New Orleans Republican.

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE UNITED STATES

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF NEW ORLEANS

THE DAILY REPUBLICAN

is published every day (Mondays excepted) at No. 94 Camp street. Terms: $10 a year; $8 for six months; $4 for three months—payable invariably in advance. Single copies ten cents.

Rates of Advertising:

Squares.	1 mo.	2 mos.	3 mos.	6 mos.	12 mos.
One	$12 net	$22 net	$30 net	$50 net	$75 net
Two	22 ..	38 ..	50 ..	80 ..	125 ..
Three	30 ..	53 ..	70 ..	110 ..	175 ..
Four	38 ..	67 ..	90 ..	140 ..	225 ..
Five	46 ..	80 ..	105 ..	170 ..	275 ..
Six	54 ..	93 ..	120 ..	200 ..	325 ..
Seven	60 ..	105 ..	135 ..	230 ..	375 ..
Eight	65 ..	115 ..	150 ..	260 ..	420 ..
Nine	70 ..	125 ..	165 ..	290 ..	460 ..
Ten	75 ..	135 ..	180 ..	320 ..	500 ..
Eleven	80 ..	145 ..	195 ..	350 ..	540 ..
Twelve	85 ..	155	210	380 ..	580 ..
Thirteen	90 ..	165 ..	220 ..	410 ..	620 ..
Fourteen	95 ..	175 ..	230 ..	440 ..	660 ..
Fifteen	100 ..	185 ..	240 ..	450 ..	700 ..
Thirty	175 ..	330 ..	450 ..	750 ..	1200 ..

Monthly advertisements, inserted every other day, to be charged two-thirds of the above rates.

Second page monthly advertisements, each square, @20per month.

Transient advertisements, having the run of the paper, first insertion $1 50 per square; each subsequent insertion seventy-five cents per square.

Second page transient advertisements, each insertion $1 50 per square.

Advertisements inserted at intervals to be charged as new each insertion.

Regular advertisers, who advertise largely, will be allowed such discount from above named transient rates as may be agreed upon; provided, that in no case shall such discount exceed twenty-five per cent.

All business notices of advertisements to be charged twenty cents per line each insertion.

THE WEEKLY REPUBLICAN

is published every Saturday morning, and contains the news by telegraph, miscellaneous reading, editorials, local matters of general public interest, commercial and monetary reports, and everything that appears in the Daily, except such items as are of little or no public moment. The WEEKLY REPUBLICAN is an excellent family paper, valuable as well for instruction and amusement as information on the current topics of the day.

Terms of Subscription.

One year, $5; six months, $2 50.

Advertisements.

Transient advertisements same terms as in the Daily. Monthly advertisements inserted for one-fourth of the daily rates.

A liberal commission allowed to those who send us clubs of five or more.

DEBATES OF THE SENATE.

MONDAY, January 9, 1871.

On the motion to adopt rule nine, in the report of the Committee on Rules, Mr. Pinchback remarked that if the Senate adopted that rule, any member of the Senate could shut off debate at any time by merely rising when some other gentleman had the floor, and calling for the previous question. If that rule was adopted it would cut off any debate whatever.

Mr. Campbell said that the adoption of the rule would merely prevent any Senator in the minority from speaking against time, and would put it in the power of the majority to cut off all debate when desirable.

Mr. Futch: I am in favor of the adoption of that rule, or I am in favor of striking it out. I should be actuated by motives of charity alone if I voted to strike it out. It is well known to every member of this House that I am not in the habit of making long speeches, but still, I have great charity for those who have that unfortunate failure. For that reason I move that that particular rule be stricken out.

Mr. Lewis: During the three years I have been in this house, I have noticed that even when it was a foregone conclusion that a bill must eventually pass, its opponents have put it off from day to day by debating it, not with the hope of finally defeating it, but from the desire they have to annoy the supporters of the bill and to delay its passage. We have only sixty days to sit, in which to transact the business of the State, and at the end of every session that I have attended I have noticed at that time there would be a crowd of bills to be passed and that Senators would allow them to pass almost without knowing what they were, because they knew the time was so short. In this way a great deal of legislation has been passed. At the end of every session, if a Senator has a particular bill he wishes to call up, he suffers others to pass without investigating them or knowing what they are, from the very fact that he has a bill of his own to call up, and he knows that if he filibusters he will not be able to call it up. For this reason, and for this reason alone, I believe it is a wise principle that where a disposition to filibuster is manifested, there should be some rule to cut it off, and thereby dispose of the bill.

Mr. Lynch: I have listened very attentively to the argument presented to lay the motion to strike out on the table. The very reasons the gentleman presents as making it necessary to adopt such a rule as this, convinces me that this paragraph should be stricken from the rule. Minorities have rights as well as majorities. In the Senate of the United States, the previous question is unknown; and it ought to be unknown in this Senate. The Senate of the State of Louisiana should be composed of gentlemen of such deliberation, of such judgment, and of such knowledge of what is proper and right, that a call for the previous question ought not to be necessary. I therefore hope that no such rule as this will be adopted.

