New Orleans Republican.

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE UNITED STATES

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF NEW ORLEANS.

NEW ORLEANS, APRIL 8, 1875.

Minor events—births.

The next spell will be a breathing spell.

With the croakey frogs comes the croquet season.

Sherman, Texas, has no brass band, and is happy.

Snake fighting is a new sport now popular in Florida.

Noteable event in Wall street—Daniel Drew a check.

The young man who did not spell well had a sick spell.

An agricultural speaker wishes a new field for lecturing.

An advertisement works on Sundays and all other days.

There are no spelling matches in heaven. Bad spellers never go there.

Bayard Taylor, by lecturing, is endeavoring to throw light on "Egypt."

The prospect of a fruit crop has been destroyed this year as usual.

Garibaldi proposes to straighten things out in Italy, especially the river Tiber.

Miss Alice Kingsbury is playing at the Walnut Street Theatre, in Philadelphia.

A committee has been appointed in Russia to inquire if the number of holidays can be reduced.

Ketchum is spoken of as a probable candidate for State Treasurer of Pennsylvania. The name will do.

A kind Providence watches over the circus interest, and old John Robinson is not mayor of Cincinnati.

The Riverside Rowing Club will give a mask and fancy dress ball at Minerva Hall, on Saturday evening.

A grand jury in Ohio has undertaken to suppress church fair raffles, as well as other raffles not considered fair.

It seems that the first patent which has been granted to a Chinaman was for an improvement in fastening the seams of overalls.

Miss Louise Hawthorne will play *Lady Teazle* on the occasion of her benefit at Hooley's Theatre in Chicago on Saturday evening next.

Umbrellas have been invented which have a pane of glass set in the front breadth. By this light the average hoodlum can tell when the rain stops.

If a man spells a word as it is pronounced he may make himself ridiculous, and if he pronounces words as they are spelled he is sure to. The inference is that we have a ridiculous language.

Manager Daly says that in Paris he has seen colored spectators sitting side by side with duchesses at theatres, and it has been suggested that the same thing might occur in this country if we only had the duchesses.

Mrs. F. B. Conway plays *Romeo* to the *Juliet* of her daughter. This is in the direct line of the fitness of things, for no young lady in the audience will wish herself a *Juliet* to receive the manly protestations of love from the old lady.

A Mr. Lanpher, of Milford, Connecticut, lately "swore off" from chewing tobacco because he had always held the opinion that chewing the weed would shorten his days. He was ninety-two years of age when he last begged a chew from his neighbor.

The St. Louis *Globe* says: "Three priests have just been sentenced in France to ten years, three years and two years imprisonment, respectively, for having organized an agency for the sale of masses. They procured the celebration of mass in any church at a fixed price.

It is reported that some time since a Chicago man organized an expedition to go to the Black Hills. He collected $5 from each man enrolled, and went to Detroit to buy wagons. He has not returned, and it is thought he is over in Canada waiting for the stripes on the wheels to dry.

The Arkansas Legislature has a habit of changing the names of counties according to the fancy of the party in power, to honor political heroes, and it does it as easily as voters change the name of a coffeehouse. The counties of Clayton and Dorsey are hereafter to be known as Poland and Saylor.

The premium of the dictionary was improperly awarded to the best speller, when it was certainly most needed by the worst. Mr. Isaac Bates agrees with this dictum, and says: "What for did they give it to the the man that's got no use for it when it's very plain de odder man didn't have any?"

Mrs. Swisshelm, who is both aged and vigilant, says: "Chastity is not the natural condition of the race, but the very opposite, and it can only be secured by ages of culture and constant vigilance." All of this is very discouraging to young people, who believed they could be good without being classical grandmothers.

Rev. Mr. Abbott has written fifty-six rules for composition. The first one is, "Use words in their proper sense." He could have stopped there and become famous, but he exaggerates in explaining exaggeration, is ambiguous in telling what ambiguity is, is metaphorical in cautions against metaphor, obscure in illustrating clearness, dull in advising pithy writing, and tiresome in attempting to prove the advantages of brevity.

