New Orleans Republican.

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE UNITED STATES

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF NEW ORLEANS

THE DAILY REPUBLICAN

is published every day (Mondays excepted) at No. 84 Camp street. Terms: $12 a year; $6 for six months; $3 for three months—payable invariably in advance. Single copies five cents.

Office—No. 84 Camp street.

RATES OF ADVERTISING:

Squares.	One month.	Two months	Three months	Six months	One year.
One	$12	$22	$30	$50	$75
Two	22	38	50	80	125
Three	30	51	70	110	175
Four	36	62	90	140	225
Five	45	80	105	170	275
Six	54	92	120	200	325
Seven	60	105	135	230	375
Eight	65	115	150	260	425
Nine	70	125	165	290	460
Ten	75	135	180	320	500
Eleven	80	145	195	350	540
Twelve	85	155	210	380	580
Thirteen	90	165	220	410	620
Fourteen	95	175	230	430	660
Fifteen	100	185	240	450	700
Thirty	175	330	450	750	1200

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE WEEKLY REPUBLICAN

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

Terms of Subscription.

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

Advertisements.

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

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

[For the New Orleans Republican.]

ROMANCE OF POLITICS IN THE BACKWOODS

Life in North Louisiana Since the War

BY W. JASPER BLACKBURN, EDITOR OF THE HOMER ILIAD.

I.—Canvass for Abney's Vacancy—Some Extra Tiles Between Blackman and Martin—The Contest in Claiborne Parish for the Constitutional Convention of 1867-68.

It would be untrue to history, and individually unjust, not to allude to the brief canvass which followed the death of Senator Abney, to fill his vacancy. The race was between Henry Gray as the Democratic candidate, and J. W. McDonald as the Union or Conservative candidate. Both of these gentlemen stood first class among their fellow-citizens on every count. As good and talented men, they had no superiors in North Louisiana, if elsewhere in the State; and as to Henry Gray, he had but few superiors in the United States. Each as brave as Julius Cæsar, manly and chivalrous almost to a fault, and ready in debate—rich and almost inexhaustible in resource both of attack and defense—they were, of course, the pride of their parties, and the admiration of their countrymen generally.

These gentlemen may have failings, political and otherwise, as most if not all men do; but they are so slight, so few and far between, compared to their many virtues and more redeeming traits, that they are not worth mentioning.

It would seem an ill wind to any country which would blow such gentlemen as Gray and McDonald into private life forever; that is, it would seem unfortunate that gentlemen of their fine ability and purity of personal character should hold political opinions deemed by the majority unsafe to free and liberal institutions. In the canvass between them for the State Senatorship they were antagonistic in politics—Gray opposing the conditions of the fourteenth constitutional amendment, and McDonald favoring them. The contest was very bitter on the part of the people, but not on the part of the candidates. Indeed, I may say, as between themselves, there was no contest—they were and are the best of personal friends—and I believe did not enter individually into the canvass at all. I suppose neither cared a copper for himself as to whether he might be elected or not. But the people, the friends of either gentleman, were none the less wide awake and active; nearly the entire population, however, being for Mr. Gray. I do not think McDonald could have canvassed his district in safety. In fact, his son was refused the right to distribute tickets for his father on election day—at a precinct, too, where at the last election, being again a candidate for the State Senate, he received a very large vote. This time, however, he was running as a Democratic or Fusion candidate.

It may not be interesting to many, and may not be deemed at all worth while to allude to such past scenes and items in the history of our country; but to me it seems different. It is both instructive and amusing. It is instructive in that it shows how great minds may differ, and how honest men may change, and is amusing in that it holds up in the light of experience the folly, if not criminality, of what is termed "public sentiment." To-day it blows one way, and to-morrow another—from the east on Sunday, from the west on Monday, from the north on Tuesday, and the south on Wednesday—often varying between hours. It is a most unsafe rule for a public man to follow—unsafe to the people and dishonorable to himself; and yet most public men follow this rule or one, or attempt to do so. Even men who condemn it follow it. Poor old Horace Greeley, with all his candor and great ability, and undoubted honesty of purpose, did this seemingly unawares. He did it against his own advice, and in the face of his own experience. He despised public opinion, and yet he followed it. He liked its flattery. He even loved a lie when it told a good story of himself. The very best thing he ever said, among the thousands and hundreds of thousands of the very good things which fell from his gifted pen and honest lips, is found in his letter to Hon. M. H. Bovee, of Wisconsin, against capital punishment. Greeley was, of course, too wise and too good to favor the barbarism and brutality of capital punishment. A man of his fine and pure and tender sense of right and propriety, could never indorse a rule so doubtful and unsafe. But he gave as his leading argument against this uncertain and most ugly "rule of right," the fickleness and unstableness of public sentiment. He said that the public feeling or sentiment which to-day might hang a man, might to-morrow shout hosannas to his name—too late, however, when dead!