Mr. Campbell remarked, that he would state merely as a matter of information to the Senate, that this rule was copied from the rules of the Senate of Pennsylvania, and that he had suggested it to the committee. He said he was not particular one way or the other, but he thought it was a wise rule and should be adopted.

Mr. Coupland sent up to the Secretary and had read an extract from Jefferson's Manual, in which that author had declared such a rule as this against parliamentary usages.

The words were then stricken out, and the rule adopted as amended.

In moving for a reconsideration of the vote by which rule number eight was adopted—

Mr. Smith said: It strikes me that this is a very frivolous rule. It is supposed we are not going to conduct ourselves in an unbecoming manner during the transaction of the business of the Senate, and it is supposed that if we do so the presiding officer shall correct us. This would probably be a very wise rule if the Senate was composed of a lot of school boys.

Mr. Lewis: Whether we are school boys or not, it is very evident that during the time some Senators are speaking, or when the journal or minutes are being read, some members of this body are reading newspapers or speaking to one another. It is very hard on the vanity of some members that people can not be forced to keep silent and listen to all the dry things they say; but still I think it a good rule.

Mr. Futch: That rule should not be adopted? I am forced to sit here and I am bound to get tired sometimes, but I do not think there is any use in adopting a rule that is not going to be obeyed.

The President remarked that if the rule was adopted it would certainly be obeyed.

Mr. Ray said that he hoped the rule would not be stricken out, as he thought it contained a principle which ought to be observed—a principle which is almost universally observed in the Senate of the United States. In that body, when a bill is being read, or when a speech is being made, and Senators want to have any conversation, they get up and go out to talk. He said that this rule was copied from the rules of the United States Senate *verbatim*. It was necessary to have this rule so that the President should have some authorization when calling Senators to order for making a noise while the reading of bills was going on.

Mr. Sypher hoped that this rule would not be stricken out, as good rules or good laws never hurt anybody. Mr. Sypher here read a section from the rules of the United States Senate.

Mr. Twitchell: I can not believe that the existence or non-existence of this rule is worth the time we are taking up in its discussion. I therefore move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The Senate laid the motion on the table.

On the discussion as to whether or not rule number thirty-one should be adopted, Mr. Pinchback said: I do not think we ought to give the Governor any power over the contingent fund of the Senate. Is it possible there is not honesty enough in the Senate to control that fund? Why, if the Sergeant-at-Arms should buy stationery, newspapers or anything, it would require a joint resolution to appropriate the money out of the contingent fund to pay those bills.

Mr. Ray: I do not understand this resolution to mean that the Governor shall sign any resolution of the Senate making a distribution of the contingent fund. I think that all these bills granting extra compensation to the attaches of the Senate ought to be introduced and go through in the regular form. It has been the general rule for these bills to pass at the end of the session, and if this rule is adopted, it will bring them up before the Senate two or three days before adjournment.

Mr. Blackman: Are we to understand that if the Senate orders newspapers, or orders the Sergeant-at-Arms to purchase stationery or postage stamps, or to pay for gas or coal, or anything that is necessary for the Senate, that it is requisite to have a joint resolution? If so, the cost of printing and passing all these resolutions will be worth more than the cost of the article itself.

Mr. Ray: It is very easy to get over that by passing them under a suspension of the rules.

Mr. O'Hara remarked that under this rule, if adopted, it would cost more to have the resolutions printed and passed than it would to buy the original articles for which it was intended to pay.

Mr. Campbell observed that this had been the same rule that the Senate had heretofore acted upon, and he had never heard any complaint from the Sergeant-at-Arms, or the Committee on Contingent Expenses.

The amendment proposed by Senator Pinchback, to strike out that part which referred to any money appropriated out of the contingent fund, was carried, and the rule adopted as amended.

Mr. O'Hara, on moving to strike out rule thirty-five, said: I hope that this rule will be stricken out, as I understand it to place it in the power of three Senators to delay a bill an indefinite time. Suppose, for instance, that I introduce a bill into the Senate, and the majority help me to pass that bill to its final stage, and then suppose it is referred to this committee of three Senators, they may say "this is not a good bill, and we do not want it;" and they may refuse to report it unless I get a majority of the Senate to instruct them to do so. I do not propose that any three Senators or any five Senators shall become dictators to the balance of us. If the chairman of the Committee on Rules will consent to throw some protection around this Senate by inserting a clause that this committee shall be required to report a bill within a given time I will be satisfied. Suppose we have only five or six days to sit, near the close of the session, and a bill comes up which some Senator is very desirous of having passed, and suppose after it is referred to this new committee, they should refuse to report it, that would certainly kill the bill for the session. By adopting this rule you are not only placing the Senate, but you are placing the entire General Assembly in the hands of three or four men. These are my reasons for objecting to this rule, and for these reasons I move to strike that rule out. In contested election cases this committee might keep papers on hand forever.