The St. Louis papers are calling for a grand jury that will tell something not already known. They say they have heard all about the poorhouse, workhouse, soup-house, condition of the plaster on the court-house, the price of flour at the charity houses, and other information given to the judges for about ninety-nine times. The grand jury of St. Louis periodically reads the old story, varying it occasionally with faintly praising the Honorable Superintendent McGuinness for doing something that he ought to do, and faintly damning the honorable or dishonorable somebody else for doing or not doing something which the honorable jury can not comprehend. Unhappy St. Louis, how different from New Orleans!

VICTORY OF THE YANKEE DEMOCRATS.

The term "Yankee" has been always used by the Democracy as a bugaboo to terrify naughty persons who do not vote the Democratic ticket. The French Creole population is especially exasperated by any imputation of this sort. They have an abomination for abolitionists and heretics, which they consider the qualities of all residing east of the Hudson.

This animosity has been sedulously inculcated from the days when Mr. Slidell, the Democrat, objected to Mr. Conrad as a Whig and therefore little better than an abolitionist, and tainted with that original political sin, the United States Bank and the protective tariff.

But while the Democratic leaders have always bade their followers beware of a Yankee or of any one who associated with or voted for Yankees, they have granted special dispensations to such of their own party as could derive advantage from a loan of Yankee money, or a Yankee appointment to any sort of an office. Notably these Southern State Rights Democrats kneeled down at the feet of the Yankees when they voted for a New Hampshire high tariff, abolition and "on to Richmond" Yankee as President. They voted at the same time against a Missourian who had always differed from the native of New Hampshire. Our Southern Democratic journals are delighted with the "Democratic victory" in Connecticut.

A Yankee, according to its strictest definition, is a man who dwells in New England. The objectionable qualities attributed to him are an imputation upon the morals or manners of all people who dwell in that country. To have been born in New England is to be a Yankee, and to be a Yankee has been, in the Southern Democratic creed, to be an object of distrust. These imputations upon the people of an entire section are unfounded and absurd, but this constitutes the chief political capital of the Southern Democracy. A Yankee is, then, a man or woman heretical in religion and political opinion, or capable of taking any advantage of those who deal with or confide in them. Let this Democratic definition stand for a moment. Is not every inhabitant of New England equally subject to this character? It can not be said that a large portion of the people of New England are not Yankees because they are Democrats. The time has been in the history of New England that a large majority were Federalists and hostile to Democracy. How happens it, then, that with such a despicable and dangerous character as the Democrats have assigned to the New Englander, the Democrats of New Orleans rejoice in a Yankee Democratic victory in Connecticut? It proves that there are more Yankees in Connecticut in favor of the Democratic doctrine than opposed to it. Connecticut is one home of industry, intelligence and thrift. It is also the precise point at which the basswood ham originated. Shoddy of shoes and cloth flourishes in Connecticut. There were manufactured the arms of precision, and we believe the spades, which subjugated the South. Why then should these Democratic politicians, who insist upon again intrenching the line of Mason and Dixon, and who hate everything north of that line as a Frenchman hates a Prussian, rejoice over a victory of Yankees? We should as soon expect MacMahon to hurrah for a successful candidate for a seat in the German Diet.

We have always expressed surprise that any Southern Democrat could ever place renewed trust in a Northern State rights Democrat. No one at the South ever expects a Northern Whig, Union man or Republican to consent to a separation of the States. But every one at the South did expect the State rights Yankee Democrats to unite in resisting the attempt to compel obedience of the Southern States. There were thousands of men at the South who on principle would have resisted any attempt to compel the obedience of a State to the federal government, but there were many more thousands who were told that the Yankee State rights Democrats would never invade a sovereign State or permit its invasion. We boldly say, then, that the positive assurance of Southern Democrats that Yankee Democrats would aid the South or stand neutral had a material influence upon the secession vote.