This uncertainty of right in the public mind was strikingly exemplified in the canvass between Mr. Gray and Mr. McDonald, for the State Senatorship, to fill Mr. Abney's vacancy. Mr. McDonald was as right and true to himself and his country then, as he was wrong and unjust to himself and to his country, when, at last election, he was a candidate for the same office on that intolerable jumble, the Fusion ticket.

But the romance of this contest between Mr. Gray and Mr. McDonald followed and culminated in the result. Mr. Gray was, of course, elected—that senatorial district being largely Democratic, before the enfranchisement of the colored man—and repaired to New Orleans, and remained throughout the balance of the term—during which time, if I mistake not, he voted against the usual levee swindles, but very foolishly and inconsistently voted for an appropriation to test or contest the constitutionality of the Congressional reconstruction measures. Senator W. B. Egan voted for both!

In the campaign in Claiborne parish, immediately after the close of the war, as related in my last article, there were many romantic, not to say dramatic passages at arms, between William C. Martin and Wilbur F. Blackman—rhetorical flights and sparks of oratory peculiar and rare—much of which would do to "print in a book," with illustrations. Martin, as before stated, represented the plebeian class, and Blackman the aristocracy—that is, what was left of that class. The idea was to retain the services and maintain the control of the colored race in a condition as nearly approximating that of absolute slavery as possible. To this end, Blackman advocated on the stump what he termed a "stringent vagrant law." He wanted it so arranged that whipping at the public post should be instituted as punishment for minor offenses. This he advocated with great earnestness; interlarding his notions with some brilliant flights of oratory, of the evanescent spread-eagle character. It was made to appear very convenient, not to say pleasant, just to take up a poor "darkey," if caught under a misdemeanor, and lash him to a post, and lash his naked back with a score or so of stripes—it would only a little freshen those already there, barely yet healed since the "breaking out of freedom;" and then it would "save cost." But plebeian and unsophisticated Bill Martin did not see it in this light. Unlike the other candidates, who simply laughed at Wilbur's whipping notions as too ridiculous to discuss, Martin pitched into them as a matter of great seriousness. He did not much like the "nigger," it is true, but was a great friend to "poor people," being himself one of that class; and as the whipping arrangement would have to include all offenders, regardless of color, he objected to it most strenuously. Blackman, in all the native courtesy so peculiar to one of the first and best families of the South, graciously proposed to interpose a proviso in favor of Martin, exempting him from the penalties of this "stringent vagrant law." This made the matter worse—the apology was more intolerable than the original insult; and so Martin retorted with much native, meat-ax vim and uncultivated bitterness. The pine hills literally reverberated with his denunciations of Blackman, and the moles and bats paused to listen. "By blood," he would have the young mountain sprout, of played out chivalry know he asked and would accept of no such exemption for himself, and demanded in the name of the people that no such infamous and retrograding penalties be enacted or even discussed in a free country, for "d—n his melt" if it would be submitted to! And so, after being "worn to a frazle" by Martin in this manner and style on various occasions, young Blackman very gallantly acknowledged himself whipped, and confessed his proposition impracticable and wrong, and apologized to his rustic plebeian friend in proper terms. But in the Legislature which followed nearly precisely such a law as he proposed passed, which very plainly shows what the Democratic or Fusion party of the South would yet do if it had the power; for what men do once they will do again, the opportunity being the same.

So it will be seen that the romance of politics in the backwoods of North Louisiana since the war implies the whipping of vagrants at the public post as a humane Democratic measure that would "save cost", and afford some amusement and recreation as well.

The next event of any special exciting influence or romance that occurred in the backwoods of North Louisiana after the war was the campaign for members to the Constitutional Convention, under the reconstruction measures of Congress. In alluding to this I shall confine myself entirely to what took place in Claiborne parish.

