New Orleans Republican.
OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE UNITED STATES
OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF NEW ORLEANS

DEBATES OF THE HOUSE.

Evening Session.

TUESDAY, February 28, 1871.

On House bill No. 153, to provide for the cleaning out of bayous in the parish of St. Mary—

Mr. Bentley, of St. Mary: The parish of St. Mary, where this bill is going into operation, is one of the best tax-paying parishes in the State. I have cheerfully voted for bills introduced by other members, asking for State aid, when it has been for the improvement of the State, and I now want this bill to pass the House. A competent engineer has examined the work, and made an estimate. This appropriation is based upon that estimate.

Mr. Carr, of De Soto: Taking into consideration the immense amount of money appropriated already for the cleaning out of bayous, I do not think it is prudent that we should go any further. If the bill is introduced next session, I shall make no objection, and if it was not for such a large amount of money I do not think I would make any objection. I do not think we can afford to go any further on this to-day. We have now no money in the treasury, and have refused to pass a revenue bill. Now, sir, I am willing to give the gentlemen from St. Mary everything, in justice and reason, that they may demand, but as we have done so much in this matter this session, I object to any more. This bill can be taken up from the table next session, and passed.

Mr. Davidson, of Livingston: The people of the parish of St. Mary are worthy people. They are in want of this appropriation and they ask this House to give it to them, and the question of further appropriation doesn't amount to anything at all. Are they entitled to the appropriation? Are they taxpayers? Is it to the interest of the State to make the improvements desired by the people asking them or not? If it is the House should go on and make this appropriation. The argument comes with poor grace from the gentleman from De Soto [Mr. Carr], who engineered the Chattanooga swindle of two and a half millions for strange speculators, to tell us that the tax-paying people are not to have anything because they can't find anything in the treasury of the State. And why is there no money in the treasury? Because it has gone to support swindlers who desire to make profit out of the pockets of the honest taxpayers of the State. I, now, sir, am willing for the House to take its own course on this matter, but I could not sit here and hear the remarks of the member from De Soto without replying.

WEDNESDAY, March 1, 1871.

The House met promptly at twelve o'clock.

Speaker Carter in the chair.

Seventy-eight members present.

Prayer by the Chaplain.

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

Senate bill No. 147, known as the State funding bill, being before the House, the first and second sections were adopted.

A motion of Mr. Harper, of St. Charles, to postpone the further consideration of the bill until to-morrow at one o'clock was tabled by a vote of 70 to 26.

Mr. Davidson, of Livingston: I went to the Auditor to inquire into this bill, and ascertained these facts: Under the first act, appropriating a certain sum of money, a certain number of bonds were issued to take up the floating debt, but warrants dated after a certain time, for instance after the first of April, were not taken up. There is still the sum of six hundred thousand dollars in the hands of the commissioners to take up these other warrants, and I ask the House if it is fair to stop the payment of warrants dated after a certain time, when the appropriation is not exhausted. There should be no preference in the matter of paying these warrants.

The motion to suspend the rules to pass the bill to its third reading was lost by a vote of 69 to 24.

An act to authorize the New Orleans, Mobile and Chattanooga Railroad Company to change its name to the New Orleans, Mobile and Texas railroad being before the House—

Mr. Carr, of De Soto: I will state why they want this name changed. The original charter provided for a road running from Chattanooga to New Orleans. After they obtained their charter and had spent over one hundred thousand dollars in surveying the right of way, they found that another company had been granted the same charter over the same route, and within twenty miles of them, for a term of years, with the exclusive privilege, and that has fifteen years yet to run. The company consequently abandoned their charter. Their original intention, as their charter states, was to run from Chattanooga to Mobile, from Mobile to New Orleans, and from New Orleans to Texas, but in consequence of this other charter the road from Chattanooga to Mobile had to be abandoned. Therefore that portion of the name is superfluous; it means nothing, and as they propose to run from Mobile to Texas, they want the road designated as the New Orleans, Mobile and Texas railroad.

Mr. Washington, of Assumption: I would like to ask a question about this affair. Does this bill change the time of building the road?

Mr. Carr, of De Soto: Not at all. It simply makes all their contracts under the new name, which they can not do except by act of the Legislature. They change their name without your permission. If you give them permission to change their name in accordance with the road as it runs, it makes their contracts good. It don't ask for any State aid. It don't invalidate any contracts they have made with the State, but confirms them.

The bill being on its final passage, and the yeas and nays having been demanded—

Mr. Carr, of De Soto: I would like to know the names of the gentlemen calling for the yeas and nays. I want it to be understood that there are two members on this floor who will consume our time and hamper legislation by calling for the yeas and nays on an act to simply change the name of a railroad.

Mr. Harper, of St. Charles: I would like to know if the gentleman is going to question the rights and prerogatives of other members.

The bill finally passed by a recorded vote of 92 yeas to 2 nays.

Mr. Davidson, of Livingston: I desire to ask the House to take up messages from the Senate. There are very important messages there, and if we expect to have laws passed let us take up the bills.

