New Orleans Republican.

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE UNITED STATES

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF NEW ORLEANS

DEBATES OF THE HOUSE.

MONDAY, February 27, 1871.

Speaker Carter in the chair.

BILL AMENDING THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT.

This bill being before the House—

Mr. Moncure, of Caddo: Mr. Speaker, I regret to be under the necessity of opposing the adoption of these amendments: I oppose the adoption, first, because I do not know what are contained in these amendments, and I would ask the forbearance of this House and respectfully ask the attention of the House while I state a few facts in connection with this matter—

Mr. Carr, of De Soto: I rise to a point of order that the amendments have already been adopted.

The Speaker ruled that the amendments had been adopted, and that the bill was before the House on its third reading.

Mr. Moncure, of Caddo: If I can not do anything more, Mr. Speaker, I shall oppose the adoption of the charter as amended. If the journal of the House shows that these amendments have been adopted, then I oppose the adoption of the charter, and I appeal to the House not to put upon us a charter which we do not want. I want to state facts in connection with this matter, and I ask the House to hear with me a few moments while I do so. I shall address my remarks to the bill as amended, and ask the House to vote it down. When the charter of the city of Shreveport came up some days ago, a motion was made to refer the charter to the delegates from the parish of Caddo and the parish of Bossier. What the delegates from the parish of Bossier had to do with it, I did not know then, and did not know until now. I was a member of that committee when these amendments were adopted, and I give this as a reason why that charter should not now be passed by the House: when these amendments were offered to that charter I was a member of that committee, and the balance of the committee, without saying one word to me, without giving me any opportunity of being heard, though I am a resident of the city of Shreveport; and though I am the representative of that parish on this floor, and without saying anything to me brought in the amendments, and the first intimation I had that a meeting had been called of that committee was when these amendments were presented before this House. Now, I appeal to the House, I appeal to their fairness and their honesty, is it right, just or honest that a member upon this floor appointed upon a committee, deeply interested in the questions involved in that charter, should be completely ignored, not permitted to enter into the deliberations of that committee? And, Mr. Speaker, who are the men, who are the men who undertake thus to thrust upon the people of the city of Shreveport this charter? Are they men to the manor born of that city or of that parish? No; they are men of but yesterday—mere mushrooms upon our society, who have undertaken to construct a charter for the government of these people against the wishes of the people themselves. A charter was sent here from the Common Council of the city of Shreveport, a charter which had received the sanction of the people of that city, and I do say it upon this floor, a charter without one single objectionable feature in it, and it was not considered objectionable here, because the Senator from Caddo and Ouachita introduced it in the Senate and passed it through that body. If there was anything objectionable in it, Mr. Antoine certainly would have discovered it, and he certainly would not have been guilty of presenting a charter in the Senate and passing it through the Senate with objectionable features in it. What these gentlemen propose I do not know: what these amendments contain I do not know. To this extent I am perfectly ignorant of the character of the charter which they propose to foist upon our people; and I do say it is not proper toward the House to treat a member of this House from that parish in this way. I am not competent to discuss the merits of this bill, but I do not think it is proper that a charter should go through this Legislature and become the active incorporation of the city of Shreveport unless full opportunity has been allowed to have its merits discussed. I am informed, not by any of these gentlemen, but otherwise, that it increases the municipal expenses of our city government. If it does, as a matter of course I shall oppose it on that ground: but what are these provisions? I am unable to say because I was not told—because I had no opportunity of reading what the amendments contain. I would therefore move that the charter be recommitted to the committee with instructions to have it printed so that we may know what we are voting upon.

Mr. Carr, of De Soto: I move the final passage of the bill, and upon that I wish to have the floor. The gentleman says that the Republican members of this House are forcing down the throats of the people of Shreveport this charter; that the persons who framed this charter are not to the manor born. He himself is not to the manor born. I maintain the city of Shreveport needs a charter; that it needs just such a charter as this. They need a loyal government; they need a good government; they need a government so that a Republican can live in the city of Shreveport and express his opinions. Is it so to-day? Look at the city of Shreveport in the last election; look at the epithets which were hurled against the Republicans of this State and against the chief executive when he was making a tour through the State. Nothing that they could say was too bad for us. Thieves, scoundrels and scalawags were too good. They even went further. They were not satisfied with that, but they said we were political vampires; that we had come there to rob and to steal; that we had no right there; that we were preying upon the people of this State, and that we had come to the city of Shreveport to prey there. Now, sir, the city and people who say this, who would hurl such epithets as these at the chief executive of our State, I say they need a good government, a loyal government; they need just such a charter as this, and we intend to give it to them. I, for one, while I am a Republican upon this floor, shall be always in favor of giving every city in this State a loyal government, so that I can go there and say what I please. I am a Republican. I am no Democrat. I want to go to the city of Shreveport to make my political speeches, if I have a mind to. You can not do it in the city of Shreveport to-day; you could not do it at the last election; but by God, we intend that it shall be done.

