

Conceding that amnesty did restore what the United States held when the proclamation was issued, it could not restore what the United States had ceased to hold. It could not give back the property which had been sold, or any interest in it, either in possession or expectancy. *Semmes v. United States*, 91 U. S. 21. Besides, the proclamation of amnesty was not made until Dec. 25, 1868. *Decree reversed.*

CHAFFRAIX *v.* SHIFF.

The doctrine announced in the case of *Wallach et al. v. Van Riswick, supra*, p. 202, reaffirmed.

APPEAL from the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Louisiana.

Mr. Conway Robinson for the appellant, and *Mr. John A. Campbell* for the appellee.

MR. JUSTICE STRONG delivered the opinion of the court.

The court below decreed specific performance of a contract for the purchase of real estate, which expressly stipulated that the purchaser should not be bound to accept the sale if the titles were not good and valid. The title offered was that of a purchaser at a confiscation sale, to whom, after the sale, Surget, the person as whose property the land was confiscated, had released, without warranty. We decided, in *Wallach et al. v. Van Riswick, supra*, p. 202, that such a title is not a complete and valid one; that it is ineffective beyond the life of Surget; and that his release did not enlarge it. *Decree reversed.*

UNITED STATES *v.* REESE ET AL.

1. Rights and immunities created by or dependent upon the Constitution of the United States can be protected by Congress. The form and manner of that protection may be such as Congress, in the legitimate exercise of its legislative discretion, shall provide, and may be varied to meet the necessities of a particular right.
2. The Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution does not confer the right of suffrage; but it invests citizens of the United States with the right of