghville with gas.

The Board then adjourned.

The City and the Butchers' Controversy.—In the Eighth District Court yesterday City Attorney Lacey made the following motion, which was granted by Judge Dibble:

Crescent City Live Stock Landing and Slaughter-house Company vs. Board of Metropolitan Police.—On motion of Geo. S. Lacey, Attorney, and of counsel for the city of New Orleans, E. W. Peters, Administrator of Police, and S. C. Emley, Administrator of Commerce, and upon suggesting and showing to the court:

1. That no good and lawful cause for issuing the injunction herein granted against appellants has been set forth and disclosed in the petition;

2. That the injunction herein granted is in violation of a certain writ of error, operating as a supersedeas, to which the plaintiffs herein are parties;

3. That the city of New Orleans cannot through the writ of injunction, be made the instrumentality or agency wherewith to carry out the pretended rights and privileges of the plaintiffs and the provisions of the act of the Legislature, approved March 8th, 1869, not only for the reason set forth without the means of so doing, but because that power is given to the Board of Metropolitan Police, as averred in plaintiffs' petition.

4. That the writ of injunction in requiring these appellees to "prohibit and prevent any and all persons from selling, or offering to sell, in the city of New Orleans, any animal meat for human food not slaughtered and inspected at the slaughter-house of petitioners," is an unwarranted and unlawful restraint upon the trade and business, not only of the citizens of Louisiana, but of the citizens of other States in the United States, who desire to bring to the city of New Orleans animal meat for human food, slaughtered beyond the limits within which the plaintiffs claim to have an exclusive right and privilege.

5. That the averments of the petition and affidavit thereunto annexed, in reference to these appeared, are untrue.

6. That the writ of injunction improvidently, improperly and illegally issued.

7. That a bond in a sufficient amount was not given, and the security upon the bond is not good and solvent, and such as the law requires.

It is ordered that plaintiffs in injunction show cause on Tuesday, the 16th day of June, A. D., 1870, at 10 o'clock, A. M., why the writ of injunction herein granted should not be vacated, annulled, and set aside, and held for naught, reserving to these appellants their recourse upon the injunction bond given by plaintiffs in injunction for such damages as these appellants have sustained or may sustain by reason or on account of such writ.

U. S. Circuit Court.—In the York & Hoover case in bankruptcy, the decision of Judge Woods maintains the motion to dismiss the appeal from the decision of Judge Durell, but allows a review of the proceedings.

It is said that within a circuit of one hundred and twenty-five miles around the White Sulphur Springs of West Virginia there is more iron ore than in the whole of Great Britain.

The Live Stock Dealers and Butchers' Association of New Orleans et al., vs. the Crescent City Live Stock Landing and Slaughter-House Company, and the Board of Metropolitan Police for the Metropolitan District of New Orleans.—Motion for Injunction on Bill and Answer.

United States Circuit Court—Decision of Justice Bradley Delivered June 10th, 1870.

The complainants in this case who are engaged in the Live Stock Landing and Slaughter-House business pray for an injunction against the defendants, commanding them to suspend all proceedings against the complainants under and by virtue of an act of the Legislature of Louisiana, passed 8th March, 1869, giving to the corporation, defendants, the exclusive right to erect and have live stock landings and slaughter-houses in and about New Orleans, which act the complainants allege to be in violation of the Civil Rights bill, passed 9th April, 1866, and the first section of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States; also, that the complainants may be protected in their rights to perform whatever may be lawful and proper in this behalf for any citizen of the State to do, including the defendants, and their right to slaughter, land, keep, maintain and sell animals for food, and, when prepared for market, to sell and dispose of their meat, subject to no copulition more severe than that of any other party, including the defendants, and that they be maintained in their rights to construct all suitable buildings, structures for landing, keeping and preserving animals for sale or use that are allowed to any other citizen of the State, including the defendants.

The application brings up the question whether the Civil Rights bill applies to such a case as the present, and whether the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution is intended to secure to the citizens of the United States of all classes merely equal rights; or whether it is intended to secure to them any absolute rights? And if the latter, whether the rights claimed by the complainants in this bill are among the number of such absolute rights?