Mr. Moncure, of Caddo: In decent language, Mr. Speaker, I call the gentleman to order.

Mr. Carr, of De Soto: We want a loyal mayor in that city, we want a loyal council, and we demand protection for every man, be he black or white, Republican or Democrat. We want a loyal government there and everywhere else in our State, where they point the finger of scorn at us when we go there.

This is the kind of city government we are going to give you, and the sooner you accept it the better for you. We will give it to the city of Baton Rouge, and if the city of Shreveport don't take it we will make them. We are tired of this thing and are not going to stand any such epithets hurled at any one in this State. We have given a loyal government to New Orleans, we have given it to Baton Rouge, and we will give it to Shreveport. While we are in power we will demand, and see that our laws are executed, and we will have a loyal city government in every city in this State, in every town and every hamlet. Now, sir, I have read this charter; I have examined it, and the amendments are very good. I grant you they don't suit the gentleman from Shreveport; they don't suit those who are to the manor born, but I will give a little advice. Let them learn to respect the government under which they live; let them learn to respect every man, and not curse and revile him because he happens to differ with them in politics; and if they don't learn that, we will make them, and this is one of the means. I move the final passage of the bill.

Mr. Bentley, of St. Mary: Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Caddo rose upon this floor and stated that this was referred to a delegation, I was struck by a feeling of courtesy and justice toward that gentleman to rise and ask the chairman of that delegation whether that was the fact or not, and if the chairman had stated that these facts were true, I would have been one to move that that report be recommitted to that delegation; but when the gentleman forgets himself and goes aside so far as to say that the members of this delegation were nothing but mushrooms, men of yesterday, he casts a reflection upon the representatives of several of the parishes of this State which neutralizes all demands of justice upon this body.

It is a style of speaking which I will vote down here, and I think we will vote it down upon this floor. I am not in favor of anything unjust. I want all men to have their rights and privileges, by all means. The Representative from Caddo has rights and privileges upon this floor, but I do say that the time for using that language and the spirit which prompted it has gone by. I want it to be understood that the soil of Louisiana has been paid for by Yankee dollars; every foot of it belongs to the United States government, no matter who lives here; and I claim the right to walk over every foot of it; so does every Republican in this State. It has been proved to my satisfaction that in the city of Shreveport men of my opinions can not live there in peace. So long as that exists I am in favor of anything that will create a change. I am going to vote for this charter. I am not in favor of forcing a charter on them, but I want to teach these people to be fair toward all men, even if they are Republicans. We are not performing any act of tyranny. We are just securing the rights, privileges and immunities to a portion of the people of Shreveport; and there are those there to-day who will hail with joy this new charter. I for one will vote for it.

Mr. Moncure, of Caddo: I will not detain the House but a few moments. The declarations made by the gentleman from De Soto [Mr. Carr] are absolutely untrue in respect to the city of Shreveport.

The Speaker: Come to order. That is improper language.

Mr. Moncure, of Caddo: I say, Mr. Speaker, and I certainly have a right to say, that those statements are not true. The people of Shreveport have been vilified; the people of Shreveport have been misrepresented.

The Speaker: The gentleman has been called to order. The gentleman from De Soto was called to order when he used improper language.

Mr. Moncure, of Caddo: The gentleman from De Soto was not called to order when he made those misrepresentations. I say that they are unqualifiedly misrepresentations; I say that law and order prevails in the city of Shreveport, as much as in the city of Boston to-day; I say that a man is as safe in his life, limb and property to-day as in the city of Boston; I say that the gentleman has made misrepresentations. He states that the Governor went up to this city recently, and was insulted in Shreveport. I say that the Governor and his whole party expressed themselves gratified at their reception and with their treatment in the city of Shreveport, and unless the Governor said what he did not feel or what was not the fact, he was satisfied with his reception and treatment there. I do not know where the gentleman [Mr. Carr] obtained his information from. I do not know that he has even remained long enough at any one time in the parish of De Soto, which is the adjoining parish to ours, to get information as to the character of the people of Shreveport and the parish of Caddo. I doubt that he has ever been there long enough, and where he derives his information from I don't know, but wherever he got it it is false.

Mr. Carr, of De Soto: I will tell the gentleman. From the city papers of Shreveport—the *Southwestern* and the *Bulletin*—Democratic organs every one.

Mr. Moncure, of Caddo: Their own papers denounce Democratic principles as these papers denounce Republicans.

Mr. Carr, of De Soto: That sounds well.