Mr. Campbell: No contested election case can ever come before this committee. This rule was copied from the rules of the Senate of the State of Massachusetts. I think that it ought to be adopted, as being a rule containing good and wholesome provisions, and as being of a great deal of usefulness to the State—for this reason—that it will prevent errors from creeping into bills that are passed hastily. This committee might find that it conflicted with some other law on the subject, which should be repealed, and they could bring that to the notice of the Senate. I think it is a good rule, and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. O'Hara remarked that there was a vast difference between the legislation of the State of Massachusetts and the State of Louisiana.

Mr. McMillen remarked that the State of Massachusetts was rapidly approaching the level of Louisiana in that particular.

Mr. Ray remarked that this was a new rule to be adopted by the Senate, and he thought it would operate badly. He said that the Senate was limited to sixty days every year for the transaction of the business of the State, and that many bills would not be acted on because this committee might not be willing to report them to the Senate. He said that it was true that this rule might have been adopted in Pennsylvania or some other State; but there might have been circumstances existing there that made it necessary.

Mr. Lewis remarked that wise men have said that all things that are worthy of being done at all are worthy of being done well. As to the objection that this committee would allow bills to remain on their hands an indefinite length of time, he said that a bill referred to any committee would be dealt with in the same way. He thought that some guard or shield should be thrown around the bills that were passed hastily; and that it was best to have a committee to refer such bills to, to put them in proper shape, and to make a fair and honest report upon them, and thereby prevent the bad effects of hasty legislation which takes place at the latter end of every session.

Mr. O'Hara: I will offer this compromise—that as long as we are going to have this committee, let us have on it three of the best lawyers in the Senate, and I will be satisfied with it. If you are going to have the committee to say what is constitutional and what is not, then let it be composed of men who know something of constitutional law.

Mr. Coupland remarked that he had nothing to say against the principle that all bills should be referred to the proper committees; but that after the report was made on them by one committee, they would have to go into the hands of another one, and consequently cause great delay.

The Senate struck the rule out.

Rule forty-four coming up for adoption, Mr. Ray moved that the privilege extended to certain officers in said rule should also be extended to Judges of Parish and District Courts.

Mr. Smith: I hope that motion will not be carried. There is more lobbying going on on this Senate floor by the Judges of District Courts than by anybody else.

Mr. O'Hara: I move that the employes of the Governor of the State of Louisiana be allowed admittance to the floor of this Senate, and that they be permitted to say that I am under compulsion to do just as they say.

The Chair called Mr. O'Hara to order.

Mr. Ray's amendment was then adopted.

Mr. Pinchback: In rule number sixty-two there is a proviso, which reads as follows: "Provided, That this rule shall not be so construed as to prevent a Senator from inviting a citizen to occupy a seat on the floor of the Senate at any time." Now, if we adopt this proviso, we might as well strike out the balance of the rule. I have seen the practical working of that thing, and know what it is. No Senator who has a friend outside can refuse to let him in if he asks him to pass him in. I know that I can not keep from it myself. I have been annoyed very much by persons seeking clerkships on committees, or wanting some office or other. If this proviso is stricken out, all a Senator has to do to get his friend inside the bar is to ask the permission of the Senate; and I am certain no Senator will refuse to extend him that courtesy. If I had a friend that I wanted to be admitted on this floor, I should certainly have no hesitation in asking that privilege of the Senate. I therefore move that this provision be stricken out.

Mr. Campbell: The Senator says that we might as well strike out the balance of this rule and adopt the proviso. I think not. The first part of the rule simply states who shall have the same right on this floor as ourselves; and the proviso allows us to extend that privilege to any of our friends. Suppose some ladies should visit the Senate Chamber (I know Senator Pinchback is not excelled by any gentleman on this floor in gallantry), we should have to ask the consent of the Senate before they could be admitted.

Mr. Pinchback: Let me tell you what will be the result of it: I know about ten thousand lobbyists, and I want some of them to electioneer for me for the United States Senate to-morrow. I shall certainly bring all of them in here.

Mr. Campbell: If the Senator has not moral courage enough to refuse admittance to any of his friends, then we must stand the penalty; but that must not prevent the balance of us from admitting one or two of our friends on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. Lewis: I move to amend by inserting that no member of the Senate shall have the right to admit more than sixteen of his friends at one time.

Mr. Lynch: I move to amend that amendment by inserting that those sixteen shall not include the lady acquaintances of any Senator.