An act for the relief of the New Orleans Academy of Sciences was finally passed.

Mr. Worrall, of Jefferson: I would simply state to the House that it is a small appropriation very much needed to enable the Academy of Sciences to take care of a large number of books and documents that are now lying loose, and of no value whatever to the State. It is a most important measure from an educational point of view.

The House being in committee of the whole.

[Mr. Davidson, of Livingston, in the chair.]

The revenue bill was before the committee.

Mr. Bryan, of Calcasieu, moved to strike out "four mills," and insert "three mills."

Mr. Blunt, of Natchitoches, moved to insert "two mills," but afterward withdrew his amendment.

Mr. Carr, of De Soto: Four mills is just the same as it was last year and for two years previous. We have appropriated a great deal of money this session. Our warrants are selling at seventy-two cents on the dollar, and I earnestly ask you not to depreciate the State's credit any more. I am opposed to the amendment and hope it will not be adopted.

Mr. Harper, of St. Charles: This estimated tax has been based upon actual expenses, and I do not see how we can go back on it. This four mills on the dollar is absolutely necessary for the expenses already incurred, and if you refuse this you reduce the price of warrants; you increase instead of decreasing the expenses of the State, because if warrants are fifty cents on the dollar you will have double the amount to pay that you would have were your warrants at par. By creating a large revenue for the State a large tax is thus withdrawn; if you attempt to reduce this amount, instead of decreasing the amount of taxes you are increasing it. This act is based on actual dollars and cents, and to reduce the tax to three mills is about as sensible as the motion of a member in the Mississippi Legislature to repeal all laws relating to the collection of taxes, and to pay all claims from the State treasury.

Mr. Blunt, of Natchitoches: I am opposed to this section because the people in the State of Lousiana are already crying out about taxes, and about you men who have levied these great taxes. I am sent here by my constituents to defend them, and have a right on this floor to speak in their behalf, and I propose to do it to the best of my ability. I own property in the State and am opposed to these great taxes which are about to be put on the State. I own property and expect to own more, but even if I did not own five cents, I shall defend my constituents. Who is ready to pay four mills on the dollar? I am not; and I will oppose this section and will vote against it, and hope every member will do the same.

Mr. Yorke, of Carroll: I move we have a copy of somebody's arithmetic sent back here [Laughter.]

Mr. Burch, of East Baton Rouge: In relation to the speech of the gentleman who has just preceded me relative to our owning property, etc., it is irrelevant to the subject. Property qualification didn't send us here to this House. I believe that is one of the relics of the past. We are here not for the purpose of asking how much property they possess, because they propose to levy a tax, but it is proper and legitimate that we should levy this tax. As the gentleman from De Soto (Mr. Carr) truthfully remarked, we have appropriated a great deal of money in this legislature. Gentlemen sitting upon this floor, whether they possess property or not, have voted these appropriations and now it is nothing more than just and right that they should pay this bill, for the purpose of meeting these appropriations, in order that the finances of the State, under the circumstances, may be as healthy as they possibly can be. This tax of four mills on the dollar is, I do not think, exorbitant, but I believe is based upon what is really necessary to meet the necessary expenses of the State. We can not sit here in the Legislature and pass appropriations from day to day, and then when the issue comes to propose means to meet these appropriations, fail to meet that issue. It is really necessary that we should, I say, enact this law for the purpose of meeting all appropriations that have been passed, and we do not for a moment need to ask if we possess property or not, but whether it is right and just—this law. A tax of four mills on the dollar will not exceed the necessary expenses of carrying on the State government for another year. A great deal of trouble has been brought to bear on this bill. We have consumed so much time in considering one single section that we will not get through the bill this session. I hope the House will consider, and especially those members who have been returned here as Republicans, that if they do not meet these appropriations they don't do their duty; and, as far as this law is concerned, your legislation is for naught. The finances of the State will be in an unhealthy condition; and I tell you it will be charged to you, and to you alone, that after passing these appropriations you failed to meet your obligations. Therefore, I shall support this resolution, and hope the amendment will be stricken out.

Mr. Bryan, of Calcasieu: I desire to state that I am perfectly willing to accept the gentleman's [Mr. Blunt] amendment, and my reasons for it are these: It is well for us to bear in mind that this four mills on the dollar is not the only tax that is to be fixed; we have in addition to that a levee tax of two mills on the dollar, a school tax of two mills on the dollar, and we may, in addition to that, have a tax of two mills on the dollar for the purpose of building schoolhouses, etc. This will bring the tax up to twelve mills on the dollar, which will amount to—

Mr. Carr, of De Soto: Do you know what it is in New York? It is six and one-half per cent.

Mr. Bryan, of Calcasieu: We are not in New York. New York is rich, and we are poor. I don't stop here. As a matter of course, every little profession has an extra license. I therefore request members to think well before they vote on this bill as it now is. I move the adoption of the amendment.