Mr. Moncure, of Caddo: But is that a reason for forcing on us this charter, because a political paper denounces a political party and the members of that political party; therefore, law and order does not prevail in the city of Shreveport. There are three Republicans in this Legislature from the city of Shreveport, and yet a man is unsafe in his life and limb in that city. There are in this House two Republicans, and one in the Senate, from the city of Shreveport, and yet this well informed De Soto gentleman—member from De Soto, but not member in De Soto—this well informed member from De Soto has such correct information in respect to Shreveport that no man can express his sentiments there if he is a Republican.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I appeal to you not to commit yourselves to allow Mr. Carr, so-called from De Soto, the so-called member from De Soto, to dictate to this House. Does he dictate to this House what they shall vote for, or what they shall not vote for? He says we give you this; we will give you such and such a charter; we will give it to you. Who are we? Is he the spokesman of this Legislature? Is he the leader of this House?

Mr. H. Lott, of Rapides: I want to ask the gentleman a question about men being allowed to express their opinions. How about Governor Warmoth in Shreveport?

Mr. Moncure, of Caddo: I will answer the gentleman from Rapides with a good deal of pleasure. Governor Warmoth came to Shreveport and addressed the people of Shreveport from a Democratic stand, by invitation of the Democratic party in Shreveport. Governor Warmoth expressed himself highly gratified with his reception there by these people. If the gentleman does not believe me, let him ask Governor Warmoth himself. I simply desire to appeal to the House to know whether they intend to permit a member who has declared what he intends to do with respect to Shreveport, whether or not they intend to follow him, to take this charter and cram it down our throats, whether we will or no, without any information on earth about it. I have done, sit.

Mr. Carr, of De Soto: As the gentleman has seen fit to make me the subject of his speeches, and said so much about my representing the parish of De Soto, I would like to ask how he came here? Not by the vote of the people of that parish. I happen to know a little about how he came here. It may not be known to the members of this House, but there is to-day one of the ballot-boxes in the parish of Caddo which has never been counted, and why? Because the Democrats ran the commissioner off to Texas, and he either had to go there or die.

Mr. Moncure, of Caddo: That's false.

Mr. Carr, of De Soto: That is why the gentleman from Caddo comes to sit here, and I say here that if that box was counted he would be elected to stay at home—

Mr. Antoine, of Orleans: I rise to a point of order. I would have been pleased to have learned before about that commissioner having been run away from Shreveport. The gentleman now comes and says the member is not entitled to his seat. I would like the gentleman to have informed me before and I would have known what action to take in regard to that case.

Mr. Carr, of De Soto: I now move the previous question on the final passage of the bill.

The main question was ordered and the bill finally passed by a recorded vote of 67 to 27.

CONTESTED ELECTION CASE OF FRANK ALEXANDER VS. B. BUCHANAN.

This being the special order of the day for this time—

Mr. Barrett, of Orleans: I move to adopt the report of the committee.

Mr. Bentley, of St. Mary: I wish to call the attention of the House to a few facts in this case before the question is put. I think we should vote intelligently. There should be no haste. We do not wish to wrong anybody.

The reading of the report was here demanded.

The report having been read—

Mr. Bentley, of St. Mary: Mr. Speaker, by the official election returns, Mr. Buchanan received upward of 1500 votes, and this man the committee recommend to take Mr. Buchanan's seat, Mr. Alexander, received but 157 votes, and some good Democrat received 145. I don't suppose that anybody will doubt there are upward of 2000 voters in the fifth district. If there are 2000 voters, I say that it is an error in mathematical calculation on the part of that committee to recommend that a man receiving 157 votes should take his seat here. If 1500 votes were improperly put in the box, the election is not valid, and it should be returned to the people. Mr. Alexander has no right to a seat on this floor. Mr. Buchanan has demonstrated to my satisfaction that he is an honest man, in his speech the other day, that he is not going to defraud anybody of his rights, and I merely ask for a clear and impartial investigation of his case. It seems even, that the committee have gone over this matter. Perhaps they could get more evidence. I have known evidence in my time that that committee has failed to have taken. I hope that, instead of that report of the committee being accepted, you will order the election to be sent back to the people, or else seat Mr. Buchanan.

Mr. Barrett, of Orleans: The gentleman has just made a remark here that Mr. Buchanan is elected by a large majority. Mr. Carr has stated upon this floor that one gentleman is improperly occupying a seat here. Now, sir, I am impartial as to every one of these gentlemen, but as I am here to do justice it makes no difference to me whether a man is a Democrat or Republican. If I have evidence that he was legitimately elected I am prepared in a proper spirit to give him his seat. It has been said that the grossest frauds have been perpetrated in the parish of De Soto. I am satisfied that the gentleman from De Soto is no better Republican than I am. It is not my purpose to allow any gentleman to rise from his seat upon the floor, let him be Democrat or Republican, and charge upon me what I know is not right. It is a well known fact that certain gentlemen have occupied their seats upon this floor, who have been seated, were very anxious to have these contested cases come up as long as they were in doubt about their seats, but just as soon as they take their seats upon this floor by vote of this House, they keep on putting off and putting off other cases. Such charged gentlemen here with being partial. I have read this testimony carefully, and I have seen the report of the committee, and shall vote as my conscience dictates to me to vote. I have nothing against Mr. Buchanan. If I think Mr. Buchanan is entitled to his seat on this floor, when my name is called I shall vote for him. If I think Mr. Alexander is the legitimate nominee coming from the Republican party, I shall vote for him. But it seems to me, gentlemen who were so anxious to have their cases tried should not object to having other cases decided. Now, on one or two occasions I have called for the previous question. My reasons were to stop off this discussion. This question has been before the House five or six weeks, and gentlemen have had plenty of time to study the testimony and satisfy their minds who was the legitimate representative on this floor.