Mr. Bowman having moved for a reconsideration of the vote by which rule thirty-five was stricken out, and his motion having been carried—

Mr. McMillen said: I am opposed to the adoption of this rule. I believe it will be found to work badly when we come to put it into practical operation. Under its working, every bill and every resolution which shall be passed to a third reading must be referred to the committee to compare bills in the third reading. It matters not how mature the consideration which the Senate may have given it; it matters not how complete and thorough may have been the examination and report of the standing or select committee upon the bill, at its proper stage; it matters not how hurried the Senate may be to consider it, or any other measure; or how near we may be to the close of the session; we must, of necessity, refer bills that have passed their third reading to this committee.

The rule then goes on to state that it shall be the duty of this committee to compare all bills and resolutions with the constitution of this State. That means that this committee shall determine for itself and report to the Senate whether, in their opinion, any of the bills or resolutions that come before them are in conflict with the constitution. Now, that is sometimes a very serious question. It is one of those questions on which some of the best judicial minds of the State differ. Under this rule, bills that have come from the Judiciary Committee and have occupied the attention of the best legal talent of the Senate, bills from the Finance Committee, which have passed through the best financial minds in the Senate, even bills that have been discussed in Committee of the Whole, are stopped in their passage in order to be committed to this committee to compare bills in the third reading for the purpose of ascertaining whether they are or not in conflict with the constitution of the State. What is constitutional or what is not constitutional in a law is something which it is the province of the courts of the State to determine, rather than the Senate or a committee of the Senate. Of course it is our duty to exercise whatever legal talent we have to see that the laws we pass are not in conflict with the constitution, but that is part of the duty of the Judiciary Committee. After that committee, which is supposed to be composed of the best legal talent of the Senate, has passed upon the constitutionality of a law, it seems to me to be unnecessary to refer it to another committee to see whether or not it is in conflict with the constitution of the State.

Then the rule goes on to state that it shall be the duty of this committee to see what relations any bills or resolutions bear to existing laws of the State. I do not know exactly what that means. I do not know that it makes any difference to the Senate whether any law they propose to pass has any relation to any other law or not. When a bill is passed that conflicts with the provisions of any existing law of the State, it is customary to insert a clause repealing the previous act, and that ends it. I do not see why it should be proposed, when we desire to pass a bill in a hurried way, near the close of the session, to allow it to go through the slow operation of a standing committee (for they are very slow at best) in order to ascertain whether it has any bearing on any other State law that has been previously passed. My impression is that if we adopt this rule to-day we will be suspending it day by day when we get to work to framing laws in earnest in the latter days of our session.

Then this rule goes on to say it shall be the duty of this committee to ascertain whether all laws and resolutions are in technical form. I am in favor of that part of the rule. I do not know how to frame a law myself; I have not enough of education or ability to frame one; and I am in favor of constituting a committee composed of men of higher education and ability than I possess, in order that they may put everything in proper "technical form." I do not know what that means exactly, but I always like to work technically; it sounds well; its meaning is defined; it looks as if we were after somebody, and as if something great was going to be done. I am in favor of that committee, but I want to have its duties confined to the technical part of the laws. Now, I come from a part of the country where a schoolmaster has not been since the war; and I think we ought to have a standing committee on technicality; and if we had one on writing and spelling, I think it would be a good thing. I think it would be a good thing if it was made the duty of this committee to see whether the words in every bill and resolution were spelled correctly, and to see whether the penmanship was according to rule. If we can not find a committee in the Senate we might draw on the State Central Committee of the Democratic party. We are trying, in our legislative capacity, to call in outside assistance; we are seeking advice in strange quarters, and I do not see why we should not seek assistance even there. I therefore hope that a portion of this standing rule will be stricken out, viz: those portions which render it obligatory on the part of the committee to determine whether the laws which we shall be required to pass are constitutional; because even if the committee (which will naturally be the case) have to assist them, the Revised Statutes of my friend from Ouachita, I doubt very much whether they can ever arrive at any conclusion unless they give a great deal of their attention and time to the matter. Even after my honorable friend has done the work, I have heard that there are persons who declare that even he omitted to insert certain amendments or correct all the discrepancies that existed in them before! How a standing committee of this Senate, in the hurry of the closing days of the session, can take time to discover whether or not laws which we are to pass have any relation to other laws or not, I don't know. I hope this rule will not be adopted, because I consider it is an unusual and unnecessary delay of the business of the Senate.

Mr. Todd having presented a memorial of Mr. Curtis Pollard protesting against the right of Mr. McMillen to a seat on the floor of the Senate—

Mr. McMillen said: I hope, Mr. President, that the document which has just been read in the hearing of the Senate, purporting to be a petition, or a statement of reasons why my seat on this floor should be contested, will have a thorough and a searching examination. I hope, sir, that it may be examined by some select or appropriate standing committee, and that the charges made by the Hon. Mr. Curtis Pollard may be thoroughly investigated. If they are true, I ought not to occupy a seat in this Senate. If they are not true, then Mr. Curtis Pollard should be known to this Senate as he is known in the parish from whence he hails.