As to the Civil Rights bill, we are clearly of opinion that it does not apply; that it was intended merely to secure to citizens of every race and color the same civil rights and privileges as are enjoyed by white citizens; and not to enlarge or modify the rights or privileges of white citizens themselves.

The next question is, Do the Fourteenth Amendment is much broader in its terms, and must be examined with more attention and care.

The Constitution of the United States before the adoption of the recent amendments contained several provisions for the protection of the people in the enjoyment of their civil rights, liberties and privileges, some of which were binding upon the government of the United States, and others upon the several States. One, the former kind were those which declared, that the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus should not be suspended, unless when in cases of rebellion and invasion, the public safety should require it; that no bill of attainder or *ex-post facto* law should be passed; that no capitation or other direct tax shall be laid, unless in proportion to the census; that the trial of all crimes shall be by jury, and shall be held in the State where the crime shall have been committed; that no person shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act or confession in open court; that no attainder of treason shall work corruption of blood or forfeiture, except during the life of the person attainted, etc., etc.

Those binding on the States were, that no State should make anything but gold and silver coin a tender for the payment of debts; nor pass any bill of attainder, *ex post facto* law, or law impairing the obligation of contracts; or lay any imposts or duties on imports or exports except as provided in the Constitution; and that the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States.

The latter class of provisions could not be carried into effect by Congressional legislation; and depended for their vindication upon the voluntary action of the State Legislature and such jurisdiction as the courts of the United States might have, when a case arose in which one of these rights was violated.

Since the breaking out of the late war several amendments to the constitution have been adopted, intended to protect the citizen from oppression by means of State legislation, and to confer upon Congress the power to appropriate legislation, to carry the amendments into effect. Amongst these, Amendment XIV, declares that all persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to its jurisdiction are citizens of the United States and of the State in which they reside, and that *no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.*

The new prohibition that "no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States" is not identical with the clause in the constitution which declared that "the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States."

It is possible that those who framed the article were not themselves aware of the far reaching character of its terms. They may have had in mind but one particular phase of social and political wrong which they desired to redress. Yet if the amendment as framed and expressed, does in fact bear a broader meaning, and does extend its protecting shield over those who were never thought of when it was conceived and put in form, and does reach such social evils which were never before prohibited by constitutional enactment, it is to be presumed that the American people, in giving it their imprimatur, understood what they were doing, and meant to decree what in fact it has decreed.

It embraces much more: The "privileges and immunities," secured by the original constitution, which were only such as each State gave to its own citizens. Each was prohibited from discriminating in favor of its own citizens, and against the citizens of other States.

But the Fourteenth Amendment prohibits any State *from abridging the privileges and immunities of the citizens of the United States*, whether its own citizens, or any others. It not merely requires equality of privileges, but it declares that the privileges and immunities of all citizens shall be absolutely unabridged, unimpaired.

What, then, are the essential privileges which belong to a citizen of the United States as such, and which a State cannot by its laws invade? It may be difficult to enumerate or define them. The Supreme Court on one occasion, thought it unwise to attempt to do so. (18 Howard, 50). But so far as relates to the question in hand, we may safely say that it is one of the privileges of every American citizen to adopt and follow such lawful industrial pursuit—not injurious to the community—as he may see fit, without unreasonable regulation and restriction, and without being restricted by any of those unjust, oppressive and odious monopolies, or exclusive privileges which have been condemned by all free governments. It is also his privilege to be protected in the possession and enjoyment of his property so long as such possession and enjoyment are not injurious to the community; and not to be deprived thereof without due process of law. It is also his privilege to have, with all other citizens, the equal protection of the laws. Indeed the latter privilege is specified by the words of the amendment.