I now move the adoption of the report, and upon that I call for the previous question.

Mr. Brewster, of Ouachita: I move to amend by referring the election back to the people.

The resolution as amended was adopted.

[Mr. Moncure, of Caddo, in the chair.]

The Governor's veto of what is known as the pork inspection bill having been read—

Mr. Burch, of East Baton Rouge: The first point I wish to make in regard to that veto, Mr. Speaker, and if I am wrong I want to be corrected, is that this veto comes too late. The bill to which the veto refers was passed, I believe, last Tuesday, and the receipt for the same, I believe, is in possession of the House. I will have to ask the Clerk if he had the receipt for that bill and the date it was received—

The Clerk of the House: February twenty-first.

Mr. Burch, of East Baton Rouge: That was last Tuesday. The Governor says he has been unable sooner to arrive at this on account of some person stealing it, or something. They have got in the way of stealing papers here lately, somehow or another, but I do not think that in this case the bill should be defeated on that score. This bill, I believe, in connection with other bills, especially the slaughterhouse bill, passed the same day. One bill came here Saturday, and it was promptly acted on. This bill has come here to-day. By the limitation law, the time expired on Saturday. This is the first point I wish to make. The second point to which I would call the attention of the House is the fact that objection is raised to this bill on the ground of its charging so much for each barrel. I would call the attention of the House to the Revised Statutes of Louisiana. Turn to pages 366 and 367, where the law creates an inspector of pork, in section 1857. It says the inspector shall be entitled to demand and receive, for every barrel of pork and beef he shall inspect, thirty-three and one-third cents, besides the price of salt, saltpetre and other services. This is the law of 1855. This law has been in effect ever since that time, and every man who held this position has received thirty-three and one-third cents for his services. Now to-day the objection comes in, if I understand rightly, on that score—that it is not constitutional to charge this price, when, by the law of 1855, that has been standing from year to year, this was the compensation fixed. We do not fix this compensation in the bill which has passed the Senate and House; but we find it upon the statute books of the State of Louisiana, a law which has been in operation since 1855. Now, I submit to the House these two propositions: First, whether this veto has arrived here in its proper time, the time designated by the law for the return of bills; and, secondly, to the fact that this law has been on the statute books since 1855; that it only gives the old compensation of thirty-three and one-third cents. Therefore, ere I take my seat I would ask the attention of the house to the fact that on these two points are based this bill: First, that this bill was not sent back in proper time; and, secondly, that this charge is upon the statute books of this State, and therefore correct and proper.

Mr. Yorke, of Carroll: I differ with the gentleman who has just spoken in regard to the time. The bill reached the Governor upon the twenty-first, which was Tuesday. That day, as I understand, does not count, and Wednesday, the twenty-second, was a legal holiday. The Sunday after does not count, which makes this bill come inside of the five days which were allowed to the Governor to send his veto in.

Mr. Carter, of Cameron: Please state by what authority you exclude Sundays and legal holidays out of the five days.

Mr. York, of Carrol: I think it has always been understood in the State of Louisiana that Sunday is a legal holiday.

Mr. Burch, of East Baton Rouge: By law of the State of Louisiana the Legislature sits sixty days, and Sundays are included. Every member of this House draws pay for Sundays, although he does no work. I want to find out whether this same law applies.

The Speaker pro tem: I wish the gentleman from Carroll would give his authority for the information of the House.

Mr. Yorke, of Carroll: I can not refer you to the exact section of the law at the present moment, but I am under the impression that Sunday is considered a legal holiday in this State. The gentleman from De Soto has the law, which he will refer you to.

Mr. Carr, of De Soto: In regard to whether the Governor is right or not, I simply call the attention of the House to the constitution. Section sixty-six of the constitution says that "every bill which shall have passed both houses shall be presented to the Governor. If he approves he shall sign it; if he does not, he shall return it, with his objections, to the house in which it originated, which shall be entered at large upon the journal, and the house shall at once proceed to reconsider it. If, after such reconsideration," etc.

Then it goes on and says:

"If any bill shall not be returned by the Governor after five days after it shall have been presented to him, it shall be a law in like manner as if he had signed it, unless the General Assembly, by adjournment, prevents its return, in which case the bill shall be returned on the first day of meeting of the General Assembly."