After some other minor business was transacted, upon which there was no debate, then Senate then adjourned.

DEBATES OF THE HOUSE.

TUESDAY, January 10, 1871.

The House met at 12 M., Speaker Carr in the chair. Ninety-eight members present. The Chaplain offered the following prayer:

O Holy and Everlasting God, before whom every knee shall bow and every heart shall confess that Thou art God, we thank Thee this morning that we have been permitted to come together to transact business for our State and for our people. O God, endow us, we beseech Thee, with wisdom from on high. We pray Thee that Thou wilt protect us and be with us, and that we may feel that Thou art our Great Redeemer. We pray Thee bless all in authority; bless the members of this House; the Governor, Speaker and the Lieutenant Governor, and make them men of sound mind and sound judgment, and we pray Thee to protect us in all we do, and that we may do all for the good of the people and the glory of God, and when we have done our work here below, save us for the Redeemer. Amen.

The Speaker then announced that in conformity with the act of Congress on the subject, the first thing in order was the election of a United States Senator to fill the seat of Senator Harris, whose term is about to expire; and on his declaring nominations in order—

Mr. Worrall, of Jefferson: I nominate Joseph R. West.

Mr. Antoine, of Orleans: I nominate Senator P. B. S. Pinchback. (Applause.)

Mr. Otto, of Orleans: I nominate Michael Hahn.

Mr. Schumacher, of Orleans: I nominate Mr. Thomas Green Davidson.

Mr Henderson Williams, of Madison: I nominate Mr. P. J. Kennedy.

After the roll had been called, and before the result had been announced—

Mr. Davidson, of Livingston: Mr. Speaker, the roll having been called, I would thank those of the gentlemen who voted for me; but I desire to change my votes—I vote for Mr. West. [Applause.]

A number of the members of the House then changed their votes, when the Clerk, after reading over the roll, as amended, announced the result, as follows:

J. R. West	68
P. B. S. Pinchback	27
Michael Hahn	3
P. J. Kennedy	2
Thomas Green Davidson	1
Senator Blackman	2
Total vote	100

Without transacting further business, the House then adjourned, at quarter before one o'clock, until to-morrow at 12 M.

J. B. KNIGHT.

76.....Carondelet street.....76

Sells all kinds of

MACHINERY.

General Southern Agent for

Watertown Steam Engine Company.

Builders of

Excelsior Patent Portable Engine, with Cylinder in Dome, Locomotive Boilers,

Plantation and Farm Engines,

Mounted on Wheels, with Spark Arrester.

STATIONARY ENGINES

Of all Sizes,

With Flue, Tubular or Locomotive Boilers.

Improved Reversible Circular Saw Mills,

Can be set up either Right or Left Handed, without altering any part of Mill or Carriage.

J. D. BROOKS Improved Jonvan

Turbine Water Wheel,

Shafting,

Hangers,

Pulleys,

Car Wheels,

Mill Work

All the above are built under the personal supervision of MR. G. BRAIDFORD, the Pioneer in

Portable Steam Engine Building,

Which enables them to produce MACHINERY UNSURPASSED BY ANY.

SOUTHERN COTTON GIN,

Manufactured by

J. E. CARVER & CO.,

Bridgewater, Massachusetts.

These Gins have been in use for many years, and received the highest MEDAL awarded at the

Paris Exposition,

And are built under the superintendence of

Mr. J. E. Carver,

The only person of the name who is engaged in the manufacture of COTTON GINS,

J. B. KNIGHT, Agent,

No. 76 Carondelet street.

Also the following from the BEST MAKERS,

Sugar Mills, Evaporators, Sugar Kettles, Portable Cotton Presses, Newell Screws, Corn and Wheat Mills, Seed Carriers, Horse Powers, Belting, Saws,

Broom Corn Threshers,

To run by hand or power.

Broom Corn Scrapers,

Wood Working Machinery, and all Varieties of

Mill and Plantation Machinery.

W. E. SEAMAN.

J. B. KNIGHT,

je16 1y2p No. 76 Carondelet street.

STYLISH BOOTS AND SHOES,

AT

MARTIN'S OLD STAND,

113.....Canal street.....113

The best stock of Ladies's always on hand and a fit guaranteed.

Custom made goods for Ladies, Children and Gentlemen, in every variety.

Give me a call.

J. POWERS,

de11 3m3m 113 Canal street.

LEGAL NOTICES.

STATE OF LOUISIANA.

FOURTH DISTRICT COURT FOR THE PARISH OF ORLEANS.

LEONTINE RAVIGNOT NIHOUL VS. MAX NIHOUL, Her Husband.—No. 21 691.

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT ON THE FIFTH day of December, 1870, judgment was rendered in this court, in the following entitled suit, in the words and figures following, to wit:

Leontine Ravignot Nihoul vs. Max Nihoul, Her Husband.—No. 21 691.

