

DEBATES IN THE SENATE.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1871.

JUDICIAL DISTRICTS.

On the bill crossing the eighteenth judicial district being called up—

Mr. Smith said he was opposed to this proposed manner of cutting up judicial districts and was in favor of the bill as it was.

He said that the bill was not a constitutional one, and at any rate ought not to be done until the next election, as the number of judicial districts was limited by the constitution.

He advised Senators who had friends in the district to pick in, as there were only two districts left.

The bill passed.

The rules being suspended, to enable the Senate to take up the resolution to amend article ninety-eight of the constitution.

Mr. Hunsacker said: Standing on this floor as a Republican, representing a Republican constituency, I never see a measure as a direct blow aimed at the people.

This amendment, if adopted, will have the practical effect of cutting up the judicial districts, and may be a district. When the constitution was framed, it was noted that the majority of the persons composing the Republican party were in the country.

By their poverty and their occupations, they were to go from one part of the State to the other, wherever their interests could be served.

A little surprised at the source from which the resolution came, I had come from the other side. I think I can see the object of the author of this bill. It is to compel a certain period of residence before a person can hold office.

It is the object of the author of this message, I will vote for that; but when I see a resolution which will practically disfranchise almost one-third of the voters of this State, I cannot oppose it. I stand committed to Republican principles.

I believe the cardinal principle of my party is that if a man is a citizen of this State, he is a citizen of the State. I venture to say that the Republican vote changes annually, and will continue to change throughout the year.

Mr. Archer: When I voted for the suspension of the rules, to allow this bill to be brought up, I did not understand it at all. I would be very much in favor of the amendment, as it is restricted to office holding.

If I am in order, I will make a motion to reconsider the vote by which this bill was placed on its second reading.

Mr. Hunsacker seconded the motion.

Mr. Lewis: I have seen a resolution from a practical experience of the tone of the minds of a number of honest men with regard to this subject. There has been a change in this State, under the provision of the constitution, which has combined the registry laws combined, to transfer into parishes outside the city of New Orleans persons as registered voters.

Who have had no business in the parishes of those parishes, probably, in the whole course of their lives. Other people go out into the parishes as registrars of voters with no intention of becoming citizens.

They simply get their salaries. As registration, however, takes more than ten days, they thus become citizens under the existing laws, and in a few days, ten, or ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, the registrar, instead of returning as an officer who has fulfilled the special mission on which he was sent back as a representative to the General Assembly, the parish where he was registrar of voters.

He did not intend when he went there to be a citizen, and he never invested a dollar in the parish, but he has acquired the rights of the parish—simply exercises the power given him to receive the ballot-boxes and keep them in close custody as long as he presides at the vote, at his own expense. What is the consequence? Instead of the people of the parish, this man, who owns no interest in the parish, and has nothing to do with the people of the parish, simply exercises the power given him to receive the ballot-boxes and keep them in close custody as long as he presides at the vote, at his own expense.

What is the consequence? Instead of the people of the parish, this man, who owns no interest in the parish, and has nothing to do with the people of the parish, simply exercises the power given him to receive the ballot-boxes and keep them in close custody as long as he presides at the vote, at his own expense.

What is the consequence? Instead of the people of the parish, this man, who owns no interest in the parish, and has nothing to do with the people of the parish, simply exercises the power given him to receive the ballot-boxes and keep them in close custody as long as he presides at the vote, at his own expense.

What is the consequence? Instead of the people of the parish, this man, who owns no interest in the parish, and has nothing to do with the people of the parish, simply exercises the power given him to receive the ballot-boxes and keep them in close custody as long as he presides at the vote, at his own expense.

What is the consequence? Instead of the people of the parish, this man, who owns no interest in the parish, and has nothing to do with the people of the parish, simply exercises the power given him to receive the ballot-boxes and keep them in close custody as long as he presides at the vote, at his own expense.

What is the consequence? Instead of the people of the parish, this man, who owns no interest in the parish, and has nothing to do with the people of the parish, simply exercises the power given him to receive the ballot-boxes and keep them in close custody as long as he presides at the vote, at his own expense.

What is the consequence? Instead of the people of the parish, this man, who owns no interest in the parish, and has nothing to do with the people of the parish, simply exercises the power given him to receive the ballot-boxes and keep them in close custody as long as he presides at the vote, at his own expense.