Now, this bill was presented to the Governor on Tuesday last. The first day does not count; the next day was the twenty-second of February, which is made a national holiday by act of Congress, and also by the law of this State. As a matter of course, holidays can not count because they are not legal days. Five days by the constitution means five legal days—it must mean five legal days.

Mr. Burch, of East Baton Rouge: I refuse to allow the gentleman to revise the constitution in his seat.

Mr. Carr, of De Soto: Let him refer to the decision of the Supreme Court or any court in this land, or any court in any other land, which says that five days are not five legal days, and I will give it up.

Mr. H. Lott, of Rapides: If the Governor was to appoint the gentleman to an office on the twenty-second of February, would it be legal?

Mr. Carr, of De Soto: If this does not mean five legal days, I would like to ask the gentleman himself, or any member of this House: Suppose a note comes due on the twenty-second of February, does that count? You have to take it up the day before.

Mr. Burch, of East Baton Rouge: I rise to a point of order. The gentleman is bounding on financial practice, and we are now on legislative practice, and I say that the same laws that govern legislative acts govern everything connected with it. The gentleman drew his pay for Washington's birthday.

Mr. Carr, of De Soto: That is all bosh. It does not amount to anything. The twenty-second of February being a legal holiday, is not a legal day, and any promise to pay due upon that day, by the law of every State, will have to be taken up on the day preceding if that is not a legal day. Therefore the Governor is quite within the five days.

Now about the bill. This bill makes it compulsory. The article of the Revised Statutes that is there now does not make it compulsory upon a person receiving beef or pork, but they can take it to the inspector and have it inspected for the protection of those who purchase. But this bill is compulsory. It is another tax upon the consumers of this beef and pork. It compels every barrel of beef and pork which comes to this city to be taken to this inspector's warehouse and by him inspected, for which he collects money. This is about as direct a tax as you can put upon a barrel of pork. It is a tax upon the consumer and the people. The gentleman calls attention to the law of 1855, article 1857, which allows the inspector to charge thirty-three and one-third cents. I grant that this is true. That law is there, but by sections 1858 and 1859 it is not made compulsory to have this pork and beef inspected. Are there members upon this floor who are going to pass a law to compel every barrel of pork and beef that comes to this city to pass under the scrutiny of one man? We might as well tax sugar or flour. We might as well make a place for this man where he will make ten or twelve thousand dollars a year, as this man will do in this place. I tell you it is an unjust tax, one which exists in no city of the Union, and no city in the world.

Mr. Burch, of East Baton Rouge: I am very glad to hear the gentleman at last advocate the protection of the people from taxation, and I would call his attention to other legislative bills, and see that the people are not cheated in them as well. What objection is there in this bill? The gentleman here says that a man might make ten thousand dollars out of it. If that is the case, he should state his objection to it as being personal; but that is a very poor reason to object to any bill. I hold that this law is for the protection of all consumers of beef and pork, for this reason: There is no man upon this floor but who has used these necessary commodities, and has bought a barrel of beef or pork, but who expects to have it weigh its legitimate weight, and he does not wish it to be half meat, half brine. We know that barrels of pork come down, have the heads knocked out, and eight, ten or fifteen pounds of meat taken out. Now, sir, that's what's the matter. I would just as lieve one man could make eight or ten thousand dollars a year by examining this pork as for these merchants to make a hundred thousand dollars a year by cheating the working people of this State, selling them short weight. This bill is for that very purpose. It is to make those merchants bring their barrels of beef and pork, have them inspected, sell consumers full weight, and give them what they buy, and not half brine; and all this cry of those merchants against the bill and their asking it to be vetoed is because it interferes with their robbing men. This bill is here on the statute books of the State since 1855. It was re-enacted in 1870. You can find it here to-day, and this House should see these appointees are protected in their appointments. Believing this, I move that the bill become a law, the Governor's veto to the contrary notwithstanding, and on that I call the previous question.

Mr. Barrett, of Orleans, withdrew his call for the previous question, in order to allow Mr. Faulkner to speak to the question.