When Blackburn was defeated for the Legislature in the contest of 1865, he told the people that the next thing would be the enfranchisement of the negro, and the disfranchisement of more white men than were included in the fourteenth constitutional amendment. Immediately after the election he went to Washington City, and was there when the reconstruction measures were passed; and they were so precisely as he had predicted that all his home people persisted in the erroneous belief that he had prepared them himself, and had dictated to Congress their passage. This of course was an error, a foolish error; because, in the first place, he would not have presumed to dictate, or even suggest to Congress what to do in any such important case, or in any case whatever; and if he had so presumed, as a matter of course, Congress would have paid no attention to such suggestion.

But so it was. Congress passed what is known as the reconstruction measures, enfranchising all "loyal" persons of the legal age, regardless of race, color or previous condition, and disfranchising or disqualifying many more of the white race than the fourteenth constitutional amendment disqualified. And on this status or programme the campaign for delegates to the Constitutional Convention "opened up."

In Claiborne the Republican candidates were W. R. Meadows, a colored man, and W. Jasper Blackburn. Almost the entire white element were opposed to the whole thing—opposed to the whole theory of Congressional reconstruction, and more especially to negro suffrage. Nevertheless, the colored man was already allowed to vote, and the white man who went into the canvass in opposition thereto, was consequently placed to a disadvantage—was perhaps conscientious, but very foolish—in the category somewhat of the gentleman's constituents who were "poor but honest;" that is, in a "very bad fix."

Thus the campaign for the Constitutional Convention opened up in Claiborne parish, in 1867, under the reconstruction measures of Congress.

The Democracy—that is, the rebel element—"swore upon the point of a knife" that they would have no candidates. They would not that far recognize the "infamy" of the reconstruction measures; and as to recognizing or submitting to "negro suffrage," that was out of the question—it was too preposterous and degrading for any "white man" to think of or even "dream of!"

Therefore, the "chivalry," by flattery and false promises, induced two very clever and talented colored men—Jeff Stallion and Stokes Steel—to run as independent Republican candidates against Meadows and Blackburn.

But now, mark the duplicity and treachery of the "oldest and best" of the chivalry, so-called, who possess or profess to possess as the old Whig party once professed to possess and combine all the talent and all the decency of the land. After promising these simple-minded, but too ambitious colored gentlemen, Stallion and Steel—rather ominous names—that they should have the support of the Democracy, they were thrown off and left out in the cold. They received but about twenty votes each, the honest and intelligent "chivalry" bringing out white candidates of their own a few days before the election. But Meadows and Blackburn were elected by about 1050 majority.

This campaign was a funny one, combining no small degree of real romance. The "independent" colored candidates did not pretend to meet the Republican nominees in debate, but bushwhacked on general principles—as the Indian went to the war—while Wilbur F. Blackman and Nelson J. Scott were "hired" by the Democracy to "stump" the parish against Meadows and Blackburn.

And it was a rich and rare canvass. Blackman was perhaps the best speaker in the company, and had the ear of the white element to an "alarming" extent; while Scott was an old stager, having some sense and more tact, and still more impudence. They "went for" Blackburn especially. They tried to prove that he had favored the Confederate side in the war; but the best proof they could bring forward were some obituary notices he had written of Confederate soldiers who were slain or had died in the service, in which notices the poor soldiers had been accorded honesty of purpose, and written to Heaven. This of course had an influence the wrong way, and only increased Blackburn's majority; for whatever may be the political prejudices of men, they will appreciate personal honesty and personal kindness and sympathy, especially when bestowed in behalf of the dead or the afflicted.

Blackman and Scott soon discovered their error, acknowledged their little political meanness, and virtually abandoned the contest many days before the election. But it is worthy of remark that United States soldiers had to be detailed to accompany the canvassers in this contest to save the Republican nominees from being mobbed. They were frequently insulted on the stump. On one occasion, when Blackburn publicly declared that he loved and revered the American flag and the government of the United States, a great big red-faced and red-headed, pork-eating Baptist preacher fumed and foamed and roared and ranted, and "swore" he felt like "smashing his fist" in the poor country editor's face. But the "pious soul" did not smash his foul and stinking "corn stealers" in any such way or manner. But the very idea, coming from a preacher, was just a little romantic, to say the least.

I have heretofore alluded to the personal appearance and traits of Wilbur Blackman, and I should perhaps here make similar allusion to Nelson Scott, as he was one of the distinguished canvassers in this race for the Constitutional Convention. Scott is a peculiar man—one among ten thousand if not altogether lovely. He has natural ability of no ordinary character, and a physique which, for looks and durability, is not to be surpassed in the present epoch. In the way of quisical anecdote he excels, and can "tell a tale" in the most entertaining and interesting style; and although somewhat deficient in education and polish, is withal a natural wit and humorist. Scott will excuse me for saying this, for the truth of history demands it. His defects, however, do not set him back much as a "stump speaker," particularly with vulgar and unthinking crowds. With his fine personal appearance and his glibness of speech the common crowd cares but little whether what he says has any particular sense or grammatical euphony; which it generally has not, particularly the latter.

