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

DEBATES IN THE SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, February 7, 1872.

EXPENSES OF THE SENATE.

Mr. Ingraham, from the committee of conference, presented an amended bill to the Senate.

Mr. Ray—I protest against these amendments. If you will make a calculation as to the time the Secretary of the Senate is employed, you will find that fifteen hundred dollars a session is over twenty dollars a day, and eighteen hundred dollars a session is nearly thirty dollars a day. Such compensation is simply ridiculous. If we go into reform, let us go down to the bottom.

Mr. McMillen—I will go with the Senator if he will include J. O. Nixon's claim in his reform measures.

Mr. Ray—I say ten dollars a day would be full compensation for the Secretary, but I am willing to give fifteen dollars a day, or a thousand and fifty dollars for the seventy days.

Mr. Blackman—I am perfectly willing to pay these officers a proper salary, but it seems to me we ought to make the salary of the Assistant Secretary double that of the Secretary, because the Assistant Secretary does all the work.

Mr. McMillen—But the chief Secretary is engaged in his duty down at the Customhouse.

Mr. Ray—I move that the Senate do not concur in these amendments, and that we insist upon the bill as originally passed.

Mr. Ingraham—In justice to the committee of conference, I will say that we did all we could to preserve the original features of the bill as it passed the Senate, but we were assured by the members of the House committee of coaference, that the House would pass no other bill but the one now under consideration—that by a vote of sixty-one to twenty-one they had adopted this bill, and had moved to reconsider the vote by which it was adopted, and had laid that motion on the table. They had determined they would not back down on anything.

A Senator—Starve them out.

Mr. Ingraham—That is just it. If the Senate wants to starve them out it can refuse to concur.

Mr. Todd—I see very plainly the gentlemen want to make capital out of this. I come here for my eight dollars a day, and I move that we concur in the amendments of the committee of conference.

Mr. Hunsaker—I was a member of that committee. There were a great many points that I objected to, but it was one of the most difficult matters to effect any arrangement whatever. The committee had a very hard session, and my experience is that it is about the best bill they can get up. I agree with the Senator from Ouachita (Mr. Ray), that no employe of the Senate ought to receive greater compensation than a member, and I would vote for a law to that effect.

Mr. McMillen—Will the Senator from St. James (Mr. Hunsaker) allow me to give him a little information? I am told that such of the employes of the Senate as have positions in the Customhouse are not allowed to receive compensation from the government during their term of service in the Senate; consequently, we are expected to make up to them what they lose.

Mr. Smith—This is a House bill, is it not?

The President—Yes, sir.

Mr. Smith—Then how can the committee of conference suggest amendments? They can either adhere or not.

Mr. Ray—This committee of conference suggested charges, which have been approved by the House and sent down here now for the concurrence of the Senate. I think that is regular.

The President—I hold it is perfectly regular, and therefore decide the point of order not well taken.

Mr. Ray—I have only a word or two to say. We have fixed the expenses of the Legislature on a scale which will not exceed two hundred thousand dollars; but I am told they have already fifty clerks in the House, and we do not know how many more there will be before the end of the session. All that I want is an economical administration, and I regard the compensation fixed by the Senate as the highest that can be consistently allowed. Therefore I move that the Senate do not concur in these amendments.

The yeas and nays were called upon the question of concurring in the amendments suggested by the committee of conference. Yeas fifteen, nays fifteen.

The President gave the casting vote in the negative, explaining that he did so because he saw the chairman of the committee had himself voted against his own report.

Mr. Noland moved to postpone these amendments indefinitely.

Mr. Ingraham—The great point of difference between the committee of the Senate and the committee of the House was the employment of clerks. In the House they have fifty-four clerks, drawing seven dollars a day. I said everything in the way of argument to persuade the House committee to agree to the striking out of at least thirty of these clerks.

Mr. McMillen—Does not the bill as returned to us from the House limit the number of clerks?

Mr. Ingraham—It leaves the House to appoint as many as it pleases.

The motion to indefinitely postpone the amendments was lost.

Mr. McMillen—I am sorry to see the Senate refusing to make these reductions. The proposition we have voted down was a proposition of reduction. I regret to see Senators who have been so prominent in reform measures recording their votes against the proposition, because in the first instance it was a reduction of the Secretary's salary from two thousand dollars to eighteen hundred dollars, and the Assistant Secretary's from eighteen hundred dollars to sixteen hundred dollars. If we had concurred in this report we would have reduced expenses by that sum at least, but I take it that the majority of the Senators, including all those so strenuous in their advocacy of reform, are opposed to these reductions. I regret to see this manifestation on the part of Senators, and hope they will reconsider their votes.