Mr. Faulkner, of Caldwell: Mr. Speaker, a good deal has been said in regard to the veto message of the Governor, and in regard to the provisions of this bill. We have had a law for a number of years relating to the inspection of beef and pork, and the charges imposed by this bill are the same; but the particular feature of this bill is this, that it does compel the inspection of beef and pork. That is just the very reason why I am in favor of it, and I will state my reasons. I cannot comprehend why anybody should oppose this bill, unless they were connected, or expected to be connected, with some trade ring. My recollection, experience and memory teaches me this, for nearly a quarter of a century I have bought beef and pork, and so have my neighbors, and the complaint has always been general, that we did not get the amount the commercial law requires, that is two hundred pounds, because it was manipulated so in the city by trade rings, and there was no compulsion to have it inspected. It was handled and re-handled, and when it found its way into the interior of the country, and got weighed out, it would fall forty or fifty, or sixty, and sometimes seventy pounds short of what commercial law and honest trading requires. We have a law authorizing inspection. This bill creates no new office, not a bit of it. Some of my friends asked me a few minutes ago if it created a new office. It does not. It only compels this article of trade to be properly inspected, so that if any person buys it he will get what commercial law and honesty requires; that is, two hundred pounds, and not one hundred and twenty, or thirty, or forty, or fifty, or sixty pounds. What does any one care about thirty-three and one-third cents? You pay that anyhow, inspection or no inspection. That enters the matter anyhow and ought to make this protection thorough. If they sell a barrel of beef or pork, not inspected, they are subject to a fine of ten dollars. That provision makes a man honest whether he wants to be honest or not. He is bound to sell two hundred pounds of beef to the barrel. That's all perfectly harmless. I believe enough has been said in regard to this matter. I think it is a matter of very grave doubt whether this bill has been brought into the House with the objections of the Governor, within the provisions of the law. That bill was submitted to the Governor on the twenty-first of February. Something was said about the twenty-second of February by the gentleman from De Soto [Mr. Carr]. Now I would like the gentleman to show me that the twenty-second is not a legal day. I would like to see that. I never heard of a man refusing to pay an obligation because it was signed on the twenty second of February. I know it is a public holiday. It is a national day, but a contract made or entered into or signed on the twenty-second of February is just as legally binding as on the twenty-first or twenty-third. That is the experience I have about the twenty-second of February.

Mr. Waters, of Orleans: I would like to ask the gentleman if he ever paid a note on the twenty-second of February?

Mr. Faulkner, of Caldwell: I have paid as many obligations on that day as on any other day. Now, in reference to the sixty days, we all know what Sunday is. No one pretends to say that Sunday is a legal day, but we all know that Sundays are included in the sixty days, as the legal session of the Legislature; Washington's birthday, too. In regard to counting time, I have one or two words to say. The Legislature by law assembles on a certain day. The day it assembles is counted. If it assembles on the twenty-first, twenty-third or twenty-fifth, whatever day, it is counted, and the sixty days are counted from the day the Legislature assembles, until the day that it adjourns, Sundays inclusive. This bill went to the Governor on the twenty-first; counting time, as we measure it, it makes seven days that it has been in the hands of the Governor. I wish to state that fact. This bill creates no new office, creates no extra officer with no extra compensation, but it enforces inspection, for the protection of the people of certain articles of necessity to the people; and I tell you where you find one man opposed to this bill you will find ten thousand in favor of it—of the people, the bone and sinew of the people, that make up the people in general. A few traders in the city of New Orleans, as a matter of course, are opposed to it. They buy and sell meat. Therefore, I hope this house will pass this bill, the veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding, and on that I call the previous question.

The main question was ordered, and the veto was sustained by a vote of 11 nays to 78 yeas.

The House adjourned at three until half-past seven P. M.

LAWS OF THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY.

No. 1.

AN ACT

Appropriating the sum of two hundred and fifty thousand ($250,000) dollars, for the payment of members, officers, employes and contingent expenses of the General Assembly of the State of Lousiana.

SECTION 1. Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana in general assembly convened, That the sum of two hundred and fifty thousand ($250,000) dollars, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be and the same is hereby appropriated out of any moneys now in the treasury or the first money hereafter paid into the treasury to the credit of the general fund, to pay the mileage and per diem of members of the Senate and House of Representatives, and to pay the officers and employes and contingent expenses of both houses of the General Assembly; the warrants to be registered in the office of the State Treasurer and paid in accordance with date of registry.

SEC. 2. Be it further enacted, etc., That this act shall take effect from and after its passage.

(Signed) MORTIMER CARR,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
(Signed) OSCAR J. DUNN,
Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.

Approved January 10, 1871.
(Signed) H. C. WARMOTH,
Governor of the State of Louisiana.

A true copy:
GEO. E. BOVEE,
Secretary of State.

No. 2.

AN ACT

To apportion the State into senatorial districts, and to fix the number of Representatives to be elected from each parish and representative district in the State, and designating in what districts Senators are to be elected where there has been a change in the senatorial districts, and repealing all other laws on the subject.

SECTION 1. Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana in general assembly convened, That with a view to the apportionment of the State into senatorial and representative districts, the State shall be divided into the following senatorial districts, to wit—

The first, second and third representative districts of New Orleans shall form one senatorial district, and elect three Senators.

The fourth, fifth and sixth representative districts of New Orleans shall form one district, and elect two Senators.

The seventh, eighth and ninth representative districts of New Orleans, and the parish of St. Bernard shall form one district, and elect two Senators.

The tenth representative district of New Orleans shall form one district, and elect one Senator.

Orleans, right bank, and the parish of Plaquemines shall form one district, and elect one Senator.

The twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth wards of the city of New Orleans, and the parishes of Jefferson, St. Charles and St. John the Baptist shall form one district, and elect two Senators.

The parishes of Ascension and St. James shall form one district, and elect one Senator.

The parishes of Assumption, Lafourche and Terrebonne shall form one district, and elect two Senators.

The parishes of Vermilion and St. Mary shall form one district, and elect one Senator.

The parishes of Calcasieu, Lafayette, St. Landry and Cameron shall form one district, and elect two Senators.

The parishes of Livingston, St. Helena, Washington, St. Tammany and Tangipahoa shall form one district, and elect one Senator.

The parishes of Pointe Coupee, East Feliciana and West Feliciana shall form one district, and elect two Senators.

The parish of East Baton Rouge shall form one district, and elect one Senator.

The parishes of West Baton Rouge, Iberia, Iberville and St. Martin shall form one district, and elect two Senators.

The parishes of Concordia and Avoyelles shall form one district, and elect one Senator.

The parishes of Tensas and Franklin shall form one district, and elect one Senator.

The parishes of Carroll, Madison, Richland and Morehouse shall form one district, and elect two Senators.

The parishes of Ouachita and Caldwell shall form one district, and elect one Senator.

The parishes of Jackson and Union shall form one district, and elect one Senator.

The parishes of Bossier, Bienville and Claiborne shall form one district, and elect two Senators.

The parish of Caddo shall form one district, and elect one Senator.

The parishes of De Soto, Natchitoches and Sabine shall form one district, and elect two Senators.

The parish of Rapides shall form one district, and elect one Senator.

The parishes of Catahoula, Grant and Winn shall form one district and elect one Senator.

Thirty-six Senators in all.

The Representatives in the House of Representatives shall be as follows:

For the parish of Orleans—

First representative district (First Ward), two.

Second representative district (Second Ward), three.

Third representative district (Third Ward), four.

Fourth representative district (Fourth Ward), two.

Fifth representative district (Fith Ward), two.

Sixth representative district (Sixth Ward), one.

Seventh representative district (Seventh Ward), two.

Eighth representative district (Eigkth Ward), one.

Ninth representative district (Ninth Ward), two.

Tenth representative district (Tenth and Eleventh Wards), three.

Eleventh representative district (Twelfth, Thirteenth and Fourteenth Wards), two.

Orleans, right bank, one.
Ascension, two.
Assumption, two.
Avoyelles, two.
Baton Rouge, East, three.
Baton Rouge West, one.
Bienville, one.
Bossier, two.
Caddo, three.
Calcasieu, one.
Caldwell, one.
Carroll, two.
Catahoula, one.
Claiborne, two.
Concordia, two.
De Soto, two.
Feliciana, East, two.
Feliciana, West, one.
Franklin, one.
Iberville, two.
Jackson, one.
Jefferson, three.
Lafayette, one.
Lafourche, two.
Livingston, one.
Madison, one.
Morehouse, one.
Natchitoches, two.
Ouachita, two.
Plaquemines, one.
Pointe Coupee, two.
Rapides, three.
Sabine, one.
St. Bernard, one.
St. Charles, one.
St. Helena, one.
St. James, two.
St. John Baptist, one.
St. Landry, four.
St. Martin, two.
St. Mary, two.
St. Tammany, one.
Tensas, two.
Terrebonne, two.
Union, one.
Vermilion, one.
Washington, one.
Winn, one.
Richland, one.
Cameron, one.
Grant, one.
Iberia, one.
Tangipahoa, one.
Total, one hundred and seven.

(Signed) GEO. W. CARTER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
(Signed) OSCAR J. DUNN,
Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.

A true copy,
GEO. E. BOVEE,
Secretary of State.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.—The foregoing act having been presented to the Governor of the State of Louisiana for his approval, and not having been returned by him to the house of the General Assembly in which it originated within the time prescribed by the constitution of the State of Louisiana, has become a law without his approval.

GEO. E. BOVEE,
Secretary of State.

No. 3.

AN ACT

To change the venue in the case of David Fisher, J. C. Oliver and Celestine Oliver from Ascension parish to the parish of Jefferson.

WHEREAS, It having been represented that a fair and impartial trial can not be had before the district court of the parish of Ascension, in the Fourth Judicial District, in the case of David Fisher, J. C. Oliver and Celestine Oliver, charged with murder; therefore,

SECTION 1. Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana in general assembly convened, That the venue in the case of David Fisher, J. C. Oliver and Celestine Oliver, charged with murder in the parish of Ascension, be and is changed to the parish of Jefferson.

SEC. 2. Be it further enacted, etc., That this act shall take effect from and after its passage.

(Signed) GEO. W. CARTER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
(Signed) OSCAR J. DUNN,
Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.

A true copy:
GEO. E. BOVEE,
Secretary of State.