These privileges cannot be invaded without sapping the very foundations of republican government. A republican government is not merely a government of the people, but it is a free government. Without freedom it is republican only in name, and not republican in truth, and any government which deprives its citizens of liberty, or of their property without due process of law, is anything but a free government. Without freedom to pursue any lawful pursuit, subject only to reasonable restrictions, or at least subject only to such restrictions as are reasonably within the power of government to impose, is tyrannical and unrepublican. And if to the benefit of a favored few, it takes away and destroys the citizens' property without trial or condemnation, it is guilty of violating all the fundamental privileges to which I have referred, and one of the fundamental principles of free government.

There is no more sacred right of citizenship than the right to pursue unmolested a lawful employment in a lawful manner. It is nothing more nor less than the SACRED RIGHT OF LABOR.

This right is not inconsistent with any of those wholesome regulations which have been found to be beneficial and necessary in every State.

It is not inconsistent with the exclusive right to make, use and vend to others for a limited period a new and useful invention which the grantee or patentee has produced from his own brains or ingenuity. Society only gives *to him* the temporary use of that which, without him, it would not have had the benefit of, as a consideration of that benefit, and to encourage others to make like use of their powers.

It is not inconsistent with the exclusive right to use a franchise—that is—a right to do what the Legislature alone can authorize to be done—and which no private citizen has a right to do without such authority—such as—to build and operate a railroad, to make a canal or turnpike, to establish a ferry, and other such public rights which involve a charge upon the public, and in most cases an exercise of the right of eminent domain. These franchises may be conferred upon a limited number of persons, natural or corporate, with powers, and even exclusive power, to exercise them in certain localities, on certain terms and under certain restrictions. Society obtains a consideration for the grant of these franchises in the investments of large amounts of capital in public improvements, which are required for the development of the country and its resources. They are franchises which can only be exercised as they are conferred by public authority, and cannot be exercised and enjoyed by all. They are the different from those ordinary pursuits and employments of mankind which all citizens may properly and lawfully follow as their inclination leads them, and as the laws of demand and supply will allow.

Again: This fundamental right of labor is not inconsistent with that large class of cases, in which the law may require a license or a certificate of requisite qualification for admission to a particular employment or profession. No doubt there are many such, as to which the interests of society require that due preparation should be made and due qualifications should be possessed, before a person shall be allowed to enter them. But then they are open to all alike. None are excluded from the race of honorable competition, by which to enter those employments, or by which to attain their honors. There is no corporate and exclusive guild of privileged individuals to which they are confined, and beyond the sacred pale of which there is no hope of admittance or promotion.

Nor is it inconsistent with the granting of a limited number of municipal licenses to follow certain pursuits, such as vending of intoxicating drinks, selling of drugs, or even selling of meats and keeping a market therefor. Public policy may require that these pursuits should be regulated and supervised by the local authorities, in order to promote the public health, the public order and the general well being. But they are open to all proper applicants, and none are rejected except those who fail to exhibit the requisite qualifications and guarantees, or who after proper selections are made, would increase the number beyond what the interests and good order of society would bear. In those cases none are excluded for the purpose of sustaining a monopoly. But each avocation is, or at least is supposed to be, examined on its own merits.

All these systems of regulation are useful and entirely competent to the governing power: and are not at all inconsistent with the great right of *liberty of pursuit*, which is one of the fundamental principles of a free government, as well as one of the fundamental privileges of an American citizen.

The next question is—Do the law complained of and the proceedings under it, conflict with the enjoyment of this fundamental privilege of the complainants? Is it only such a political and police regulation as is competent for a State Legislature to make?

The Legislature has an undoubted right to make all police regulations which they may deem expedient, even if inconsistent with constitutional restrictions, for the preservation of the public health, good order, morals and intelligence—but they cannot interfere with liberty of conscience, nor with the entire equality of all creeds and religions before the law. Nor can they under protection of a police regulation, interfere with the fundamental privileges and immunities of American citizens. The question has its limits in both directions; and whilst we are to be specially careful not to do anything that French upon the vast and almost limitless field of legislation, where the will of the people is supposed to be most freely and powerfully expressed; it is nevertheless our duty, with a firm and unflinching hand, to prevent the invasion of any clear and undoubted individual right secured upon the several States, or upon those which the United States declared, that the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus should not be suspended, unless when in cases of rebellion and invasion, the public safety should require it; that no bill of attainder or *ex-post facto* law should be passed; that no capitation or other direct tax shall be laid, unless in proportion to the census; that the trial of all crimes shall be by jury, and shall be held in the State where the crime shall have been committed; that no person shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act or confession in open court; that no attainder of treason shall work corruption of blood or forfeiture, except during the life of the person attainted, etc., etc.