Mr. Blackman—Either the gentleman does not understand the question or I do not. Either he is in ignorance of the force of the vote just taken, or I do not know anything about it, and I have been voting in the dark. As to the question of reform, I have nothing to say about it.

Mr. McMillen—That is what I object to. You have not enough to say about it.

Mr. Blackman—I understand that the Senate first passed a bill for the appropriation of a certain amount of money to meet the expenses of the General Assembly, and fixing the compensation of the employes; that that bill was sent to the House of Representatives, and the House of Representatives refused to pass the bill of the Senate, but passed an original bill, which they called a substitute for the Senate bill. They sent this down to the Senate, which refused to concur in the House bill, and inserted amendments therein, which amendments were a reduction of the salaries of the employes and a limitation of the number of clerks.

Mr. Ray—Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him. I hold that if the Senate refuses to concur in the amendments proposed by the committee of conference, it brings the matter back to the original Senate amendments.

Mr. Blackman—That is the way I understand it.

Mr. McMillen—That is not the way I understand it.

Mr. Blackman—If we refuse to act on the report of the committee of conference, we simply leave the bill where we found it—that is, the House bill with the Senate amendments thereto; but to bring the matter to a test, and to see whether I am right or whether the Senator from Carroll (Mr. McMillen) is right, I make a motion that the Senate refuse to concur in the amendments of the committee of conference; in other words, that the Senate refuse to adopt the report of the committee of conference. This will bring before us the original House bill with the Senate amendments reducing the expenditures.

Mr. Noland called for the order of the day.

Mr. Blackman moved to suspend the order of the day.

Mr. McMillen called for the special order order of the day.

The President—There is no special order of the day.

Mr. McMillen—The election bill was made the special order of the day.

The President—Unfinished business is the highest order of the day. I know of no order of the day that can take precedence over the unfinished business.

The order of the day was postponed.

Mr. Blackman—I now renew my motion that the Senate refuse to concur in the report of the committee of conference.

Mr. Ray—I second the motion; but would is not be a more regular parliamentary proceeding, as we are now acting on the report of the conference committee, if we were to reject that report. We could then call another committee of conference on the same bill. The House will have refused to concur in the Senate's amendments, and the Senate will have refused to concur in the course of the House.

The President—I find, in the joint rules of the the houses of Congress, rule fifteen: "That if the houses shall have adhered to their disagreement the bill shall be lost." This also is mentioned in Jefferson's Manuel, and the opinion of the Chair is that if the Senate now refuse to adhere to this proposition coming from the House, after having agreed to a committee of conference, this bill is lost and you will have to originate a new bill, either in the House or in the Senate.

Mr. Blackman—I do not that would be the effect in this instance. Our action will simply be to refuse to adopt the amendments offered by the committee of conference.

The President—The House has already adopted these amendments and tabled the motion to reconsider the vote by which they were adopted.

Mr. Ray—It is not unusual to discharge one committee on conference and appoint another one.

Mr. Blackman moved that the report of the committee of conference be laid on the table, subject to call, and that the House be requested to appoint another committee.

Mr. O'Hara—I rise to a point of order. The committee itself has amended this bill, which it has no right to do, and in so doing it has transcended its powers. The only authority it had was to recede from the amendments proposed by the Senate, or to adhere to them. These amendments bring the whole question before the Senate. My point of order is that both the amendments proposed by the committee and the amendments proposed by the Senator from St. James (Mr. Hunsaker) are out of order.

The President ruled the point of order not well taken.

Mr. Blackman raised the point of order that the bill was not before the Senate to be amended.

The President—The point is well taken. The Senate is considering the report of the committee of conference.

Mr. Hunsaker asked if he had a right to offer this as a substitute for the report.

The President—I do not think so. We have a bill before us passed by the House, to which the Senate made some amendments, and we refused to agree to those amendments. Upon that information reaching both houses, the House asked for a committee of conference, which has reported a set of amendments, which amendments the House has adopted. The only thing that the Senate has to do is to concur in those amendments. As far as the bill itself is concerned, only so much of it as is referred to by the report of the committee is before the Senate properly; but on this ruling I am not quite sure, and would have the Senate to determine it.

After further discussion, the President took the position that either this Senate had to concur or not concur in the amendments of the committee.

Mr. McMillen—It seems to me this question can be very easily explained. This bill was a House bill, and was received from the House of Representatives, and adopted by the Senate with certain amendments. The bill as amended was then returned to the House, and the House refused to concur in those amendments. The House then asked for a committee of conference upon the amended bill. That committee was appointed, and made its report, which was concurred in by the House of Representatives, and a bill containing the amendments agreed upon by the committee was adopted. That bill is now before the Senate, and it has either to concur or not concur in the report of the committee of conference; and I think, after we get through, it will be our duty to inform the House that we have not been able to concur, and to request another committee of conference. It has been customary to make two attempts of this kind before the question is lost.