On motion of Hays & New, for plaintiff, producing due proof of plaintiff's demand, it is ordered, adjudged and decreed that the default herein entered November 28, 1870, be now confirmed; and that there be judgment in favor of plaintiff, decreeing a separation of property, dissolution of the community hitherto existing between plaintiff and defendant, Max Nihoul, her husband; and that the plaintiff recover of said defendant four thousand five hundred dollars, with mortgage and privilege on all defendant's property, and costs of suit.

Judgment rendered December 5, 1870.

Signed, December 3, 1870

PAUL E. THEARD, Judge.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand, and affixed the seal of the said court, at the city of New Orleans, on this fourth day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seventy-one, and the ninety-fifth year of the independence of the United States.

FRANK WALL, Deputy Clerk.

jal 20 1t4

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT.

DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA.

IN THE MATTER OF ALFRED F. JONES, BANKRUPT.

In Bankruptcy—No. 1078.

WHEREAS, ALFRED F. JONES, OF NEW ORleans and district aforesaid, duly declared bankrupt under the act of Congress of March 2, 1867, has this day filed in said court a petition praying for a discharge and certificate thereof from all his debts and other claims provable under said act:

Notice is therefore given to all creditors who have proved their debts, and to all other persons in interest, that the twenty-fifth day of January, 1871, at 11 A. M., is assigned for the hearing of the same, and that they may then and there attend and show cause, if any they have, why the prayer of the said petition should not be granted; and further notice is given that the bankrupt will undergo an examination before Register Pitkin, on the twentieth day of January, A. D. 1871, at 11 A. M. at his office, Customhouse building.

Clerk's Office, New Orleans, January 2, 1871.

ja5 10 17 E. LOEW, Deputy Clerk.

THE NEW ORLEANS REPUBLICAN

PRINTING COMPANY'S STEAM

BOOK AND JOB

Printing Establishment,

94.....Camp Street.....94

We have purchased from George Bruce, New York, entirely new type for the REPUBLICAN.

Also from T. H. Seaver, agent, a new

CAMPBELL BOOK PRESS,

with all the late improvements, which, in addition to our previous supply of Printing Machinery, will enable us to turn out work with dispatch, and in a style that can not be excelled in the South.

We have also recently added to our office

GORDON PRESSES

of assorted sizes. These are considered in New York the Best Presses that are made, for the rapid and superior execution of work. We employ skill ful workmen, who will at all times be properly informed as to the latest and best styles of work.

We would call the particular attention of the Mercantile and Business Community to this department of our Establishment, as we have made to it extensive additions in the very

NEWEST STYLES

OF

POSTER AND GENERAL JOB TYPE,

PRESSES, ETC.,

WHICH ENABLE US TO

EXECUTE EVERY DESCRIPTION

OF

PRINTING,

SUCH AS

MAMMOTH POSTERS,

FANCY SHOW CARDS,

RAILROAD WORK,

LAWYERS' BRIEFS,

BOOK WORK,

STEAMBOAT WORK,

BUSINESS CARDS,

PROGRAMMES,

BANDBILLS,

and all kinds of MERCANTILE WORK.

The facilities we have in the way of

STEAM, CARD AND HAND PRESSES

ENABLE US TO EXECUTE WORK

RAPIDLY, NEATLY AND CHEAPLY.

RULING AND BOOK-BINDING

IN

EVERY DESCRIPTION

EXECUTED WITH DISPATCH.

STEAMBOAT PRINTING.

Steamboat Officers will find it to their

INTEREST TO CALL AT OUR JOB OFFICE

AND

LEAVE THEIR ORDERS.

We have made special provision for Steamboat Printing, and have

NEW FONTS OF BEAUTIFUL TYPE

FOR

COLORED BILLS,

AS WELL AS BOTH OF THE

FINEST COLORED INK TO BE HAD.

POSTERS AND HANDBILLS

IN

BLACK AND COLORED INKS,

AND OF EVERY SIZE

Our Facilities for Printing

BLANK WORK,

are unequaled by any establishment in this city

BILL HEADS

ON ANY QUALITY OF PAPER,

Prices Accordingly.

INSURANCE POLICIES AND BLANKS.

RAILROAD TICKETS, TIME-TABLES,

In fact, all kinds of JOB PRINTING can be executed at this Office—not only with dispatch but on accommodating terms.

MISCELLANEOUS.

CLARKE & WASSON,

STATIONERS, PRINTERS AND BLANK BOOK MANUFACTURERS,

Nos. 34 and 36 Carondelet Street,

NEW ORLEANS,

Also compilers and publishers of "Clarke & Wasson's Eight Per Cent Interest and Average Tables."

All orders for Ruling, Printing and Binding executed with neatness and dispatch. jal0 6t

ALBERT PAUL & CO.,

(Frank Hyde—Albert Paul.)