On a motion to rise and recommend the adoption of the bill—

Mr. Thompson, of St. Tammany: I am opposed to passing a bill containing one hundred and three pages in any such manner, without giving the members an opportunity of examining the different clauses in that bill. Here is a bill affecting the entire revenue of this State, imposing taxes upon every citizen and every species of property, and now you wish to rush it through by its title, without allowing any opportunity to make amendments. There are one or two clauses that I want to see amended. I therefore oppose this motion, and move, as a substitute, that you take up this bill section by section.

The motion to withdraw was withdrawn.

The second section having been read—

Mr. Worrall, of Jefferson: We have had this bill before us, and I believe a majority of this House is perfectly satisfied with it. I therefore move that we now rise and recommend its passage.

The committee refused to rise.

The second section was adopted and the third section read.

Mr. Thompson, of St. Tammany: I object to some portions of this section. You first tax a man owning a brickyard, a sawmill, a shingle-mill, or a factory of any sort. Then for every wagon or cart necessary for his business you tax him ten or twenty dollars more, making a tax, perhaps, of hundreds and hundreds of dollars. Every farmer is absolutely required to have a wagon or cart to carry on his business, and in nine cases out of ten they are not worth more than a few dollars, and yet you tax him every year ten dollars. I move to strike out the word "private," and only tax those vehicles used for the public.

The amendment was adopted.

In item seven of the third section, Mr. Ringgold moved to strike out "one thousand dollars" and insert "five hundred dollars."

Mr. Carr, of De Soto: I am opposed to that amendment. We have down here on the levee three snake shows. They rob everybody, and I say let us tax them out of existence. They will have to pay a thousand dollars license now, and by this tax we will prevent them from coming among us. Look at St. Charles street now. To-day there are two or three of these institutions there, and you can not pick up a morning paper without finding that some person has been robbed.

Mr. Brewster, of Ouachita: I do not believe this tax will tax them out of existence, but I do believe in putting on taxes of every dollar we can, and if we do succeed in taxing them out of existence so much the better. I recommend placing the heaviest taxes upon theatres, cockpits, saloons and all these luxuries, and to let those taxes relieve the poor, hard-working people of the State.

Mr. Barrett, of Orleans: Inasmuch as this is a very important measure, I hope the gentleman will allow every member to discuss the question. I feel interested in it myself. I am in favor of the amendment of my colleague and distinguished friend Mr. Ringgold, because I am identified with it. It is very easy for gentlemen to get up on this floor and advocate a bill when they know that they probably will never come in contact with it. I am in favor of the amendment of Mr. Ringgold, because I think I will be benefited by that amendment. It is very easy to get up and make spread-eagle speeches when they are not interested. I hope every gentleman on this floor will accept the amendment. I make an appeal to my friends, and, in order to give these gentlemen the largest latitude to show their interest in this bill, I now yield the floor.

Mr. Burch, of East Baton Rouge: I shall vote against this amendment for this reason: I can readily understand why the gentlemen from the city of New Orleans are anxious. It is our country members that suffer when we come into New Orleans, and I want a chance to make these sharpers disgorge their ill-gotten gains. One reason urged why the State capital should not be removed to Baton Rouge was that there was no 65 St. Charles street, no theatres, no cockpits—they can only be found in the Crescent City of the South. Now, we come here to do business necessary for the Legislature of the State. These gentlemen who are proprietors fulfill the Scriptural injunction: they find us strangers and they take us in. I am only sorry, sir, that the tax is not larger than it is. These gentlemen in the city who have free passes to these institutions come up here and advocate a reduction of taxes, but we country members have to pay exorbitant prices, and if we are a little dark-hued we have to pay full price and go away in some dark corner or up at the roof. We do not propose to leave this matter to the city delegation. For self-protection, for the protection of the country members, we must sustain this section. We are determined by these means to get back to the State, and as it comes back to the State we will get some of it, some of these ill-gotten gains.

On motion, the committee rose and reported progress.

[Speaker Carr in the chair.]

Mr. Davidson, of Livingston: This is an act to provide for the revenue of the State. It is very extraordinary that gentlemen are here who ask for a hundred thousand dollars for the improvement of their parishes, their watercourses, and other internal improvements, and get up and object to the raising of the money to meet these internal appropriations. How are they to have appropriations made? How can the Governor sign bills when there is no money to pay them? How is it to be done? I am astonished, I am really grieved to see this thing. Last night there was an appropriation made of one hundred thousand dollars, and it was remarked that the State was poor. We know the State is poor, and the only reason, the strongest reason why this bill should pass is that you have appropriated money for internal improvements; and how can you expect anybody to credit you if you refuse to raise the money to pay for these appropriations? I hope the House will take this into consideration at once and adopt the report of the committee.

The bill was finally passed.

Mr. Faulkner, chairman of a special committee to examine the condition of the New Canal of New Orleans, offered a report which was read.

Mr. Huston, of East Feliciana: This canal lacks in width and depth, and as a member of the committee on canals—

Mr. Faulkner, of Caldwell: I call the gentleman to order. The journal shows the gentleman is not a member of the special committee.