These binding on the States were, that no State should make anything but gold and silver coin a tender for the payment of debts; nor pass any bill of attainder, *ex post facto* law, or law impairing the obligation of contracts; or lay any imposts or duties on imports or exports except as provided in the Constitution; and that the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States.

The latter class of provisions could not be carried into effect by Congressional legislation; and depended for their vindication upon the voluntary action of the State Legislature and such jurisdiction as the courts of the United States might have, when a case arose in which one of these rights was violated.

Since the breaking out of the late war several amendments to the constitution have been adopted, intended to protect the citizen from oppression by means of State legislation, and to confer upon Congress the power to appropriate legislation, to carry the amendments into effect. Amongst these, Amendment XIV, declares that all persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to its jurisdiction are citizens of the United States and of the State in which they reside, and that *no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.*

The new prohibition that "no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States" is not identical with the clause in the constitution which declared that "the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States."

It is possible that those who framed the article were not themselves aware of the far reaching character of its terms. They may have had in mind but one particular phase of social and political wrong which they desired to redress. Yet if the amendment as framed and expressed, does in fact bear a broader meaning, and does extend its protecting shield over those who were never thought of when it was conceived and put in form, and does reach such social evils which were never before prohibited by constitutional enactment, it is to be presumed that the American people, in giving it their imprimatur, understood what they were doing, and meant to decree what in fact it has decreed.

It embraces much more: The "privileges and immunities," secured by the original constitution, which were only such as each State gave to its own citizens. Each was prohibited from discriminating in favor of its own citizens, and against the citizens of other States.

But the Fourteenth Amendment prohibits any State *from abridging the privileges and immunities of the citizens of the United States*, whether its own citizens, or any others. It not merely requires equality of privileges, but it declares that the privileges and immunities of all citizens shall be absolutely unabridged, unimpaired.

What, then, are the essential privileges which belong to a citizen of the United States as such, and which a State cannot by its laws invade? It may be difficult to enumerate or define them. The Supreme Court on one occasion, thought it unwise to attempt to do so. (18 Howard, 50). But so far as relates to the question in hand, we may safely say that it is one of the privileges of every American citizen to adopt and follow such lawful industrial pursuit—not injurious to the community—as he may see fit, without unreasonable regulation and restriction, and without being restricted by any of those unjust, oppressive and odious monopolies, or exclusive privileges which have been condemned by all free governments. It is also his privilege to be protected in the possession and enjoyment of his property so long as such possession and enjoyment are not injurious to the community; and not to be deprived thereof without due process of law. It is also his privilege to have, with all other citizens, the equal protection of the laws. Indeed the latter privilege is specified by the words of the amendment.

These privileges cannot be invaded without sapping the very foundations of republican government. A republican government is not merely a government of the people, but it is a free government. Without freedom it is republican only in name, and not republican in truth, and any government which deprives its citizens of liberty, or of their property without due process of law, is anything but a free government. To the benefit of a favored few, it takes away and destroys the citizens' property without trial or condemnation, it is guilty of violating all the fundamental privileges to which I have referred, and one of the fundamental principles of free government.

There is no more sacred right of citizenship than the right to pursue unmolested a lawful employment in a lawful manner. It is nothing more nor less than the SACRED RIGHT OF LABOR.

This right is not inconsistent with any of those wholesome regulations which have been found to be beneficial and necessary in every State.

It is not inconsistent with the exclusive right to make, use and vend to others for a limited period a new and useful invention which the grantee or patentee has produced from his own brains or ingenuity. Society only gives *to him* the temporary use of that which, without him, it would not have had the benefit of, as a consideration of that benefit, and to encourage others to make like use of their powers.