What is the consequence? Instead of the people of the parish, this man, who owns no interest in the parish, and has nothing to do with the people of the parish, simply exercises the power given him to receive the ballot-boxes and keep them in close custody as long as he presides at the vote, at his own expense.

What is the consequence? Instead of the people of the parish, this man, who owns no interest in the parish, and has nothing to do with the people of the parish, simply exercises the power given him to receive the ballot-boxes and keep them in close custody as long as he presides at the vote, at his own expense.

What is the consequence? Instead of the people of the parish, this man, who owns no interest in the parish, and has nothing to do with the people of the parish, simply exercises the power given him to receive the ballot-boxes and keep them in close custody as long as he presides at the vote, at his own expense.

What is the consequence? Instead of the people of the parish, this man, who owns no interest in the parish, and has nothing to do with the people of the parish, simply exercises the power given him to receive the ballot-boxes and keep them in close custody as long as he presides at the vote, at his own expense.

What is the consequence? Instead of the people of the parish, this man, who owns no interest in the parish, and has nothing to do with the people of the parish, simply exercises the power given him to receive the ballot-boxes and keep them in close custody as long as he presides at the vote, at his own expense.

What is the consequence? Instead of the people of the parish, this man, who owns no interest in the parish, and has nothing to do with the people of the parish, simply exercises the power given him to receive the ballot-boxes and keep them in close custody as long as he presides at the vote, at his own expense.

What is the consequence? Instead of the people of the parish, this man, who owns no interest in the parish, and has nothing to do with the people of the parish, simply exercises the power given him to receive the ballot-boxes and keep them in close custody as long as he presides at the vote, at his own expense.

What is the consequence? Instead of the people of the parish, this man, who owns no interest in the parish, and has nothing to do with the people of the parish, simply exercises the power given him to receive the ballot-boxes and keep them in close custody as long as he presides at the vote, at his own expense.

What is the consequence? Instead of the people of the parish, this man, who owns no interest in the parish, and has nothing to do with the people of the parish, simply exercises the power given him to receive the ballot-boxes and keep them in close custody as long as he presides at the vote, at his own expense.

What is the consequence? Instead of the people of the parish, this man, who owns no interest in the parish, and has nothing to do with the people of the parish, simply exercises the power given him to receive the ballot-boxes and keep them in close custody as long as he presides at the vote, at his own expense.

What is the consequence? Instead of the people of the parish, this man, who owns no interest in the parish, and has nothing to do with the people of the parish, simply exercises the power given him to receive the ballot-boxes and keep them in close custody as long as he presides at the vote, at his own expense.

What is the consequence? Instead of the people of the parish, this man, who owns no interest in the parish, and has nothing to do with the people of the parish, simply exercises the power given him to receive the ballot-boxes and keep them in close custody as long as he presides at the vote, at his own expense.

What is the consequence? Instead of the people of the parish, this man, who owns no interest in the parish, and has nothing to do with the people of the parish, simply exercises the power given him to receive the ballot-boxes and keep them in close custody as long as he presides at the vote, at his own expense.

What is the consequence? Instead of the people of the parish, this man, who owns no interest in the parish, and has nothing to do with the people of the parish, simply exercises the power given him to receive the ballot-boxes and keep them in close custody as long as he presides at the vote, at his own expense.

What is the consequence? Instead of the people of the parish, this man, who owns no interest in the parish, and has nothing to do with the people of the parish, simply exercises the power given him to receive the ballot-boxes and keep them in close custody as long as he presides at the vote, at his own expense.

What is the consequence? Instead of the people of the parish, this man, who owns no interest in the parish, and has nothing to do with the people of the parish, simply exercises the power given him to receive the ballot-boxes and keep them in close custody as long as he presides at the vote, at his own expense.

What is the consequence? Instead of the people of the parish, this man, who owns no interest in the parish, and has nothing to do with the people of the parish, simply exercises the power given him to receive the ballot-boxes and keep them in close custody as long as he presides at the vote, at his own expense.

What is the consequence? Instead of the people of the parish, this man, who owns no interest in the parish, and has nothing to do with the people of the parish, simply exercises the power given him to receive the ballot-boxes and keep them in close custody as long as he presides at the vote, at his own expense.