Mr. Huston, of East Feliciana: I am on the standing Committee on Canals and Drainage. I was one of the gentlemen who visited that canal, and I found that in no particular have they complied with their charter. In measuring, we found that from the mouth of the canal up to the first bridge it averages five feet less than called for by the charter. The number of batturs are less by six than the number required by the charter.

Mr. Carr, of De Soto: It will be seen by reading that report that this committee state that these men have complied with their contract; that they have made a canal so many feet wide, so many feet deep. Now everyone that rides on the shell road knows better. They know the road is not in order in the first place, and that the canal company have never complied with their charter in width and depth. That report, if adopted, will confirm them in their charter, and will say that they have complied with the charter. We all know better. We don't want any of that here. We know who owns this contract, and how it was obtained; and we know that the State has been swindled. By their original contract they would have to pay so much money every year into the State treasury. What did they do afterward? They came back to the Legislature and said in consideration of our doing so and so this money shall not be paid into the State treasury, but will go into our pockets. They have never complied with their charter. They have never attempted to do it. They tax the trade coming in at the rear of the city seventy-five cents a ton, and this committee say they have complied with their contract. I, sir, say that no committee report will put me down on record in this way. We all know whose canal it is. It is Dick Taylor's canal. I move to lay the report on the table.

Mr. Faulkner, of Caldwell: I pronounce the statement false. I tell you, if the gentlemen from Massachusetts or Maine come here, nothing is said of their contracts; but when "bona fide" citizens are involved, they raise a clamor. I tell them they are false. Here, anywhere or elsewhere, I want to be heard and I ask the gentleman to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Huston, of East Feliciana: If I make any statements, I am responsible for them.

The motion of the gentleman from De Soto [Mr. Carr] not being withdrawn, the gentleman from Caldwell [Mr. Faulkner] obtained the consent of the House to make a few remarks. He said:

I desire, now that I can indulge in the privilege of speaking, to make a few remarks. I, myself, as chairman of this committee, did not have an opportunity of visiting the canal, but I sent two honorable members of this House who were with me on the committee. I was on three or four committees and did not have the time to spare. I desired, if possible, to have done so. I sent two gentlemen, honorable members of this House. They examined the new canal, determined the width and depth, and I say, Mr. Speaker, when this House by its action appoints a special committee to do and perform a special work, I would like to know what parliamentary precedent would justify a standing committee neglecting its own business, and slipping over to interfere with the operations of a special committee. We hear it stated by members on this floor that they went to examine this canal. Who authorized them to go? They have their particular duty; they have their particular province. But what standing committee has a right to go and obtrude itself within the sphere of a special committee? Do you hear that? This special committee simply went forward to do its duty under the power conferred upon it, and the facts embodied in that report are the results of their investigation. Now then, I must go a little further. It occurs to me, at least I can not help having the impression, that if that canal had been under the control of some adventurers from Maine, Massachusetts or Connecticut, instead of poor Dick Taylor or some other of our old citizens who have been broken up by the ravages of war, we could not have heard of this opposition. I would like to know why this feeling manifests itself on this floor and elsewhere whenever an old citizen comes up? Answer me that question. I say this thing shows itself often, and I deprecate it.

Mr. Gaddis, of Orleans: I rise to a point of order. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. I thought you rose on the floor to give an idea about a canal!

Mr. Faulkner, of Caldwell: I simply have this to say, that when you put the saddle on a sore back the horse begins to flinch. I simply wish to state, for the information of the House, that this special committee went forward to discharge its duty under the powers conferred upon it, and they made a report according to the facts exhibited to the members when they examined the work. Now, then, simply because these parties may or may not have done all—the report does not say they have done all, but it indicates that they have done as much as they could under the circumstances; it don't recommend this or that, but simply states facts—I can not doubt the word of these gentlemen who examined this work, nor can this House in justice to these two members—[Question: Who are the members?] Mr. Raby and Mr. Meadows, two as honorable members as occupy seats on this floor.

The report was tabled by a vote of 52 to 21.

Evening Session.

WEDNESDAY, March 1, 1871.

The House was called to order at half-past seven.

Seventy members present.

The Governor's veto message on the Louisiana warehouse bill being before the House—

Mr. Thompson, of St. Tammany: That bill was passed through this House in a very hurried manner, and I would like to have some of the gentlemen who advocate its passage over the Governor's veto explain to me why the State should guarantee these bonds, or furnish the capital for these men to go into business. What benefit is the State to derive from it? What are they to pay the State in consideration of their furnishing this capital to do business on? I can not see that the State will derive any advantages from the issue of bonds to these men, when other private citizens have to furnish their own capital without any assistance. I conceive that it is unjust, and therefore I shall vote to sustain the veto of the Governor, and I ask that every man on this floor who wishes to protect the State, to protect the treasury of the State from being depleted by such bills as this, will vote to support the Governor.