It is not inconsistent with the exclusive right to use a franchise—that is—a right to do what the Legislature alone can authorize to be done—and which no private citizen has a right to do without such authority—such as—to build and operate a railroad, to make a canal or turnpike, to establish a ferry, and other such public rights which involve a charge upon the public, and in most cases an exercise of the right of eminent domain. These franchises may be conferred upon a limited number of persons, natural or corporate, with powers, and even exclusive power, to exercise them in certain localities, on certain terms and under certain restrictions. Society obtains a consideration for the grant of these franchises in the investments of large amounts of capital in public improvements, which are required for the development of the country and its resources. They are franchises which can only be exercised as they are conferred by public authority, and cannot be exercised and enjoyed by all. They are the different

To this bill the defendants have filed an answer in the nature of a demurrer, objecting, first, to the jurisdiction of this court because the parties all reside in Louisiana, and the Circuit Court of the United States cannot enjoin proceedings in a State court. Secondly, that the bill set up the same matters which are set forth in a petition filed by the complainants in the State court, and decided by the Supreme Court of Louisiana, and from which decision a writ of error has been granted to remove the same to the Supreme Court of the United States. Thirdly, because the statute referred to is constitutional and valid, containing only police regulations, in no manner conflicting with the Constitution of the United States, or the amendments thereof.

Before proceeding to examine the technical points raised by the defendants, we will conclude the discussion of the main question arising upon the act of the Legislature and the Fourteenth Amendment.

So far as the act of the Legislature of Louisiana is a police regulation, it is, of course, entirely within its power to enact it. It is claimed to be nothing more. But this pretence is too bald for a moment's consideration. It certainly does confer on the defendant corporation a monopoly of a very odious character. If it be not full and fairly within the definition of a monopoly given in the great case of monopolies, 11 Coke's Rep. 85, it is difficult to conceive of a case which would be within it. But it is not sufficient to show that it is a monopoly and void at common law, for the Legislature may alter the common law, and may establish a monopoly, unless that monopoly be one which contravenes the fundamental rights of the citizen protected by the Constitution. We have already seen that some monopolies are legal, if not politic. But it is this such as one as will be endured in a free country under a Constitution which guarantees to the citizens its fundamental privileges and immunities? This is the precise question for us to decide. And we admit that the question is one of great delicacy and embarrassment. When the question was first presented, our impressions were decidedly against the claim put forward by the plaintiffs. But the more we have reflected on the subject the more we are satisfied that the framers of the amendment of the Constitution was intended to protect the citizens of the United States in some fundamental privileges and immunities of an absolute and not merely of a relative character. And it seems to us it would be difficult to conceive of a more flagrant case of violation of the fundamental rights of labor than the one before us.

It was very ably contended, on the part of the defendants, that the Fourteenth Amendment was intended only to secure to all citizens equal rights before the law. That was at first our view of it. But it does not so read. The language is, "No State shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States." What are the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States? Are they capacities merely? Are they not also rights?

In the case before us the citizen has chosen a lawful and useful employment in it. He has invested property in it. He is willing to comply with all police regulations, properly such, in the exercise of it. He will not offend in any particular with the regulations which the legislative or the municipal authorities may adopt. He will observe times, seasons, places, localities. But all is not enough. He is required by law to locate stock landings and slaughter-houses, to be forced to participate in proportion to the census; that the trial of all crimes shall be by jury, and shall be held in the State where the crime shall have been committed; that no person shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act or confession in open court; that no attainder of treason shall work corruption of blood or forfeiture, except during the life of the person attainted, etc., etc.

These binding on the States were, that no State should make anything but gold and silver coin a tender for the payment of debts; nor pass any bill of attainder, *ex post facto* law, or law impairing the obligation of contracts; or lay any imposts or duties on imports or exports except as provided in the Constitution; and that the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States.

The latter class of provisions could not be carried into effect by Congressional legislation; and depended for their vindication upon the voluntary action of the State Legislature and such jurisdiction as the courts of the United States might have, when a case arose in which one of these rights was violated.