The foregoing act having been presented to the Governor of the State of Louisiana for his approval, and not having been returned by him to the house of the General Assembly in which it originated within the time prescribed by the constitution of the State of Louisiana, has become a law without his approval.

GEO. E. BOVEE,
Secretary of State.

No. 16.

AN ACT

Granting an appropriation of money to remove the obstructions from the Amite river as high up as the Governor's Bluff, the Bayou Manchac to Hampton's ferry, the Tickfaw river to Lorin Chapman's, the Blood river to Duncan's Bluff, and the Netalbany river to Springfield.

SECTION 1. Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, in general assembly convened, That Charles Sclassie, Denis Bowman, Sr., E. D. Cooper, James Penn and William A. Davidson be and they are hereby appointed commissioners for and to examine, receive and report the work to be done on the Amite river contemplated by this act; that William S. Round, Marcus T. Carter, John Setton and James H. Baily be and they are hereby appointed commissioners for the work to be done in the Tickfaw, Blood and Netalbany rivers contemplated by this bill. A majority of each board shall be sufficient to transact the business they are appointed for by this act.

SEC. 2. Be it further enacted, etc., That the sum of fifty-three thousand five hundred dollars be and the same is hereby appropriated to remove the obstructions from the Amite river as high up as Governor's Bluff; the Bayou Manchac as high up as one mile above Hampton's ferry; from the Tickfaw river as high up as Lorin Chapman's; from the Blood river as high as Duncan's Bluff; and from the Netalbany river as high up as Springfield.

SEC. 3. Be it further enacted, etc., That out of the appropriation the sum of thirty thousand dollars is hereby appropriated to remove the obstructions from the navigation of the river Amite and Bayou Manchac to the point designated by the second section of this act; that the sum of ten thousand dollars be and is hereby appropriated to remove the obstructions from the river Tickfaw; that the sum of ten thousand dollars be and is hereby appropriated to remove the obstruction from the Netalbany river; and that the sum of three thousand five hundred dollars is hereby appropriated to remove the obstructions from Blood river to the points in each river designated in the second section of this act.

SEC. 4. Be it further enacted, etc., That the contract for the doing of the work shall be let by the Governor of the State of Louisiana, who shall take good and sufficient security from the contractor or contractors for the faithful execution of the contract let out, that the work shall be done under the supervision of the commissioners appointed for each river, under the provision of the first section of this act, and that no money shall be paid until the commissioners created by the first section of this act, or the majority thereof, shall certify to the Governor that they have examined, approved and received the work done under this contract; whereon the Governor shall issue his warrant upon the Treasurer under the form of law to pay for the same, which warrant shall be paid by the Treasurer out of any moneys in the treasury not otherwise appropriated.

GEO. W. CARTER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
OSCAR J. DUNN,
Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.

A true copy:
GEO. E. BOVEE,
Secretary of State.

The foregoing act having been presented to the Governor of the State of Louisiana for his approval, and not having been returned by him to the house of the General Assembly in which it originated within the time prescribed by the constitution of the State of Louisiana, has become a law without his approval.

GEO. E. BOVEE,
Secretary of State.

No. 31.

AN ACT

Creating a commission to locate the site for a State House in the city of New Orleans, to purchase the necessary grounds therefor, and making an appropriation to pay for such grounds and to build a State House and other buildings necessary for State purposes, and improving the same.

SECTION 1. Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana in general assembly convened, That a joint committee of three of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker thereof, and two of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and two to be appointed by the Governor, be and is hereby raised and created as a commission for the purpose of locating in the city of New Orleans a site for a State House, and the other buildings and improvements necessary for State purposes, for purchasing the necessary grounds therefor, and for all purposes appertaining thereto, and to contract for the building of said State House thereon, and other necessary buildings, and it shall be lawful for a majority of said committee to act.

SEC. 2. Be it further enacted, etc., That for the purposes of paying for the grounds, and for the building of said State House and other buildings and improvements necessary thereon, as authorized by the first section of this act, that the sum of fifteen hundred thousand dollars be and the same is hereby appropriated, to be paid as follows, to wit: One hundred thousand dollars to be applied to the purchase of the grounds, to be paid on the order of the commission herein appointed, or a majority thereof, on the Auditor of Public Accounts, whose duty it shall be to warrant on the State Treasurer for said amount, and the balance of said fifteen hundred thousand dollars thereof to be paid in bonds of the State of Louisiana, having forty years to run from their date, signed by the Governor and countersigned by the Auditor of Public Accounts, State Treasurer and Secretary of State, and under the great seal of the State of Louisiana; to be made payable to bearer, and dated February tenth (10) eighteen hundred and seventy-one (1871), and to draw eight per cent per annum interest, with interest coupons attached, payable semi-annually; principal and interest payable at New York or New Orleans, as may be deemed advisable by the commission or a majority of them.

SEC. 3. Be it further enacted, etc., That for the purpose of providing