How did these Yankee State right Democrats meet this assurance? By offering some faint opposition to the proclamation of Mr. Lincoln, yielding to the pressure of public opinion and going in for every military contract or commission which could be obtained at Washington. As a specimen of the manner in which political abstractions will yield to personal obligations we cite two distinguished cases. General Dix, in his eulogy of Stephen A. Douglas, a native of Vermont and citizen of Chicago, affirms that when that statesman, forgetting the party antagonism which had separated him from Mr. Lincoln, visited and tendered him his aid in the approaching conflict, he also remarked to a friend that he had but one regret. It was that he had ever been separated from the section of his nativity, and with which he agreed in all essential things. Here was one Yankee Democrat who had done a great deal to affirm Southern Democratic construction of the constitution, but who was not willing to carry that creed to its consequences.

Mr. Benjamin Butler, another Yankee Democrat, voted in convention many times for Mr. Jefferson Davis, Southern State rights Democrat. We suppose the testimony of many Southern State rights Democrats could be obtained that General Benjamin Butler, Yankee State rights Democrat, did not recognize the rights of the Southern States as the secession conventions did.

It is history that Democratic thousands enlisted or were drafted, or hired substitutes in the Union armies; that Yankee State rights Democrats put their money into the public bonds, and other Democrats sold their farm produce, horses and cattle, and hired their steamboats and ships to the Union arms.

After the Yankee Democrats had seen fifteen hundred men killed in the New York draft riot, they trotted perfectly square in the Union harness, took every exemption from military service that offered, and every dollar of contract, and never after intervened in behalf of their Southern brethren in the South. They even rendered great aid to the Union army in going secretly into the Confederacy, as was done by the Blairs, Vallandigham, and other more obscure Democratic emissaries. They endeavored to persuade the Democratic leaders that if they would forego further fighting and come back into the Union they would be reinstated in their position, and with the aid of the Yankee State rights Democrats, the control of the federal government could be speedily secured at the polls.

It is proper to inquire what the Southern State rights Democrat expects to gain by the success of the Yankee State rights Democrat of Connecticut. Is it a recognition of the right of a State to decide "the mode and measure of redress" proper in a conflict between the State and federal governments? Is it to obtain by the vote of manufacturing Connecticut the repeal of the protection, actual or incidental, of our revenue laws? Is it to procure the recognition or vindication of one single principle involved in the late war, or affirmed by the sectional platform of the Southern State rights Democrat? We will assume that the Yankee Democrats will no more sanction any single item of the Southern Democratic creed than the Democratic Governor of Ohio would have aided in the technical insurrection of the fourteenth of September, which he tendered Democratic volunteers to President Grant to suppress.

Major Burke and Mr. Zacharie explained that the grievances of the State rights Democracy of Louisiana had very little to do with the elections of last fall, and the elections of Maine and Connecticut prove that so long as people have grievances of their own they will scarcely take up those of their neighbors.

Why, therefore, the Democrats of Louisiana should denounce their fellow-citizens as unworthy of confidence, and hurrah for the success of the Yankee Democracy of Connecticut, we can not conceive. We can imagine no other reason than because the Yankee Democrat possesses those elements of political deception improperly attributed to all his fellow-citizens. This capacity for political fraud, this indifference to political principle, makes him a valuable adjunct, and hence his accession to power is hailed as an avenue opened to the treasury.

FREE PUBLIC EDUCATION.

In France all males of the military age are compelled to serve the State by land or by sea for a period of some twenty years. Our French friends of the *Bee*, exercising that glorious freedom of opinion which our constitution secures alike to citizens and aliens, attacks the American system of popular education. It is opposed to any system which tends to substitute the action of the State or community for individual discretion, because such a system does not seem equitable or rational in a country of self-government. It is opposed, in other words, to gratuitous and compulsory education organized in the present positive mode, and reposing upon a very false notion of republican institutions.