Since the breaking out of the late war several amendments to the constitution have been adopted, intended to protect the citizen from oppression by means of State legislation, and to confer upon Congress the power to appropriate legislation, to carry the amendments into effect. Amongst these, Amendment XIV, declares that all persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to its jurisdiction are citizens of the United States and of the State in which they reside, and that *no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.*

The new prohibition that "no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States" is not identical with the clause in the constitution which declared that "the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States."

It is possible that those who framed the article were not themselves aware of the far reaching character of its terms. They may have had in mind but one particular phase of social and political wrong which they desired to redress. Yet if the amendment as framed and expressed, does in fact bear a broader meaning, and does extend its protecting shield over those who were never thought of when it was conceived and put in form, and does reach such social evils which were never before prohibited by constitutional enactment, it is to be presumed that the American people, in giving it their imprimatur, understood what they were doing, and meant to decree what in fact it has decreed.

It embraces much more: The "privileges and immunities," secured by the original constitution, which were only such as each State gave to its own citizens. Each was prohibited from discriminating in favor of its own citizens, and against the citizens of other States.

But the Fourteenth Amendment prohibits any State *from abridging the privileges and immunities of the citizens of the United States*, whether its own citizens, or any others. It not merely requires equality of privileges, but it declares that the privileges and immunities of all citizens shall be absolutely unabridged, unimpaired.

What, then, are the essential privileges which belong to a citizen of the United States as such, and which a State cannot by its laws invade? It may be difficult to enumerate or define them. The Supreme Court on one occasion, thought it unwise to attempt to do so. (18 Howard, 50). But so far as relates to the question in hand, we may safely say that it is one of the privileges of every American citizen to adopt and follow such lawful industrial pursuit—not injurious to the community—as he may see fit, without unreasonable regulation and restriction, and without being restricted by any of those unjust, oppressive and odious monopolies, or exclusive privileges which have been condemned by all free governments. It is also his privilege to be protected in the possession and enjoyment of his property so long as such possession and enjoyment are not injurious to the community; and not to be deprived thereof without due process of law. It is also his privilege to have, with all other citizens, the equal protection of the laws. Indeed the latter privilege is specified by the words of the amendment.

These privileges cannot be invaded without sapping the very foundations of republican government. A republican government is not merely a government of the people, but it is a free government. Without freedom it is republican only in name, and not republican in truth, and any government which deprives its citizens of liberty, or of their property without due process of law, is anything but a free government. To the benefit of a favored few, it takes away and destroys the citizens' property without trial or condemnation, it is guilty of violating all the fundamental privileges to which I have referred, and one of the fundamental principles of free government.

There is no more sacred right of citizenship than the right to pursue unmolested a lawful employment in a lawful manner. It is nothing more nor less than the SACRED RIGHT OF LABOR.

This right is not inconsistent with any of those wholesome regulations which have been found to be beneficial and necessary in every State.

It is not inconsistent with the exclusive right to make, use and vend to others for a limited period a new and useful invention which the grantee or patentee has produced from his own brains or ingenuity. Society only gives *to him* the temporary use of that which, without him, it would not have had the benefit of, as a consideration of that benefit, and to encourage others to make like use of their powers.

It is not inconsistent with the exclusive right to use a franchise—that is—a right to do what the Legislature alone can authorize to be done—and which no private citizen has a right to do without such authority—such as—to build and operate a railroad, to make a canal or turnpike, to establish a ferry, and other such public rights which involve a charge upon the public, and in most cases an exercise of the right of eminent domain. These franchises may be conferred upon a limited number of persons, natural or corporate, with powers, and even exclusive power, to exercise them in certain localities, on certain terms and under certain restrictions. Society obtains a consideration for the grant of these franchises in the investments of large amounts of capital in public improvements, which are required for the development of the country and its resources. They are franchises which can only be exercised as they are conferred by public authority, and cannot be exercised and enjoyed by all. They are the different

BY TELEGRAP

To the New Orleans Bee.

FROM WASHINGTON.

Congressional Proceedings.