Another reason is that we have already reached the constitutional limit of our indebtedness, and I think that alone is sufficient reason, and I must expressly request that those gentlemen who are advocating the bill will tell us why the State should furnish these gentlemen with capital to start in business, and what benefit the State will derive from it.

The bill was finally passed by a recorded vote of 68 yeas to 18 nays, the Governor's veto to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Governor's veto message on the bill for the relief of Mr. J. O. Nixon, late State Printer, being before the House—

Mr. Quinn, of Orleans: From the beginning of this Legislature, since 1868, this very party has been here every year to receive relief, and the records will show it. Take the journals of 1868, 1869 and 1870 and you will find Mr. Nixon has had different sums of four and five and six thousand dollars, and now he comes here and asks us to give him the modest sum of fifty thousand dollars—God knows for what. I suppose next session he will come in here and ask for two hundred thousand dollars. I hope every member who remembers the duty he owes to himself and the people he represents will not vote away the money of the people in this manner.

Mr. Moncure, of Caddo: It is very well known that I have opposed all these measures, but I must give expression to the fact that it comes with bad grace from that member to complain that the Legislature is called upon to pay J. O. Nixon what he has actually lost, when he has this instant voted a million and a-half to a warehouse company. Where is the justice, the reason or the consistency, sir, in this conduct?

Mr. Garstkamp, of Jefferson: As Chairman of the Committee on Claims, I know something of this matter. I know that this claim was before the committee in sixty-eight. They reported favorably, but the House adjourned before action could be taken on the bill. It has been reported favorably by two or three committees, and I do think it a just claim. In sixty-eight the bill was opposed because Mr. Nixon was a Democrat. I know that Mr. Nixon has never received any pay on this. He received three thousand dollars in bonds for extra printing, but this has never been settled, and I think he is entitled to it as much as any other gentleman in the State.

Mr. Quinn, of Orleans: Will he give a clear receipt to the State?

Mr. Carr, of De Soto: I desire to inform the gentleman that in the bill is incorporated this clause:

"Provided, that Mr. Nixon shall give the State Treasurer a clear receipt of all claims against the State."

The bill was finally passed, the Governor's veto to the contrary notwithstanding, by a recorded vote of 91 yeas to 2 nays.

The Governor's message vetoing the bill known as the Simeon Belden bill having been read—

Mr. Davidson, of Livingston: This *ad captandum* style of denouncing claims does not become well the Governor of this State. The Governor of the State of Louisiana treats us as though we were a parcel of school-boys. I insist upon it that we are the representatives of the people. We are dignified by being called by the people here to make laws for this State. Mr. Speaker, did it never strike you that it becomes us, on some occasions, to go back to first priciples? It is necessary to let the people know something about this one-man power, its influence upon the destinies of the country since the days when the people arose in their strength and wrested from King John the Magna Charta—since that day it has been a constant struggle between the many and the few. The many have rights, and the few propose to take them from them. That is the case we have here. We have decided, after mature deliberation, that this bill was just and proper, and the Governor lectures us, and tells us that we have acted without proper deliberation, without reflecting properly upon this thing. Now, three hundred of the principal citizens of New Orleans organized for the purpose of resisting the one per cent tax. Here is an agreement evidencing that one case is to be taken, and the balance decided from that. Here is the evidence that it became necessary to employ assistant counsel. Mr. Hunt and Mr. Dibble were employed. The most eminent counsel in the State of Louisiana were employed to resist the collection of this tax, on the ground of its being unconstitutional. After a hard fought contest the case went to the Supreme Court, and it was decided, and I stand here as a lawyer and a professional man to assert the rights of my profession, and as a Representative to recognize what the people owe this gentleman, and to reward him for his services. You know, and the House knows, and I know that I am a Democrat to the core and this gentleman is a Republican, but that does not affect the right. It is right that the man should have his money and I shall vote that he *shall* have it. The Governor talks about the parishes of Bossier and Caddo, but the matter of these parishes was not in the controversy. Here we have the certificates of the tax collectors that they could not collect the tax in these two parishes, Orleans and Jefferson. Who was to fight them? Why didn't the Governor do it if he knows so much? Why didn't he call on his police force and order these people to pay their taxes? But because the Attorney General of this State takes the matter up in due course of law, we who represent the people have no right to pay him—

Mr. Quinn, of Orleans: He is paid for it

Mr. Davidson, of Livingston: He is *not* paid for it. The law plainly states that he shall be entitled to five per cent for all taxes that he collects. It was through the means of this single suit that all these taxes were collected, and what difference does it make whether it was on one dollar or a million? It was the principle that was involved. The argument had to be as strong and as powerful before the court to have that case properly decided, as if it had been for the whole sum: and, it is in bad taste for a handsome, good looking, intelligent man, like the Governor, to lecture us; to say that there is but five dollars due to the Attorney General. What nonsense! What tolly! The gentleman talks to us as if we were demented, just as if we were school-boys. I think it is a duty the House owes to give this to Mr. Belden. I voted for it because I thought it was just. I voted for it because the law authorized it. I voted for it because I have sworn that I would carry out the provisions of the law, according to the best of my knowledge and ability, when I took my seat upon the floor, and having taken all these things into consideration, I ask this House to pass this bill over the veto of the Governor.