Mr. Sypher called for the order of the day.

THE REGISTRATION BILL.

The Senate proceeded with the consideration of section three of the registration bill.

Mr. McMillen asked unanimous consent to make the election bill the special order for Monday.

Mr. Blackman moved to make it the special order as soon as the registration law was disposed of.

Mr. Todd—I object to having the election law brought up. It is out of its regular order.

The President—It requires unanimous consent.

Mr. McMillen—That is a very queer ruling. It is in broad violation of the rules.

The President—The gentleman has his remedy in an appeal.

Mr. McMillen—Not in this Senate. The idea of depriving a special order of its place seems to me preposterous.

The President quoted rule twenty-nine.

Mr. Todd—The gentleman has his remedy; let him take it. It is not for him to explain what the rules are.

Mr. Hunsaker moved to postpone the order of the day in order to settle the question of the appropriation bill.

The motion to postpone the order of the day was lost.

Mr. Noland called for executive session.

Mr. Blackman rose to a point of order. Executive session could be called but once during the consideration of a question.

The President—The point is well taken.

Mr. McMillen—What becomes of the election law?

The President—It is on the calendar for a special day.

On section five of the registration law—Mr. Blackman said: It was understood that the committee would agree on the provisions of this bill in a general way, but it was also understood that the Senator from Ouachita (Mr. Ray) and myself would offer a minority report. The section we objected to was the one just read. I now offer a substitute for section five, providing that the police juries of the several parishes shall appoint the supervisors of registration for their respective parishes, except the parish of Orleans; and that, in the parish of Orleans, the Mayor and Administrators shall appoint the supervisors. We urge the passage of this substitute. Why? Because the police jurors in each parish are presumed to be representatives of the people; the police jurors are men who reside in the parish, and they are competent to select some good honest man of either party, or irrespective of party, to register for the parish. This is one of the provisions we deem important, because we wish not to commit the practical machinery of the government to the power of any party, whether high or low. We must not give to any man, by means of the appointing power under the laws of the General Assembly the power to control the elections of the people. It is not only right but it is just to the people that the Legislature should put it beyond the power of any man to appoint registrars in such a way as unduly and unfairly to control the election. It is, therefore, for the purpose of disconnecting the registration entirely from the political department of the government that we offer this substitute. I may say that it covers directly the points made by the Governor in his message, in which he recommends the passage of a registration law placing the power of appointing the registrars in the police juries of each parish. He says the exigencies and the demands of the people are such that the Legislature should pass this law, and so say we. All that we ask is that you pass such a law as will give us a fair registration throughout the State and enable everybody to register that is entitled to do so; that the registrar appointed to discharge the duty shall be under no obligation whatever to any person who might think proper to use him at the election. We heard both from the Democratic side and the Republican side, both from the Democratic friends of the Governor and those opposed to him that there were frauds committed at the last election; that some of the registrars sent throughout the country in parishes did not discharge their duties honestly or as contemplated by law. We say that the Governor of the State has said to the Legislature and the people that the power has been used improperly, and he has recommended in his message that we pass an act vesting the power in the police juries of each parish, in order that he may get rid of the responsibility of appointing these registrars. The recommendation of the Governor should be listened to. It was a wise and judicious recommendation on the part of the executive, and the amendment we now offer is recommended not only by him and by us, but meets the approval, you might say, of the united people of the entire State. I therefore hope the Lislature will not refuse to pass this amendment. It will be an injury to no one. It will simply place the power in the hands of the police jurors elected by the people. They will be disposed to appoint as registrars men who reside in the parish and who have some responsibilities at home. The abuses which have occurred under the present registration law can not occur if the registrars are appointed by the police juries, because they are directly responsible to the parish they represent, and the people will see to it that they discharge their duties faithfully and for the good of the citizens at large.

Mr. McMillen—As a test vote I move to lay the substitute of the Senator from Claiborne (Mr. Blackman) on the table, and on that motion I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. Ingraham—I rise to explain my vote. I am opposed to the police juries appointing the supervisors of registration, for the reason that a great many of these police jurors have been appointed since our last adjournment, and up to this hour their names have not been submitted to the Senate for confirmation. I do not know who they are, and I do not believe there is one Senator in possession of information on the subject by which I could by any means be enlightened. Again, police jurors have been appointed in several parishes, and for some reason or other there have been removals and changes among them, and the question has been carried to the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court has decided that the Governor has no authority to remove a police juror after he has once made the appointment. I will not vote to vest the police juries with the right of appointing supervisors of registration, because I do not believe they represent the wishes of the parishes. They themselves being appointees, I believe, instead of subserving or answering to the wishes of the people, would consult only their individual preferences in their appointments. As the people have not the selection of police jurors in this State, the police jurors do not represent the people. I desire a State board to be named in the bill, who shall make these appointments.