Scott is a lawyer, but not much to hurt, and is at present judge of Claiborne parish, and I can not better portray his real character and legal acumen and literary taste than by relating the manner and style of one of his decisions. A very nice lady had sued her very worthless husband for a divorce. Scott at once granted it, with the remark, "that he knew of no law which compelled a decent lady to live with a damned drunken dog."

This is told of him, and I believe it is literally true, and have been long intending to send it to "Harper's Drawer."

These allusions are made, not to criticise Scott vindictively, but simply in behalf of the truth of history, and to show what constitutes the romance of politics in the backwoods. He will himself, I am sure, appreciate it, for no man living knows better how to "take a joke" than himself.

I will in my next number give an account of the campaign for the ratification of the new constitution, relate the assassination of W. R. Meadows, my colleague in the Constitutional Convention and also allude to the massacre of colored men in Bossier parish.

COURT RECORD.

MONDAY, JANUARY 19, 1874.

Supreme Court.

Present—Chief Justice Ludeling and Justices Taliaferro, Howell and Morgan.

Justice Wyly being prevented from sitting by illness, Chief Justice Ludeling read his opinions.

The following decisions were rendered:

BY CHIEF JUSTICE LUDELING.

No. 4890. Daniel & James D. Edwards vs. E. Marin, appellant.

No. 4732. Same vs. same.—From Fifth District Court. Motion to dismiss appeal overruled.

No. 4917. Eneas M. Cramer vs. Alexander V. Brown, appellant.—From Thirteenth Judicial District. Motion to dismiss appeal refused.

No. 4945. State ex rel. E. B. Benton vs. judge of the Superior District Court.—Rule for contempt on the ground that the judge appointed Alfred Shaw as an expert and sequestered relator's property in defiance of the mandate of this court commanding him to grant an appeal. It appears that the expert desisted when informed of the rule nisi, and made a report, on which the sequestration issued for that time. The judge probably erred in considering the report, but we do not think he had any idea of disobeying the mandate of this court, and it was an error of judgment in a matter not referred to in the mandate. Rule dismissed.

No. 4951. State ex rel. Richard Taylor vs. judge Superior District Court.—Rule for contempt dismissed, the defendant not having been guilty of disregarding or disobeying the decree of this court.

No. 4921. State ex. rel. John Larrieux vs. Judge Superior District Court.—Application for mandamus. Relator enjoined the Crescent City Slaughterhouse Company from slaughtering animals on the east bank. The latter enjoined relator from slaughtering animals anywhere but in their yards. Both parties appealed. Since then the company has enjoined relator from slaughtering animals on the west bank. This second injunction is vexatious, and the writ of mandamus prohibiting defendant from proceeding further is made perpetual.

No. 2990. Oldham & Scott, appellants, vs. Bank of West Feliciana.—From Sixth District Court. Suit on a lost bill of exchange, the transaction being in Confederate notes. Delmas vs. Insurance Company, 14 Wallace, settles that such contracts will not be enforced by the courts. Hanly vs. Scott, 19 A., 161; Reeve vs. Daughty, 19 A., 164; Groves vs. Hasdesty, 19 A., 186. Plaintiff would also have failed if the bill had been drawn against lawful money through laches. Story on Bills, 33, 325, 276; Chitty on Bills, 262; 2 Parsons Notes and Bills, 269. Judgment affirmed.

No. 4733. Succession of Pierre Monette—From the Second District Court of Orleans. Judgment affirmed, Justice Morgan dissenting.

BY JUSTICE TALIAFERRO.

No. 4847. Jacob Hawkins vs. New Orleans Printing and Publishing Company, appellants.—From the Fourth District Court of Orleans. Motion to dismiss appeal overruled.

No. 3910. Henry Freilsen vs. Daniel Dairex, appellant.—From Fifth District Court, Orleans. Judgment affirmed, with $500 damages for frivolous appeal.

No. 4913. F. C. Mahan vs. Accommodation Bank, appellant.—From Superior District Court. Judgment annulled and reversed, and defendant in injunction recover from plaintiff and surety ten per cent of the amount enjoined.