Amendments to the Deficiency Bill.

Final Interview with Red Cloud.

Investigation of the Cuban Corruption Affairs.

The North Carolina Republican Convention.

Proceedings of the International Typographical Union.

FOREIGN NEWS.

Death of Charles Dickens.

Comments of the Press.

Miscellaneous Intelligence.

WASHINGTON ITEMS.

Washington, June 10.—SENATE—The book publishers have with them a petition for modification of the copy-right laws.

A bill was introduced authorizing army officers to insure their lives in the life insurance offices of the United States.

The Central Branch of the Pacific Railroad of Kansas taxing privilege were discussed to recess. Senate is in session tonight.

HOUSE.—The greatest portion of the day was consumed in the investigation of the alleged laxity of the dispatch charging Congressional corruption in Cuban affairs. During the discussion, which was very warm, it was shown that newspaper men, as well as preachers and lawyers, had a right to compel their sources of information. The correspondent in this case was brought to the bar of the House. A motion was made by the aggrieved party that he be expelled from the reporters' gallery, which was amended by the committee with power to send for persons and papers.

The Deficiency bill, as it was returned from the Senate, was considered.

The Senate made 256 amendments. The first, regarding the Pacific Railroad, was adopted, provided that no pardon or amnesty had been granted by the President, which, if granted, is subject to proclamation or otherwise, nor any acceptance of such pardon or amnesty, nor oath taken, or other act performed in pursuance of, or as a condition thereof shall be admissible on the part of any claimant in the Court of Claims as evidence in support of any claim against the United States, or to establish the standing of any claimant in said court, or his right to bring or maintain any suit; and that except where such pardon and amnesty were granted upon oaths of allegiance and amnesty taken in strict good faith, and in continuance of active operations of the late rebellion, under the proclamation of President Lincoln of December 8, 1863, and the twelfth section of Congress, approved July 17, 1862, pledging the public faith for a restoration of the rights of property, where all the requirements and conditions named in said act and proclamation have been complied with, and said oath of amnesty and allegiance kept and maintained inviolate, and this is hereby declared to be the true intent and meaning in this regard of the several acts conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims, and of proclamation of July 17, 1862, and the said proclamation of President Lincoln's founded thereon.

Without further amendments on Deficiency bill the Senate adjourned.

Washington, June 10.—The persistent wet weather interferes with outdoor sports.

Washington, June 10.—Internal Revenue receipts to-day over $1,000,000.

Secretary Boutwell has gone North, and will be absent a week.

The President will also be absent a week.

Mr. Richardson, Mr. Greeley, Mrs. Colfax, Mrs. Sherman and others, who attended the celebration of the recent trial, have worked up into a four act drama with tableaux, in which a national pistol shot policeman in uniform, and a national pistol shot super—the whole interspersed with comic songs and a street fight, for a San Francisco theatre.

A smart old lady of 72 years, in Decatur county, Indiana, recently walked thirty miles in one day, to pay her taxes and buy a spring bonnet.

MONETARY AND FINANCIAL.

FRIDAY EVENING, June 10, 1870.

The Money market proper is without any material change. The demand for notes, with unquestionable collaterals and business paper without collaterals, are quoted at 10@12 per cent. for prime and second grade at 12@15 per cent. month; At mortgage paper at 1@2 per cent. per month. Call loans are quoted at 6@7 per cent. Gold opened at 113¾ and closed at 113⅝ at New York) and closed at 113⅝ against 113⅝@113¾ yesterday. The sales included $10,000 and $20,000 at 113⅝; $25,000 at 113⅝; $5000 and $20,000 at 113⅝, all at 11 A.M. There was no apparent movement in Silver. Sterling Exchange on American half dollars and Spanish dollars, at a premium in gold for Mexican dollars.

A mercantile firm in North Carolina, after Foreign Exchange at easier rates in the market closing ¼ ⅝ cent. lower than on yesterday, sold sterling at 109 for bills, including 2,000 commercial at 109¼; 2,000 commercial at 109¼; 2,000 at 109¼; 2,000 at 109¼; 2,000