The substitute was tabled by 20 yeas to 11 nays.

Mr. McMillen—I now move that section five be adopted, and on that motion I call for the previous question.

Mr. Hunsaker—I second the call.

Mr. Ray—I ask the gentleman to withdraw that motion, in order that I may offer an amendment.

Mr. McMillen—I must decline to do so.

Mr. Ray—The Senator himself proposed to me that I should make the amendment.

Mr. McMillen—But the Senator declined to do it.

The previous question was ordered, and the section was adopted.

Mr. Ray—I move an additional section—that the Governor be required to submit to the Senate the names of the registrars he proposes to appoint.

Mr. Ragan—This additional section would be in conflict with the section we have just passed, and inasmuch as a motion to reconsider that section has been tabled, I raise the point of order that the motion can not now be entertained.

The President ruled the point of order not well taken.

Mr. McMillen—I desire to appeal from the decision of the Chair. The proposition of the Senator from Ouachita (Mr. Ray), coming as it does at this time, is absurd in my judgment, being in direct conflict with the proposition just adopted. Section five provides for the manner of appointment, and the time when these appointments shall be made. The proposition of the Senator from Ouachita (Mr. Ray) now is to provide another manner and a different time for making these appointments. If you adopt the proposition of the Senator from Ouachita (Mr. Ray) you will have side by side in the same law two sections contradictory. Therefore, I say it would be an absurdity on its face, and not in accordance with parliamentary usage. Now, then, in regard to the gist of the proposition itself, which is that these appointments shall be made by the Governor, by and with the consent of the Senate, and during the present session. I am in favor of such a proposition in the abstract. I believe, as a formal proposition, that supervisors of registration should either be elected by the people or appointed by the Governor. If they are to be appointed, one by one, I believe the appointing power belongs to the chief executive of the State. It is a prerogative of that high office, and I do not believe it would be right to take from the Governor this power, and give it to a set of officials appointed by the same hand. The proposition is to give the appointments to the police juries. The police jurors are appointed by the Governor, without the advice and consent of the Senate. In the law adopted last session we gave that extraordinary power. We did not even reserve to ourselves the right to revise his appointments, and that is the reason the Senator from the Second District (Mr. Ingraham) does not know who the appointees are.

Mr. Blackman said he thought the Senator was mistaken in this statement, and referred him to the law.

Mr. McMillen—I am mistaken. It is "with the advice and consent of the Senate" the appointments are made. I have been informed to the contrary, and spoke without looking at the law. I desire to state that I favor the proposition to require the Governor to make these appointments during the present session of the General Assembly, and I think that the appointments should be made by and with the consent of the Senate, but I do not want to vote for the proposition of the Senator from Ouachita (Mr. Ray) in its present shape.

Mr. Blackman—We have now twenty-four days, and at the rate we are going on with this bill we can not pass it in time enough for the Governor to make the appointments before we adjourn.

Mr. McMillen—Then let the Governor call the Senate in executive session.

Mr. Blackman—He has not the right to do so.

Mr. McMillen—I think he has. The General Assembly has decided that he has, and I will join the Senator from Claiborne (Mr. Blackman) in asking him at any time to call an extra session, at which the nominations shall be submitted.

The President—This discussion is entirely out of order.

Mr. Hunsaker—The proposed section is unconstitutional in the first place. Articles twenty-five and twenty-six of the constitution provide for the passage of laws for the registration of every voter of the State.

The President—The gentleman is out of order. He is not speaking to the appeal.

Mr. Hunsaker—I submit that I was speaking to the question. I was showing that the Chair was in error in ruling that the substitute of the Senator from Ouachita (Mr. Ray) was now in order. These sections of the constitution imply that the supervisors of registration are constitutional officers. They are recognized as such.

The President—What has this to do with the appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. Hunsaker—I claim that the Chair committed an error when it stated that the point of the Senator from Terrebonne (Mr. O'Hara) was not well taken. I assert that article sixty of the constitution provides that all constitutional officers not otherwise provided for shall be appointed by the Governor. I claim that the supervisors of registration are constitutional officers, and that this proposition of the gentleman from Ouachita (Mr. Ray), that the police jurors shall appoint higher officers than themselves, is clearly unconstitutional.

Mr. Lewis—What article is this?