No. 3064. J. C. Murphy vs. McCarthy & Finnerty, appellants.—From Fourth District Court of Orleans. Appeal dismissed.

No. 3045. Mrs. M. A. Krall vs. E. M. Rusha, appellant.—From Sixth District Court of Orleans. Judgment affirmed.

No. 4918. James Gardner, appellant, vs. James Dezutier.—From Fifth District Court of Orleans. Motion to dismiss appeal overruled.

No. 1946. State ex rel. Garthwaite, Lewis & Miller vs. Judge of the Fourth District Court of Orleans.—Application for mandamus, compelling the judge to sign bill of exceptions. The judge having shown sufficient reason for not signing, the rule is dismissed.

BY JUSTICE HOWELL.

No. 2139. J. P. Harrison, appellant, vs. Esther Barbara Meyers.—From Second District Court of Orleans. After judgment was tendered and the appeal herein and writ of error was obtained from the Supreme Court of the United States, counsel for plaintiff in suit and in error discovered that the certificate of the clerk of the lower court was unsigned, whereupon he took a rule on the defendant, her counsel of record, and the clerk not now in office. The defendant could not be found, her counsel of record refused to accept service of the rule, stating that he had no further connection with the suit as attorney; the ex clerk was served but has made no answer. We can see no good reason why the certificate should not be signed as desired. Both parties submitted the record without the signature to this court without any objection, and neither party should now be dispensed, or allowed to take advantage of the clearly accidental omission. It is therefore ordered that the rule be made absolute.

No. 3017. Peter Markey vs. Frank W. Seymore, appellant.—From Fourth District Court of Orleans. Judgment affirmed.

No. 3025. St. Leon Destez vs. Mrs. C. L. Walker, appellant.—From Fifth District Court of Orleans. Appeal from an order of seizure, which is ordered to be amended to exclude $16 87.

No. 3075. St. Leon Destez, appellant, vs. Gillet De Vresse.—From Seventh District Court of Orleans. Appeal dismissed.

No. 3031. Rosina Prague vs. E. F. Walliche et al., appellants.—From Fourth District Court of Orleans. Judgment affirmed.

No. 4992. State ex rel. E. Merle, appellant, vs. Antoine Dubuclet, State Treasurer.—From the Superior District Court of Orleans. Rehearing to explain the decree which reversed the judgment of the lower court, and commanding the defendant to pay the warrants annexed to the petition out of any funds that may be in the treasury. The court erred in granting a mandamus when there was no money. Decree set aside, and judgment of lower court affirmed. Justice Morgan dissented.

No. 4625. Chaffraix & Agar vs. W. P. Harper et als., appellants.—On rehearing, ordered that the former decree remain undisturbed. Justice Morgan dissenting.

No. 4812. Patrick Gallagher vs. John Michel et als., appellants.—From Superior District Court. Judgment reversed, and Michel to recover three per cent on amount enjoined and $150 damages.

No. 4908. Josiah Fisk vs. police jury, Jefferson parish.—From Second Judicial District. Judgment affirmed.

BY JUSTICE WYLY.

No. 4611. Succession of A. H. D'Meza—From Second District Court of Orleans. Judgment affirmed.

No. 3104. Charles H. Davis, appellant, vs. B. L. Millaudon.—From Fifth District Court of Orleans. Judgment affirmed.

4851. Albert R. Whitney vs. Bernard Saloy, appellant.—From Second Judicial District. Judgment dissolving plaintiff's injunction affirmed.

No. 3079. Postera Bayou Navigation Company vs. William Durbridge, appellant.—From Fifth District Court of Orleans. Judgment affirmed, rejecting defendant's reconventional demand and compelling him to pay $456 88.

BY JUSTICE MORGAN.

No. 4897. Mrs. A. E. DeBlanc vs. Firmin Levasseur, appellant.—From Second District Court of Orleans. Motion to dismiss appeal denied.

No. 3005. George W. Hunter vs. Sun Mutual Insurance Company, appellant.—From Fourth District Court. George W. Hunter had been employed as book-keeper by the Sun Mutual Insurance Company at the rate of $2500 per annum. He was elected according to the by-laws at a meeting of the board of directors, in February, 1870, to serve for twelve months, but was dismissed in April, 1870, by the directors, for no dereliction of duty, but merely to reduce expenses. Judgment of lower court, given in favor of plaintiff, annulled and reversed, as the by-laws of the company provide "that the terms of all the offices of this corporation shall be during the pleasure of a majority of the board of directors."