Mr. Lynch, of Iberville: I am exceedingly astonished, Mr. Speaker, to see the gentleman from Livingston get up on this floor and advocate so strenuously this infamous bill; not only is he advocating that bill, but he has denounced the Governor of the State for the most brave and magnanimous act he has ever done since he has held that office. I, sir, would have contented myself with sitting down and voting to sustain the Governor's veto, if it had not been for this harangue, this base and outrageous harangue of the gentleman from Livingston, and I say that of all the acts that have been done by Governor Warmoth since he has been Governor of the State, he has performed no more courageous act, no wiser act, no more judicious act than the veto of this infamous bill. What are the facts of this case? Mr. Belden brought suit for the State to recover some small tax, to the amount of four hundred dollars. This tax was resisted, and eminent counsel was employed by the State to assist him. Mr. William Hunt, one of the ablest men and most distinguished counsel of this State, was employed; Mr. Dibble was also employed, but ten thousand dollars was paid them for their services in advocating the enforcement of this law, and now Attorney General Belden stands up here and says it was his argument which brought that money into the State treasury. Mr. Hunt is ignored. Mr. Dibble is ignored. Mr. Belden did all. What did he do? Five per cent is allowed the Attorney General for the collection of claims for the State, and he gets this where the money comes into the treasury entirely through his instrumentality. Has any money come into the treasury through the instrumentality of the Attorney General? Not at all. One man is sued, and the suit gained, for a hundred dollars, or some trifling thing. He does not bring suit against the others at all, because they obeyed the law. Mr. Belden ceases to obtain his five per cent if they obeyed the law voluntarily. Mr. Hunt and Mr. Dibble got ten thousand dollars for resisting it, and obtaining the collection of this money, and I say if there is any claim at all, it is for Mr. Hunt and Mr. Dibble, for the money came through their instrumentality. That gentleman has been a constant source of expense to the State government ever since he came into office. There is another claim here of Major New for acting attorney general of the State, before this very Legislature, for ten thousand dollars. He was assisting the Attorney General. Ten thousand dollars and ten thousand dollars are twenty thousand dollars, and this fifty thousand dollars are seventy thousand dollars to Mr. Belden for one year. There was Mr. Roselius, who filled this office, and other distinguished men, and Mr. Belden has drawn more money out of the treasury than all of them put together. I tell you, gentlemen, and Mr. Speaker, that I think Governor Warmoth has acted the part of a brave, true, faithful, devoted public servant in refusing to sign this infamous bill, and I call upon you, out of regard to the State, out of regard to your own integrity, to protect the people. I would not have spoken on this thing at all if the gentleman from Livingston had not got up and denounced Governor Warmoth for doing what he was sworn to do, what his oath of office compelled him to do, to see that no person should plunder the State treasury, whether it was the Attorney General of the State, or was a thief or robber. I say that he had no instrumentality in collecting this tax. He has not done one dollar's worth of service. There was a suit brought the other day. He sued the State. What was the consequence? The State had no one to represent it. He was elected as a constitutional officer to represent the State, but there was no one to represent the State. So Governor Warmoth had to appoint some one to represent the State. I say that Governor Warmoth was obliged to employ counsel to defend this case against this very Attorney-General. He who should be the defender of the State is no defender, because he was suing her, and the Governor employed counsel to defeat this very claim, and I call upon every honest man upon this floor to sustain the Governor.