Mr. Hunsaker—Article sixty. "That the Governor, by and with the consent of the Senate, shall appoint all officers."

Mr. Lewis—Read a little further.

Mr. Hunsaker—Read it to suit yourself.

Mr. Ragan—If I understand this matter, it is in this shape, as far as the Senate is at present concerned. This fifth section is the law of the State, because an attempt has been made to reconsider it, and that motion has been tabled; therefore there can be no further action taken on this section until we shall have passed through the entire bill. Then, upon the adoption of the bill as a whole, this section will be brought up again, but at present we can do nothing with it. The question for the Chair to determine is whether it is proper for the Senate to insert a section between sections five and six which is in conflict with section five. I believe that can not be done, because, so far as the Senate is concerned, if this bill should be adopted, this section is the law of the State, and how is it possible for a section directly in conflict with it to be introduced into the same act?

Mr. Lewis—I wanted to finish the reading of article sixty of the constitution. It says: "He shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate appoint, all officers whose offices are established by the constitution and whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for; provided, however, that the General Assembly shall have the right to prescribe the mode of appointment of all other officers."

Mr. McMillen withdrew his appeal.

The President—I am satisfied that the decision was right. The proposition of the Senator from Ouachita (Mr. Ray) was not in conflict with the section that preceded it.

Mr. McMillen—Do you not consider it in the nature of an amendment to section five?

The President—No, sir. In my opinion these officers will have to be confirmed by the Senate, whether the Governor sends their names in or not. It has been the custom of the Governor, or rather he has failed on several occasions to send in the names of the appointees before the Senate adjourned, but there is no law that leaves in his hands the power of appointing anybody he pleases without the revision of the Senate. I know the proposition of the gentleman from Ouachita (Mr. Ray) is what the Senate desires, and will probably adopt, before this bill passes. I do not believe it is the province of the Chair to decide whether two sections are in conflict, even if they were. It would not be the first time that the Senate has passed a bill with contradictory sections in it.

The previous question was ordered, and the yeas and nays called on the substitute of Mr. Ray; yeas 15, nays 15.

The President voted nay and the substitute was lost.

Mr. Blackman desired to offer an amendment.

Mr. Campbell—While I would agree to anything which would give the Senate a proper prerogative, I ask the Senator whether he thinks it proper for the number of registrars which the bill provides for to be appointed and their names sent in before the end of this session?

Pending the discussion the Senate adjourned.

Persecution of the Jews.

LONDON, February 17.—Advices received in this city state the Jewish persecution in Roumania is increasing. Numbers daily fall victims to the hatred of the native inhabitants, over whom the authorities exercise no control. Murder in public is frequent and unpunished. The unfortunate Israelites are subjected to every kind of indignity and persecution, their dwellings fired by lawless mobs, and numbers of lives not unfrequently sacrificed to complete the holocaust. This relentless persecution has compelled many to leave the territory. Numbers of these refugees are placing themselves under Turkish protection.

In the city of Rahoui the persecution has been developed in the bloodiest aspect. Seventy Israelites, including defenseless women and children, have fallen victims to the oppressors; thirty-five wounded, many fatally.

The receipt of the above awakens general sympathy in this city.

It has taken the courts of Brooklyn fifteen years to decide whose business it is to mend a hole in the street.

INSURANCE.

OFFICE OF THE SUN MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY
OF NEW ORLEANS.
61 ..... Camp street 61

FIFTEENTH ANNUAL STATEMENT.

NEW ORLEANS, January 31, 1872.

In conformity with the requirements of their charter, the company publish the following statement for the year ending December 31, 1870:

Amount of premiums for the year ending thirty first December viz.:

On Fire Risks	$392,069 58	
On Marine Risks	68,465 54	
On River Risks	74,305 59	
	$534,332 11	
Add—		
Unterminated Risks for 1869	51,511 00	
		$585,843 11
Deduct—		
Unterminated Risks for 1870	$45,612 00	
Return Premiums	914 56	
		46,526 56
Net earned premiums for 1870		$539,316 55
Losses paid during same period viz.:		
On Fire Risks	$79,539 00	
On Marine Risks	51,005 61	
On River Risks	20,964 38—150,510 99	
Taxes	13,913 79	
General Expenses	37,012 72	
Discount on Premiums	16,931 31	
Interest on Scrips	47,434 42	
Re-insurances	3,114 33—117,507 19	
Amount reserved for unadjusted losses less savings	6,759 04	
	$274,776 35	
Less—		
Discount and interest, and profit and loss	$7,995 30	
		266,780 55
Net Profit		$12,035 00

The Company have the following Assets, estimated at the lowest market cash values, viz:

465 Consolidated and Railroad City Bonds	$238,435 00
6 State Bonds	5,160 00
44 City Seven Per Cent Bonds	20,630 75
4 I. O. O. F. Bonds	4,000 00
3 Grand Lodge of Louisiana Bonds	3,000 00
2 N. O. Turners' Association	1,000 00
600 Shares N. O. Gas Light Company*	30,000 00
234 Shares Citizens' Bank of Louisiana	36,600 00
380 Shares Union Bank of Louisiana*	11,900 00
223 Shares Canal Bank*	9,372 00
50 Shares Crescent City Bank	1,200 00
50 Shares Louisiana State Bank*	5,200 00
50 Shares Mechanics' and Traders' Bank	1,500 00
30 Shares Harbor Protection Company	1,500 00
5 Shares Merchants' Bank	325 00
Loans on Pledge	54,863 45
Loans on Mortgage	72,450 00
Bills Receivable	2,909 00
Scrip of other Insurance Companies	6,331 00
State Coupons	3,457 20
Premiums in course of collection	28,000 00
Cash on hand	62,266 82
Total	$574,061 82

*Including Dividends.

The above statement is a just, true and correct transcript from the books of the Company.

THOMAS SLOO, President.
THOMAS ANDERSON, Secretary.

STATE OF LOUISIANA, PARISH OF ORLEANS, City of New Orleans.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this twenty first day of January, 1871.

ANDREW HERO, JR., Notary Public.

The Board of Directors have resolved to pay six per cent interest on the outstanding Certificates of Profits, on and after the second Monday of February, 1871; also, fifty per cent on the balance of the scrip of the year 1868, payable on and after the third Monday in March, 1871, and they have further declared a dividend of ten per cent on the net earned Participating Premiums for the year ending December 31, 1870, for which certificates will be issued on and after the twentieth day of March next.

THOMAS SLOO, President.
JOHN G. GAINES, Vice President.
THOMAS ANDERSON, Secretary.

DIRECTORS:

John G. Gaines,	E. J. Hart,
B. Blacoe,	Henry Renshaw,
B. N. Marks,	W. K. Seymour,
J. Wels,	R. S. Venables,
W. A. Kent,	Richard Flower,
Hugh Wilson	Thomas Sloo.

ja27 1y

INSURANCE.

GUARDIAN MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY OF NEW YORK.

Established n 1859.

ALL POLICIES NON-FORFEITABLE.

CASH OR THIRD NOTE PREMIUMS.

NO NOTES REQUIRED.

Last Cash Dividend Fifty Per Cent.

Cash assets over	$2,000,000
Policies in force	25,000,000
Annual income	1,000,000
Losses paid since 1859	600,000

OFFICERS:

W. H. PECKHAM, President.
W. T. HOOKER, Vice President.
L. McADAM, Secretary and Actuary.
G. A. FREDRIKAR, Superintendent of Agencies.

DIRECTORS:

Hon. John A. Dix, New York.
John J. Crane, President Bank of Republic.
William M. Vermilye, Banker, Wall street (Vermilye & Co).
Charles G. Rockwood, Cashier Newark Banking Company.
Hon. George Opdyke, ex-Mayor of New York.
Minot C. Morgan, Banker.
Thomas Rigney, firm Thomas Rigney & Co.
Benjamin B. Sherman, Treasurer New York Steam Sugar Refining Company.
Aaron Arnold, firm Arnold, Constable & Co.
Richard H. Browne, of Wetmore & Browne, lawyers.
E. V. Haughwout, firm E. V. Haughwout & Co.
William Wilkens, firm W. Wilkens & Co
Julius H. Pratt, Merchant.
William W. Wright, Merchant.
Charles J. Starr, Merchant.
William Allen, Merchant.
George W. Cuyler, Banker, Palmyra, New York.
George T. Hope, President Continental Fire Insurance Company.
John H. Sherwood, Park Place.
Walton H. Peckham, corner Fifth avenue and Twenty-third street, New York.
William T. Hooker, Wall street.
Edward H. Wright, Newark, New Jersey
George W. Farlee, Lawyer.
W. L. Cogswell, Merchant.

JOSEPH MAGNER,
Manager for Louisiana and Texas, No. 158 Common street, New Orleans. fo18 2y

DELTA INSURANCE COMPANY.

OFFICE CORNER CARONDELET AND COMMON STREETS, NEW ORLEANS.

CAPITAL STOCK DEPARTMENT.

Shares $100 each. Annual interest dividends ten per cent.

PREMIUM DEPARTMENT.

All dividends to Stockholders payable in Cash.
FIRE, MARINE and RIVER policies issued by this Company at Current Rates of Premiums.