No. 4785. Marco Geranovich vs. Citizens' Bank of Louisiana, appellant.—From Superior District Court. Judgment appealed from reversed and plaintiff's demand rejected. Justice Wyly dissenting.

No. 4622. State of Louisiana vs. Didio Baptiste and Francis Martini, appellants.—From the First District Court of Orleans. The accused were convicted of murder. The judge did not err in refusing a continuance until testimony was obtained from Europe; in excepting the physicians from the rule separating the witnesses, or in permitting Ward to testify, he having been pardoned of the offenses of which he had been convicted. The objection that the jury sat after their time expired is without force. But when the jury returned for further instructions the court erred in refusing to hear the counsel for the defense, upon the judge's charge on the weight of circumstantial evidence. It was right that the whole law should have been given. New trial ordered, Justice Howell dissenting.

No. 4809. Thomas Lynne vs. city of New Orleans, appellant, and Edward T. Manning, appellant, vs. the city of New Orleans.—From the Superior District Court. Appeal on the part of the city to resist payment of Thomas Lynne's bill of $10,700 for services in 7352 tax suits while said Lynne was clerk of the Eighth District Court. Appeal on the part of Edward T. Manning, who claims to have been the lawful clerk of the Eighth District Court, and therefore entitled to the above mentioned fee bill of $10,700. Judgment of lower court affirmed, adjudging Lynne entitled to the amount of compensation claimed, $10,700, and nonsuiting E. T. Manning.

First District Court.

VERDICT.

State vs James Florda.—Murder. Not guilty.

INFORMATION FILED.

State vs. George Fritz alias Fry.—Forging an order on the steamboat Selma, for the delivery of six barrels of pecans.

Second District Court.

The succession of Henry Ledig was opened.

The Contested Seat.

Says the West Baton Rouge *Sugar Planter*:

Mr. C. F. Glandin is contesting the seat of Hatter Booth, Esq., in the State Senate, and, from the mass of information filed in the case, is likely to get it. So out will go the vendor of silk, beaver felt and windy publications, and in will come a man with less rhetorical flourishes and more brains. Bootny, old boy, stick more to your hat blocks and less to politics, and you may be a great man one of these days "when merit will be more appreciated!"

INSURANCE.

NEW ORLEANS MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY.

Office Corner of Camp and Canal Streets.

Capital.....$500,000 00
Assets December 31, 1872..... 755,841 34

Insures Fire, Marine and River Risks, dividing the profits separately on each department to the insured.

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

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

Directors.

George Urquhart,	M. Payre.
C. T. Dugazon,	Placide Forstall.
G. W. Babcock,	Aug. Reichard.
T. Bailly Blanchard,	E. Miltenberger,
A. Schreiber,	W. B. Schmidt.
Charles Lafitte.	J. Tuyes. fel4 1y

LOUISIANA MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY.

NINETEENTH ANNUAL STATEMENT.

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

Total premiums for the year ending February 28, 1873.....$402,713 56

Viz: Fire premiums.....	$125,721 59	
Marine premiums.....	133,500 58	
River premiums.....	39,491 47	403,713 6
Less unearned and returned premiums, reinsurance and rebate on premiums.....		95,202 19
Net premiums.....		$308,511 42
Fire losses.....	$74,822 86	
Marine losses.....	152,136 13	
River losses.....	10,185 77	
Total.....	$237,144 83	
Taxes, etc.....	10,233 83	
Expenses, profit and loss, less discount account.....	27,662 19	275,040 85
Profits.....		$33,470 58

The company has the following assets, estimated at the lowest market value:

City and other bonds.....	$53,300 00
Bank and other stocks.....	16,047 0
Stock and scrip of insurance companies.	65,838
Real estate.....	60,300
Bills receivable on mortgages.....	49,844
Bills receivable.....	34,551 79
Premiums in course of collection.....	61,347 37
Cash on hand and in Europe.....	195,324 44
Total.....	$447,053 19

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

CHARLES BRIGGS, President.

J. P. ROCY, Secretary.

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

Sworn to and subscribed before me this twenty fifth day of March, 1873.

P. CHARLES CUVELLIER, Notary Public, No. 140 Gravier street.

The Board of Trustees have resolved to pay SIX PER CENT interest on the outstanding certificates of scrip on and after MONDAY, May 12, 1873, said scrip to be then converted into capital stock, as per amended charter of the company.