Mr. Burch, of East Baton Rouge: I must, in turn, express my surprise at the gross personalities indulged in by the gentleman from Iberville [Mr. Lynch], and it comes with bad grace, indeed, to say the least, from a gentleman who has occupied the same position which the present claimant for relief in this bill has occupied. I must reiterate, that it comes with bad grace from a gentleman who is now a member on this floor, who has once occupied the same position that Mr. Belden does, and who has been before the Legislature of this State asking for a claim of five thousand dollars for the same cause; and now I must say this, if the gentleman had been successful in coming before the Legislature and claiming this five thousand dollars he would not be so bitter against this claim to-night; but from the fact that he did not gain it, he does not wish his successor to obtain it. [Laughter.] I hold that it is unfair to ask men to accept responsible positions in this State that requires great mental ability and days and nights of labor, it is unfair to ask them to do these great services to the State and to save to the State immense sums of money, which are now in the treasury, and to refuse to pay them compensation which is justly due them. We talk of placing officers beyond the influence of bribery and corruption, but here we have an example of an officer who has performed his whole duty to the State and is now obliged to come to the Legislature to ask that this compensation shall be granted to him, and he has a right to receive it. If gentlemen upon this floor will examine this carefully and see the immense sums of money which this gentleman, by his legal abilities, has secured to the State, they would not, for a single moment, object to the compensation which he asks for, but would grant it at once with the generosity which I am sorry to see does not pervade the bosom of every man on this floor. We are not here to indulge in personalities on any one; we are simply here to consider what claims this gentleman may have upon the State, and to pass upon them. That is the whole question before us, and if we find the compensation asked for by this gentleman to be legal, if we have a right to give it, we should give it—Mr. Lynch and the Governor himself to the contrary notwithstanding. I would ask the gentlemen upon this floor whether they wish officers to perform these great duties for the public welfare and the public good without receiving compensation. I recollect that when this Legislature here, two or three years ago, they brought in bills giving twenty-five per cent extra pay to members in order that they might get their whole pay. But to-day we find that there are gentlemen upon this floor unwilling to allow to a man the compensation which he is entitled to according to law, and what justly belongs to him. Talk about putting your hands in the public purse; why, you put your hands into his private pocket, and you deprive him of that which justly belongs to him. He has been working solely for the benefit of the commonwealth, and now asks the Legislature to award to him, not what belongs to you, not what belong sto the State, but what belongs to him. If you recognize the amount which is due to him, allow it. He has done his whole duty, and I think that the members upon this floor should award him the compensation to which he is entitled. We are unwilling that these important positions should be filled by any but men able to fill them, and if we do not give them the compensation to which they are entitled, we will find them filled by second rate men, who will take them for anything they can get, and then bribery and corruption will be prominent all over the State. Let us reward this officer. Let us see that he obtains his just compensation. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that the subject has been thoroughly discussed, and, therefore, move the previous question.

The main question was ordered.

While the roll was being called on the final passage of the bill, the name of Mr. Stamps, of Jefferson, having been reached—

Mr. Stamps, of Jefferson: Mr. Speaker, I vote against this bill because it says he has collected money in the parish of Jefferson, and I know it is not true. I vote "no."

The bill finally passed over the Governor's veto by a vote of 63 yeas to 24 nays, and the House adjourned.

SHERIFF'S SALES.

Green & Elder vs. Marie Jane Brinkmann—Seventh District Court for the parish of Orleans, No. 8511.

BY VIRTUE OF A WRIT OF SEIZURE AND SALE to me directed by the Honorable the Seventh District Court for the parish of Orleans, in the above entitled cause, I will proceed to sell at public auction, at the Merchants and Auctioneers' Exchange, Royal street, between Canal and Customhouse streets, in the Second District of this city, on TUESDAY, April 11, 1871, at twelve o'clock M., the following described property, to wit—

A CERTAIN LOT OF GROUND, with all the buildings and improvements thereon, and all rights, ways and privileges belonging or in any wise appertaining, situated in Bast Bodigny, City and parish of Jefferson, in this State, in square number twenty-seven, bounded by Magazine, Marengo, Camp and Constantinople streets, said lot being designated by the number eighteen, on a plan of James N. B. de Pauli, architect, dated June 20, 1836, and measures thirty feet front on Constantinople street, by one hundred and twenty feet in depth, between parallel lines, etc.

Seized in the above suit.

Terms—Cash on the spot.

C. S. SAUVINET.

mh11 25 ap11 Sheriff of the Parish of Orleans.

Succession of Lydia Robinson, wife of John McClean—Second District Court for the parish of Orleans, No. 29,564—Fieri facias against John McLean, tutor, in favor of Morris, Wheeler & Co.

Morris, Wheeler & Co. vs. John McClean—Fifth District Court for the parish of Orleans, No. 19,562.

BY VIRTUE OF TWO WRITS OF FIERI FACIAS to me directed by the Honorable the said District Courts for the parish of Orleans, in the above entitled causes, I will proceed to sell at public auction, at the Merchants and Auctioneers' Exchange, Royal street, between Canal and Customhouse streets, in the Second District of this city, on TUESDAY, April 4, 1871, at twelve o'clock M., the following described property, to wit—

TWO CERTAIN PIECES OR LOTS OF GROUND, situated in the suburb Washington, Third District of this city, in the square bounded by Clouet, Montegut, Craps and Love streets, designated by the numbers one and two on a certain plan drawn by J. A. D'Hemecourt, Surveyor of Municipality No. 3, dated seventeenth January, 1848, annexed to an act passed before A. Chiapella on the twelfth August, 1848. Said lots of ground are contiguous, and measure each, English measure, thirty-one feet eleven inches and five lines front on Clouet street, and extending in depth between parallel lines one hundred and three feet nine inches and three lines; the said lot number one forming the corner of Love street; ; together with all the buildings and improvements thereon. Which lots of ground were acquired by said John McClean by purchase from Mrs. Marguerite Diggs, as per act passed in the office of A. Chiapella, late notary in this city, on the sixth of August, 1849.

Seized in the above suit.

Terms—Cash on the spot.

C. S. SAUVINET.

mh3 22 ap4 Sheriff of the parish of Orleans.

SHERIFF'S SALES.