TRUSTEES:

A. Baldwin,	C. J. Leeds,	L. H. Gardner.
G. P. Blanchard,	F. Laborde,	J. Lapene,
A. Eimer Badet,	A. H. D'Meza,	O. Hopkins,
O. Bercier,	Emile Dupre,	C. H. Moutin.
A. Tertrou,	John Brunsso,	W. B. Conger,
B. Huft,	B. Bouligny,	E. Bordelois,
R. W. Theurer.	A. Palacio,	T. L. Airey,
M. A. de Lizarul,	T. M. Simmons,	Joseph Aleix,
	E. Ganucheau.	

OFFICERS:

E. GANUCHEAU, President.
A. BALDWIN, Vice President.
L. W. BAQUIE, Secretary.

ec31 6m

LAFAYETTE FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY,
OF NEW ORLEANS.

Capital ..... $300,000.

Office corner of St. Andrew and Magazine streets up stairs; entrance on St. Andrew street.

INSURES AGAINST LOSS OR DAMAGE BY FIRE AT LOWEST RATES.

OFFICERS:

KASPAR AUCH, President; ROBERT JACKSON, Vice President.
Louis Mathis, Secretary; John Purcell, Inspector

DIRECTORS:

J. H. Keller,	Philipp Drumm,
E. H. Burton,	Henry Rice,
W. S. Fish,	L. L. Levy,
O. F. Theisman,	Florence Pfister,
Louis Faessel,	J. F. Evans,
Henry Hermann,	Dr. S. S. Wood,
Henry Bousel, Jr.,	Alfred Shaw,
Charles Kemper,	E. R. Chevalley,
Christian Mehle,	J. H. Norton
B. H. Schene,	J. M. G. Parker,
August Bernard.	

fe10 1y

NEW ORLEANS MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY.

Office, corner of Camp and Canal streets.

Capital, $500,000.

Assets, December 31, 1871, $694,579 90.

Insures fire, marine and river risks, dividing the profits on each department separately to the insured.

For the accommodation of its customers, the company will make marine losses payable in London.

J. TUYES, President.
J. W. HINCKS, Secretary.

DIRECTORS.

George Urquhart,	M. Payro,
C. T. Dugazon,	Placide Forstall,
G. W. Babcock,	Aug. Reichard,
Henry Blanchard,	E. Miltenberger,
A. Schreiber,	W. B. Schmidt,
Charles Lafitte.	J. Tuyes.

fe2 2mo

HOME MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY
OF
NEW ORLEANS

TWENTIETH YEAR.

Premiums received during the year ending December 30, 1871, including unterminated risks of 1870 ..... $460,325 23

The company have the following

ASSETS:

Cash	$54,384 13	
Bills receivable, loans on pledge	43,360 00	
Bills receivable for premiums	9,553 36	
Outstanding accounts in course of collection	38,137 51—$145,444 02	
Real estate, No. 73 Camp street		50,000 0
Bonds of the city of New Orleans		316,796 25
Bonds of the State of Louisiana		49,550 00
Bonds of the St. Charles Hotel Company		68,000 00
Bonds of the Grand Lodge F. A. M.		5,000 00
Bonds of the Odd Fellows' Hall Association		5,000 00
Bonds of the Mechanics' and Agricultural Fair Association		5,000 00
Bank stocks		65,050 00
Vallette Dry Dock Company stock		7,400 00
Harbor Protection Company stock		1,800 00
Scrips of New Orleans insurance companies		3,997 00
Suspended stock and bond account		258,460 47
Total		$982,997 74

The Board of Trustees, at a meeting held this nineteenth day of January, 1872, unanimously adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, That six per cent interest on all outstanding certificates of profits be paid to the legal holders of the same on and after the twelfth day of February next.

ALFRED MOULTON, President.
WILLIAM M. PERKINS, Vice President.
A. W. HUNTER, Secretary.

Trustees—1872.

A. MOULTON,	WILLIAM M. PERKINS,
R. HARE,	S. J. KRITH,
B. M. HORRELL	G. W. ROPER,
JOHN C. ROGERS,	M. C. RANDALL,
JOHN T. MOORE,	WILLIAM F. TUTT,

ADOLPH MEYER. fe3 1m

INSURANCE.

MERCHANTS' MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY OF NEW ORLEANS.

No. 104 Canal street.

SEVENTEENTH ANNUAL STATEMENT.