CHARLES BRIGGS, President.
ANT. CARRIERE, Vice President
J. P. ROCY, Secretary.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

Elected February 17, 1873.

Charles Briggs,	Thomas H. Hunt,
Ant. Carriere,	Chas. Honold,
George A. Fosdick,	D. Jamison,
R. Brugier,	R. S. Howard,
P. Anderson,	Felix Larue
A. Frerichs,	Aug. Bohn
George W. Durbat,	Edward Toby,
E. F. Stockmeyer,	Wash. Morton,
Henry J. Vose,	William Knox,
E. Marqueze,	W. S. Bailey,
Charles Weishaar,	J. E. Livaudais,
A. Lecourt,	Atwood Violett,
Frank Williams,	A. K. Miller,
Charles Lafitte,	Edward Morphy,
Rudolph Sieg,	J. A. Lum,
W. C. Black,	Silas Weeks,
George W. Hynson.	mh27

MERCHANTS' MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY OF NEW ORLEANS.

Office No. 104 Canal street.

NINETEENTH ANNUAL STATEMENT.

In conformity with the requirements of their charter the company publish the following STATEMENT.

Premiums received during the year ending May 31, 1873, including unearned premiums of the previous year—

On fire risks.....		$731,886 30
On marine risks.....		92,630 13
On river risks.....		182,563 44
Total premiums.....		$1,007,088 92
Less unearned premiums.....		202,675 00
Net earned premiums May 31, 1873....		$804,413 92
Losses paid—		
On fire risks.....	$132 703 28	
On marine risks.....	48,149 47	
On river risks.....	63,941 24	
Taxes.....	23,302 92	
Reinsurances and return premiums.....	61,064 63	
Total.....	$629,266 64	
Deduct interest, less expenses.....	17,775 31	$611,491 33
Profit.....		$192,922 59

The company has the following assets:

Real estate.....	$123,371 15
City bonds.....	307,050 00
Bank and railroad stocks.....	21,188 00
Notes secured by mortgage.....	404,232 30
Notes secured by pledge.....	153,408 72
Bills receivable.....	46,673 79
Premium in course of collection.....	101,908 36
State bonds.....	1,500 00
Insurance stocks.....	1,800 00
Stock of Vallette Dry Dock Company.	19,800 00
Stock of Levee Steam Cotton Press ...	2,300 00
Stock of Marine Dry Dock and Ship Yard Company.....	4,000 00
Harbor Protection Company.....	1,500 00
St. Louis Hotel Association.....	9,000 00
Mortgage bonds Turner's Association.	2,000 00
Mortgage bonds Odd Fellows' Hall	5,000 00
Judgment on mortgage notes.....	6,000 00
Cash on hand.....	171,417 14
New Orleans, Florida and Havana Steamship Company.....	3,000 00
Total.....	$1,386,209 46

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

PAUL FOURCHY, President.

G. W. NOTT, Secretary.

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

Sworn to and subscribed before me the ninth day of June, 1873. P. CHARLES CUVELLIER, Notary Public.

At a meeting of the Board of Directors held on the ninth day of June, 1873, it was resolved to declare a CASH DIVIDEND OF FIFTEEN PER CENT on the net earned participating premiums for the year ending May 31, 1873, payable on third Monday in July next.

Also to pay to the stockholders, on demand interest at the rate of ten per cent per annum on their stock.

DIRECTORS:

P. Maspero,	David McCoard,
S. Z. Relf,	L. F. Generes,
M. Puig,	P. Fourchy,
P. S. Witts,	J. J. Fernandez,
D. A. Chaffraix,	J. M. Allen,
Charles Lafitte.	jel2 1y

TEUTONIA INSURANCE COMPANY OF NEW ORLEANS.

Office No. 111 Gravier Street.

INSURE FIRE, MARINE AND RIVER RISKS AT LOWEST RATES.

Assets.....$798,454 81

A. EIMER BADER, President.
CH. ENGSTFELD, Vice President.
GEORGE STROMEYER, Secretary.

Board of Trustees:

Henry Abrams,	A. Eimer Bader,
N. A. Baumgardner,	E. F. Del Bondio,
Ch. Engstfeld,	M. Frank,
H. R. Gogreve,	Hy. Baller,
Sigmund Statz,	J. H. Keller,
J. Keiffer,	Louis Leonhard,
Theo. Lillienthal,	C. H. Miller,
F. Rickert,	Frank Roder,
Louis Schneider,	W. B. Schmidt,
B. Seig,	Isaac Seherck,
Louis Schwartz,	J. M. Schwartz,
J. R. Wildermann,	J. Weissenbach.
oc25 1y	

MARSHAL'S MONITIONS.