AUCTIONEERS,

47.....Exchange Place.....47

Between Customhouse and Bienville streets,

NEW ORLEANS.

Will attend to the sale of Real Estate, Cargoes, Furniture and outdoor sales of every description. jal0 1m

JUST PUBLISHED.

BARTLE'S OFFICIAL MAP

OF THE

STATE OF LOUISIANA.

This new and accurate map has been prepared with great care and accuracy, by Mr. T. S. Hardee, the engineer especially appointed by the State for this purpose. This being official, it becomes a standard authority.

It embraces a variety of information never before embodied in any State map, having all the various canals and railroads completed and projected, the designation of each township on the face of the townships, the names of all the planters and plantations along the Mississippi river, together with a full and accurate digest of historical and statistical information relating to the State.

The undersigned, having secured the control and exclusive right of sale of this valuable map, now in course of publication in this city, informs the public that the work, complete, will be ready for delivery to subscribers by the first of February next.

The size of this map will be about six feet square, beautifully colored, and mounted on rollers.

The price will be fixed at ten dollars per copy.

EDGAR STEEL, Publisher.

Office at Christian & Hyatt's, 38 Camp street, New Orleans. Lock Box 469, New Orleans Postoffice. jal0 6t

VOR. MAIGNAN & F. LABORDE,

DEALERS IN

WINES AND BRANDIES,

Nos. 23 and 25 Bienville street.

COGNACS.

20 counter pipes Alexandre Seignette Rochelle—fourth proof.
27 eighths Alexandre Seignette Rochelle—fourth proof.
27 sixths Vineyard Propts, Co.—1868.
15 sixths Vineyard Propts, Co.—1858.
74 sixths Vineyard Propts, Co.—1797.
40 quarter Charles Castillon 1135—1775.
9 sixths Hy. Sutton—1794.
10 sixths Hy. Sutton—1796.
12 sixths Goldenberg—1820.
12 sixths Goldenberg—1848.
7 sixths Larronde Freres—1848 cedit.
8 octaves Larronde Freres—1826 cedit.
24 octaves Larronde Freres—1795.
6 octaves Gautier Freres—1848.
4 quarters Louis O. Lamyes.

CLARET IN CASKS.

40 casks Claret—Roussenack.
2 casks Claret—Rions.
130 casks Claret—Beaurech.
40 casks Claret—Landeville.
10 casks Claret—Larronde Freres aine.
50 casks Claret—For family use.
37 casks Claret—For family use.

CLARET IN CASES.

50 cases, 12 bottles each, Chateau Pape Clement.
25 cases, 24 half bottles each, Chateau Pape Clement.
5 cases, 12 bottles each, Chateau Margaux, A. de Luze & Fils.
6 cases, 12 bottles each, Chateau Pavie, Mazeau, A. de Luze & Fils.
5 cases, 12 bottles each, Fichet de Longueville, A. de Luze & Fils.
12 cases, 12 bottles each, St. Estephe, A. de Luze & Fils.
25 cases, 12 bottles each, Fronsac, A. de Luze & Fils.
6 cases, 12 bottles each, Medoc, A. de Luze & Fils.
50 cases, 12 bottles each, Medoc, old.
8 cases, 12 bottles each, Pauillac.
22 cases, 12 bottles each, St. Emilion.
30 cases, 12 bottles each, St. Julien.
10 cases, 12 bottles each, Cru de Flausac, Larronde Freres.
50 cases, 24 half bottles each, Cru de Flausac, Larronde Freres.
36 cases, 12 bottles each, St. Cloud, Larronde Freres.
25 cases, 24 half bottles each, St. Cloud, Larronde Freres.
25 cases, 12 bottles each, Margaux, Larronde Freres.
50 cases, 24 half bottles each, Margaux, Larronde Freres.
25 cases, 12 bottles each, Haute Brion, Larronde Freres.
25 cases, 12 bottles each, Carbonne, Larronde Freres.
3000 cases, 12 bottles each, Eagle Brand.
25 cases, 24 half bottles each, Eagle Brand.
100 cases, 12 bottles each, Martinet.

WHITE WINE.

50 casks WHITE WINE, Good Ordinary.
40 half casks WHITE WINE, Superior.
164 cases, 12 bottles each, Cotes de Rions.
1000 cases, 12 bottles each, Graves U. Chisey & Co.
50 cases, 12 bottles each, WHITE WINE, Graves.
25 cases, 12 bottles each, Haut Sauternes.
2 cases, 12 bottles each, Chateau Yquem, A. de Luze & Fils.

PORT AND SHERRY.

120 quarters PORT, Paul Emile Thomas.
100 quarters SHERRY, Paul Emile Thomas.
150 quarters PORT, B. Reig.
50 quarters SHERRY, B. Reig.
25 eighths SHERRY, B. Reig.
25 eighths PORT, B. Reig.
50 quarters PORT, F. M.
150 cases SHERRY, ex London Docks.