In conformity with the requirements of their charter, the company publish the following statement:

Premiums received during the year ending May 31, 1871, including unearned premiums of the previous year—

On fire risks		$757,573 63
On marine risks		103,808 61
On river risks		239,680 38
Total premiums		$1,101,062 64
Less unearned premiums		222,422 00
Net earned premiums, May 31, 1871		$878,640 64
Losses paid—		
On fire risks	$429,790 37	
On marine risks	69,230 27	
On river risks	72,791 63	
Total	$571,812 27	
Taxes	46,531 71	
Reinsurances and return premiums	30,052 37	
Total	$648,396 35	
Deduct interest, less expenses	33,269 75—	$615,135 60
Profit		$263,505 04

The company have the following assets—

Real estate	$110,965 11
City bonds	254,650 00
Bank and railroad stocks	37,456 00
Notes secured by mortgage	410,932 8
Notes secured by pledge	103,596 8
Bills receivable	57,755 43
Premiums in course of collection	62,923 94
State bonds	1,500 00
Scrip of other companies	6,112 50
Stock of Vallette Dry Dock Company	19,200 00
Stock of Levee Steam Cotton Press	2,300 00
Stock of Marine Dry Dock and Ship Yard Company	2,700 00
Harbor Protection Company	1,500 00
Mortgage bonds Grand Lodge of Louisiana	2,000 00
Mortgage bonds Turners' Association	2,000 00
Mortgage bonds Odd Fellows' Hall	5,000 00
Stock Opera House Association	3,000 00
Judgments	19,134 10
Cash on hand	381,262 89
Total assets	$1,495,189 57
Less—Unclaimed interest and interest payable July next on all outstanding scrips of the company	$79,745 96
Issues of scrip for the years 1863, 1864 and 1865, payable in July	179,390 00
Unearned premiums on May 31, 1871	222,422 00— $481,057 96
	$1,092,131 61

The above statement is a just, true and correct transcript from the books of the company.

P. FOURCHY, President.
G. W. NOTT, Secretary.

STATE OF LOUISIANA, Parish of Orleans, City of New Orleans.

Sworn to and subscribed before me the third day of June, 1871.

JOSEPH CUVILLIER, Notary Public.

At a meeting of the Board of Directors, held on the third day of June, 1871, it was resolved to declare a scrip dividend of thirty per cent on the net earned participating premiums for the year ending thirty-first of May, 1871 for which certificates will be issued on and after the first day of August next. Also, to pay on and after the second Monday in July next the whole issues of Scrip for the years 1863, 1864 and 1865, and six per cent interest on all outstanding scrip of the company.

DIRECTORS:

P. Fourchy,	L. P. Generes.
P. Maspero,	P. S. Witz,
D. McCoard,	S. Z. Relf,
M. Puig,	Joseph Roy,
D. A. Chaffraix,	Charles Lafitte
J. J. Fernandez.	

fe4 1y

NEW ORLEANS MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY.

Office Corner of Camp and Canal Streets.

ASSETS DECEMBER 31, 1870, $802,742 07.

Insures fire, marine and river risks, dividing the profits on each department separately to the insured.

J. TUYES, President.
J. W. HINCKS, Secretary.

Directors.

George Urquhart,	M. Payro,
A. Rochereau,	Placide Forstall,
G. W. Babcock,	Augustus Reichard,
A. Schreiber,	Ernest Miltenberger.
Charles Lafitte	W. B. Schmidt,
T. Bailly Blanchard,	J. Tuyes.

my12 1y

CRESCENT MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY

Twenty-second Annual Statement.

NEW ORLEANS, May 19, 1871.

The Trustees, in conformity to the charter, submit the following statement of the affairs of the company on the thirtieth day of April, 1871:

Fire premiums for the year	$180,572 50	
Marine premiums for the year	70,195 62	
River premiums for the year	222,613 88	
		$473,382 00
Earned premiums, less reinsurance and return premiums		$400,019 99
Losses paid and estimated as follows:		
On fire risks	$45,799 95	
On marine risks	19,195 09	
On river risks	72,639 45	
	$127,634 49	
Taxes paid and estimated	43,319 21	
Discount in lieu of scrip, stamps, expenses, interest account, etc., less discount, etc	50,103 53	
		231,557 2
Leaving net profits		$169,453 46
The company has the following assets:		
Bills receivable	$24,589 11	
Loans on bond and mortgage	91,143 33	
		$115,732 44
Loans on pledge of stocks at call	266,716 66	
Cash on hand	119,095 77	
		405,812 43
Real estate		75,000 00
City bonds, bank and other stocks		228,745 00
Premiums in course of collection		82,572 65
Total		$909,662 52
The company has also suspended—		
Notes, stocks and bonds		$283,246 25
Forfeited scrip		9,994 78
Less interest on scrip		53,489 52

The above statement is a true and correct transcript from the