What is the consequence? Instead of the people of the parish, this man, who owns no interest in the parish, and has nothing to do with the people of the parish, simply exercises the power given him to receive the ballot-boxes and keep them in close custody as long as he presides at the vote, at his own expense.

bill No. 33, entitled "an act reorganizing the

judges members, and perform the duties of

thereof, and prescribing the number and

their duties, and compensation, and

marking clerks of the district courts in each

parish, and the manner of their appointment

and their compensation shall be

The bill was taken up section by section,

and the first section read:

Mr. Ingraham: I can not say my necessity

for the bill is less than it was. Ever since the first organization of the

State as a State, in 1812, down to the present

time, we have had in force the same system

of organizing the police juries throughout

the State, and it has been found to work

well and satisfactorily to the people. It is

strange, indeed, that at this late day an

act should be introduced into the General

Assembly to do away with the police juries

entirely.

Mr. Lynch explained that such was not the

intention of the bill.

What defect exists in the present system

which requires correction? I repeat that I am

opposed to the abolition of the present police jury

system, and am confident that it will continue

to be the best system for the people of the

parish of St. Landry, and there are thirteen or

fourteen jury wards, and this bill proposes

to reduce that number to three. A party

from the parish of St. Landry, who has a

courthouse of the parish, and if he wanted

a public bridge prepared in his immediate

vicinity, he would be compelled to travel all

that distance to the police jury in session

in order to have the work done. Under the

present system he would have to go only

two or three miles to one of his neighbors

to obtain the services of a police jury from

the parish. In the parish of St. Landry, there

is forty-five miles from what is known as the

"Rivieres wood-yard" to Covington; twenty

miles from there to Bogalusa; twenty miles

from Bogalusa to the parish line of St. Helena.

Now, suppose a party was living at Pine

Grove, and desiring to have a bridge built

in the neighborhood of Covington, he would

be obliged to travel all the way to Covington

to have it done. I repeat that I can not see

the object of this bill, unless it is to

concentrate all the political power of the

State into the hands of a few men. If such

is not the intention of the bill, it will

certainly be the practical result of it, and

the honorable member for St. Landry, Nat

Chalices, Rapides, Pointe Coupee, Madison,

Texas, Ouachita, and other parishes that I

could name, which are now composed of

fourteen or fifteen police juries, each, the

number is to be reduced to three. I trust

that the Senate will carefully consider this

measure before taking final action upon it.

Mr. Lynch: I have no objection to the

adoption of the bill, if it is the intention

of the Senate to do so. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

measure of reformation, and it is the duty

of the Senate to pass it. The bill is a

the case, and the clerk would be

the police jury. There is a plenty of com

petent men who would be glad to perform

all the duties of the police jury at a

very moderate compensation. We pay that

officer in our parish four hundred dollars

per annum, and it is a very large parish.

The office of the clerk of the police jury

of the parish is worth five thousand dollars

per annum, and I think the present com

ensation, although he is a particular friend of mine.

It is also a very important office, and the

police jury to issue the commissions for

all the road overseers and the other officers

connected with the administration of par

ochial affairs. I hope, as I mentioned, that

this section will be stricken from the bill.

I offer, as a substitute for it, that the police

juries elect their own clerks.

Mr. Bay: I have listened with great

attention to the speech of the Senator from

St. Landry (Mr. Anderson), and I have

failed to hear him give a single good reason

why this section should be stricken from

the bill. I do not see the necessity of

such a provision in any section of the

State. It is true that in the parish of St.

Landry, the most populous parish in the

State, there are some difficulties to be met.

The simple fact, however, that the clerk of the

gentleman's parish does a large amount

of business, and that he receives a large

amount of fees, is no argument at all

against the adoption of the section in

question. The gentleman says that it is

the duty of the clerk of the police jury to

issue warrants for juries on the part of the

treasurer, and if he also performs the duties

of clerk of the police jury, there is no

check whatever upon him. What other check

is necessary, in a township where there

is a large amount of business, and where

there can certainly be no reasonable

objection to the clause on that score. As I

stated before, the police jury will doubtless

be the best system for the people of the

lowest possible figure on account of the fact

that he has another office, from which he

collects fees. It is also a matter of great

importance to persons having any business

to transact with the clerk of the police jury

that they should know where he can be

found at all times, and where his papers

and archives are kept. Under the present

system, the clerk of the police jury is

not taking any interest in the parishes of