Thomas Jordn vs. N. Ruiz and G. Espinola—Seventh District Court for the parish of Orleans, No. 3484.

BY VIRTUE OF A WRIT OF FIERI FACIAS TO me directed by the honorable the Seventh District Court for the parish of Orleans, in the above entitled cause, I will proceed to sell at public auction, at the Merchants and Auctioneers' Exchange, Royal street, between Canal and Customhouse streets, in the Second District of this city, on SATURDAY, March 25, 1871, at twelve o'clock M., the following described property, to wit—

THE STEAMSHIP BEAUFORT, her masts, bowsprit, sails, boats, anchors, cables, furniture and other accessories thereunto belonging and appertaining, now lying in the Mississippi river (left bank), below the Ursulines Convent.

Seized in the above suit.

Terms—This being the second and last auction, the said steamship will be definitely adjudicated to the highest and last bidder for whatever she will bring, at twelve months' credit, the purchaser furnishing bond with good and solvent security, bearing eight per cent interest per annum from date, and privilege on the said steamship until final payment. Said purchaser shall have to deduct and pay in cash the amount of printing, sheriff's and clerk's fees, keeping, etc.—say about $1650.

C. S. SAUVINET.

mh8 17 25 Sheriff of the Parish of Orleans.

Louis Muh vs. J. A. Jaquet.—Seventh District Court for the parish of Orleans, No. 3359.

BY VIRTUE OF A WRIT OF FIERI FACIAS TO me directed by the Honorable the Seventh District Court for the parish of Orleans, in the above entitled cause, I will proceed to sell at public auction, on SATURDAY, March 18, 1871, at five o'clock P. M., at my warehouse, No. 74 St. Ann street, between Royal and Bourbon, in the Second District—

ONE PAIR OF DIAMOND EAR-RINGS.

Seized in the above suit.

Terms—Cash on the spot.

C. S. SAUVINET.

mh7 12 18 Sheriff of the Parish of Orleans.

Francois Ducom vs. Jean Marie Theodore Michon—Fourth District Court for the parish of Orleans, No. 24,922.

BY VIRTUE OF A WRIT OF SEIZURE AND SALE, to me directed by the Honorable the Fourth District Court for the parish of Orleans, in the above entitled cause, I will proceed to sell at public auction, at the Merchants and Auctioneers' Exchange, Royal street, between Canal and Customhouse streets, in the Second District of this city, on SATURDAY, March 11, 1871, at twelve o'clock M., the following described property, to wit—

A LOT OF GROUND, situated in the Second District of this city, in square bounded by Bourbon, Royal, Bienville and Conti streets, measuring about seventy-three feet four inches front on Bourbon street on about one hundred and twenty-seven feet in depth, more or less, together with all the buildings and improvements thereon, including the bakery and the kitchen, and also the ovens thereon, and all the rights, privileges and servitudes thereunto belonging, without any reservation or exception.

Being the same property acquired by defendant by purchase from plaintiff per act passed before Selim Magner, late a notary public in this city, on the fourteenth of January, 1867.

Seized in the above suit.

Terms—1. In cash for a sufficient amount to pay plaintiffs' claim, say the sum of six thousand six hundred and sixty-six dollars and sixty-six and two-thirds cents ($6,666 66⅔) with interest as follows, to wit:

On $3,333 33⅓, at six per cent per annum from the fourteenth of January, 1867, to the fourteenth of January, 1870, and thereafter, at eight per cent per annum to the day of sale.

On $3,333 33⅓, at six per cent per annum from the fourteenth of January, 1867, to the fourteenth of January, 1871, and thereafter, at eight per cent per annum till the day of sale.

And costs of suit.

2. The purchaser to assume (to the extent of the amount of his bid), the payment of two promissory notes secured by mortgage on said property, dated January 14, 1867, drawn by the defendant to his own order and by him indorsed, each for the sum of $3,333 33⅓, payable respectively five and six years after date, and bearing interest at six per cent per annum from date till maturity, and thereafter at eight per cent per annum from said maturity till paid.

3. And the balance of the price of adjudication (if any) cash on the spot.

C. S. SAUVINET.

fe7 26 mal1 Sheriff of the parish of Orleans.

George Stewart vs. Mrs. Jane C. Robinson—Sixth District Court for the parish of Orleans, No. 2214.

BY VIRTUE OF A WRIT OF SEIZURE AND SALE to me directed by the Honorable the Sixth District Court for the parish of Orleans, in the above entitled cause, I will proceed to sell at public auction, at the Merchants and Auctioneers' Exchange, Royal street, between Canal and Customhouse streets, in the Second District of this city, on SATURDAY, April 8, 1871, at twelve o'clock M., the following described property, to wit—

TWO CERTAIN LOTS OF GROUND, together with the buildings and improvements thereon, and all the rights, ways, privileges and advantages thereunto belonging, or in any wise pertaining, situated in the faubourg Avart, parish of Jefferson, in this State, and designated by the numbers fourteen and fifteen, of