SUNDRIES.

300 cases BRANDY CHERRIES, Cabinet.
50 cases BRANDY FRUITS, Cabinet.
32 bales CORKS, various qualities.
47 cases EMPTY BOTTLES.
64 cases COGNAC, Delattre & Worms.
100 cases COGNAC, 00 Gautier Freres.
25 cases COGNAC, 000 Gautier Freres.
25 cases COGNAC, 0000 Gautier Freres.
50 cases COGNAC, Imperial, Finest, Gautier Freres.
130 cases BURGUNDY WINE.

In store and landing ex ships Hilda and Denike, from Bordeaux, and for sale by

VOR. MAIGNAN & F. LABORDE,

jal 2t 23 and 25 Bienville street.

CHINESE LABORERS.

CHINESE LABORERS,

Now is the time for Planters, Merchants, Manufacturers, Housekeepers, etc., to order good and reliable Chinese Laborers, Mechanics, House Servants, etc.

Apply at the office of the

"Chinese Emigration Company,"

No. 30 Perdido street,

Between Carondelet and Baronne streets,

Up stairs, Front Office.

BRANCH OFFICES,

Hong Kong, China, and San Francisco, California. de23 3m

FRUIT AND ORNAMENTAL TREES.

JOHN NELSON (Successor to John M. Nelson), Proprietor of the MAGNOLIA NURSERY, has reopened at the OLD DEPOT, corner of Camp and Lafayette streets, with a superior stock of FRUIT and ORNAMENTAL TREES, Green House Plants, etc., and respectfully solicits the patronage of his friends, the friends of the late proprietor, and the public generally. All orders from the city or country will receive prompt and careful attention. Catalogues furnished on application.

Address: JOHN NELSON,

Corner Camp and Lafayette streets,

de20 1m New Orleans.

IN BANKRUPTCY.

ESTATE OF HARVEY McMAHON & CO., and of Robert B. Harvey, Thomas McMahon and William Forstall, individually.

OFFICE OF UNITED STATES MARSHAL, District of Louisiana. New Orleans, December 24, 1870.

THIS IS TO GIVE NOTICE THAT ON THE twenty-fourth day of December, A. D. 1870, a warrant in bankruptcy was issued against the estates of Harvey McMahon & Co., and of Robert B. Harvey, Thomas McMahon and William Forstall, individually, of New Orleans, in the parish of Orleans, and State of Louisiana, who have as a firm and individually been adjudged bankrupts on their own petition, that the payment of any debts and delivery of any property belonging to such bankrupts, to them or for their use, and the transfer of any property by them are forbidden by law; that a meeting of the creditors of said bankrupts, to prove their debts and to choose one or more assignees of their estates, will be held at a Court of Bankruptcy, to be holden at New Orleans, in the Customhouse building, before C. S. Kellogg, Register, on the twenty-fourth day of January, A. D. 1871, at nine o'clock A. M.

S. B. PACKARD,

United States Marshal, District of Louisiana.

de27 ja24

MARSHAL'S MONITIONS.

W. G. Coyle & Co. vs. Steamboat Travis Wright.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, District of Louisiana, No. 9630.—In obedience to an admiralty warrant, to me directed in the above entitled suit, I have seized and taken into my possession—

The steamboat TRAVIS WRIGHT, now libeled by W. G. Coyle & Co., for the causes set forth in the libel now pending in the District Court of the United States.

And I do hereby cite and admonish the owner or owners thereof, and all and every person or persons having or pretending to have any right, title or interest in or to the same, to be and appear at a District Court of the United States, for the District aforesaid, to be holden at the city of New Orleans, on or before the first Monday of February, 1871, to show cause, if any they have or can, why the said steamboat Travis Wright should not be condemned and be sold agreeably to the prayer of libelants.

United States Marshal's office, tenth day of January, 1871.

S. B. PACKARD,

United States Marshal.

Schooner Queen of the South, Captain and owners vs. steamship De Soto and tugboat Neafie.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, District of Louisiana, No. 9636.—In obedience to an admiralty warrant, to me directed in the above entitled suit, I have seized and taken into my possession—

The tugboat NEAFIE, now libeled by the schooner Queen of the South, captain and owners, for the causes set forth in the libel now pending in the District Court of the United States.

And I do hereby cite and admonish the owner or owners thereof, and all or any persons having or pretending to have any right, title or interest in or to the same, to be and appear at a District Court of the United States, for the district aforesaid, to be holden at the city of New Orleans, on or before the first Monday of February, 1871, to show cause, if any they have or can, why the said tugboat Neafie should not be condemned and be sold agreeably to the prayer of libelants.

United States Marshal's Office, New Orleans, 11th day of January, 1871.

S. B. PACKARD,

United States Marshal.

ja 10 17 24

Aleus, Scherck & Autey vs. Steamboat Lizzie Hopkins.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, District