Philip Brady vs. Steamboat Governor Allen.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, District of Louisiana, No. 10,319.—In obedience to an admiralty warrantry, to me directed in the above entitled suit, I have seized and taken into my possession—

THE STEAMBOAT GOVERNOR ALLEN, her tackle, apparel, etc., now libeled by Philip Brady, for the causes set forth in the libel, now pending in the District Court of the United States.

And I do hereby cite and admonish the owner or owners thereof, and all and every person or persons having, or pretending to have, any right, title or interest in or to the same, to be and appear at a District Court of the United States, for the district aforesaid to be holden at the city of New Orleans, on the first Monday of February, 1874, to show cause, if any they have or can, why the said steamboat should not be condemned, and be sold agreeably to the prayer of libelant.

United States Marshal's office, New Orleans, January 5, 1874.

S. B PACKARD, United States Marshal.

ja6 20 27 fe1

William Greenwood vs. Ship Florence Alton.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, District of Louisiana, No. 10,332.—In obedience to an admiralty warrant, to me directed in the above entitled suit, I have seized and taken into my possession—

THE SHIP FLORENCE ALTON, now libeled by William Greenwood, for the causes set forth in the libel now pending in the District Court of the United States.

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

United States Marshal's office, New Orleans, January 9, 1874.

S. B. PACKARD, United States Marshal.

ja10 20 27 fe1

United States vs. Steamer Royal George, her boats, tackle, etc.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, District of Louisiana, No. 10,339.—In obedience to an admiralty warrant, to me directed in above entitled suit, I have seized and taken into my possession—

THE STEAMER ROYAL GEORGE, her boats, tackle, etc., now libeled by the United States, for the causes set forth in the libel now pending in the District Court of the United States.

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

United States Marshal's office, New Orleans, January 9, 1874.

S. B. PACKARD, United States Marshal.

ja10 20 27 fe1

Juan y Canal et al. vs. Steamer Belle Lee.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, District of Louisiana, No. 10,325.—In obedience to an admiralty warrant to me directed in the above entitled suit, I have seized and taken into my possession—

THE STEAMBOAT BELLE LEE, now libeled by Juan y Canal et al., for the causes set forth in the libel now pending in the District Court of the United States.

And I do hereby cite and admonish the owner or owners thereof, and all or every person or persons having or pretending to have any right, title or interest in or to the same, to be and appear at a district court of the United States for the district aforesaid, to be holden at the city of New Orleans, on the third Monday of January, 1874, to show cause, if any they have or can, why the said steamer Belle Lee should not be condemned and sold agreeably to the prayer of libelants.

United States Marshal's office, New Orleans, December 27, 1873.

S. B. PACKARD, United States Marshal.

de27 31 ja6 1f

George Williams, John Comford and John Clark vs. the steamer Favorite.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, District of Louisiana, Nos. 10,330, 10,333 and 10,341.—In obedience to an admiralty warrant to me directed in the above entitled suit, I have seized and taken into my possession—

THE STEAMER FAVORITE, now libeled by George Williams, John Comford and John Clarke, for the causes set forth in the libels now pending in the District Court of the United States.

And I do hereby cite and admonish the owner or owners thereof, and all and every person or persons having or pretending to have any right, title or interest in or to the same, to be and appear at a District Court of the United States, for the district aforesaid, to be holden at the city of New Orleans, on the first Monday of February, 1874, to show cause if any they have or can, why the said steamship should not be condemned, and be sold agreeably to the prayer of libelant.

United States Marshal's office, January 5, 1874.

S. B. PACKARD, United States Marshal.

ja6 20 27 fe1

Samuel Stewart et al. vs. Wreck of the steamboat Royal George, her tackle, etc.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, District of Louisiana, No. 10,331.—In obedience to an admiralty warrant to me directed in the above entitled suit, I have seized and taken into my possession—

THE WRECK OF THE STEAMBOAT ROYAL GEORGE, her tackle, apparel and furniture, etc., now libeled by Samuel Stewart et al. for the causes set forth in the libel now pending in the District Court of the United States.

And I do hereby cite and admonish the owner or owners thereof, and all and every person or persons having, or pretending to have, any right, title or interest in or to the same, to be and appear at a District Court of the United States, for the district aforesaid, to be holden at the city of New