The education fund is then placed in the category of appropriation for the alleviation of individual misfortunes by public gift. A poor ignorant child is placed on the same footing with an insolvent spendthrift, or even of a felon who breaks his leg in a burglary. "Gratuitous instruction is," we are told, "like gratuitous bread." Education in France is, then, esteemed a charity. Admitting, then, that this Bourbonist doctrine is orthodox, we have to remark that it is not received in the United States with the favor which exotic wisdom should always command. It is also stated that "the Legislature under which we live" has placed the right of gratuitous instruction above all discussion. Yet the *Bee* proceeds to revive some of those questions which had long since prevented the adoption of the system in the United States. It objects to the large amount paid by New Orleans to the education of the people of other parishes because the taxpayers are thus compelled to meet the cost of educating the children of those who pay no taxes.

It may be new in France, but in the United States it has long been conceded that Plato was right when in his ideal republic he proposed to make the education of all children a public charge. Our reasoning is not, however, precisely that employed by him. We think that it is the duty of society to utilize the capacity of all its members, and therefore that to educate all boys and girls up to a point at which they can render this service, is a measure of public policy essential to the development and defense of the State. It is well to talk of the contribution of the taxpayer, whose property depends on the tenure of public ability to defend it. It would be as unwise as ungrateful to thrust the soldier from the door which he has defended, as to insult his pauper infant by refusing him the bread of instruction. The sordid and very often stupid rich man does not perceive that such an appropriation is in the result equal. The taxpayer of this generation may be the pauper of the next. His descendants may then receive the contributions of those who have been raised by educated industry to the rank of property holders. The French government holds it to be the duty of every citizen to carry arms in defense of the property of the State. With what justice can a man who owns no property be required to take up arms in defense of the property of others? Or how can a man who owns no house be properly asked to rise from his bed and risk his life in saving the property of another from a consuming fire? Society can not keep account of individual contributions made or benefits received from public taxes. We have stated the principle of public education. It is not a charity. It is an investment for the insurance of society against the weakness and wickedness of ignorance. It is an expenditure intended to enhance the productive forces of society and increase the common ability to maintain common obligations. A boy would be no more degraded when society places a primer in his hand, than when afterward it thrusts, with anxious alarm, a musket into the same hands and bids the bearer go forth to battle to the death for the safety of the very property which may have complained of having had to purchase the primer.

As a corollary to the principle that the children of the man who has no property should go without public education, it is added the control of the public schools appertain to those who pay the school taxes or to their representatives. The various municipalities comprising the city of New Orleans were, a long time ago, governed by the "custom of Paris," but in the United States a municipal authority, whether of county, city or parish, is subject to the paramount authority of the State or to the right of eminent domain of the United States. It would not be well to go back to the times when cities were made independent of the government to which they belonged. It is the mission of the republic to confuse and refute many usages and institutions of old Europe. For that reason our ancestors emigrated. We have seen the independent autonomy of this city advocated in many respects. It should govern the schools and direct the police, and enact its own taxes. We have seen monopolies after the oldest style of gifts to royal courtiers advocated. We have at hand a published project to give almost every attribute of municipal authority to individuals. We are to have an Earl of the Markets, a Duke of the Wharves, a Marquis of the Waterworks. It is now proposed that those who pay the school tax, or those who represent the municipal taxpayers shall have the exclusive right to regulate the amount and application of the fund.

There are some difficulties in the way of this proposal. The constitution of Louisiana orders the establishment of at least one free public school in every parish, and provides for its support by taxation or otherwise. All children between six and twenty-one shall be admitted to these schools in common without distinction of race. It forbids the establishment of any separate schools for the education of any race exclusively, and it forbids any municipal corporation—New Orleans, for instance—to make any rules or regulations contrary to the spirit or intentions of these requirements.

We have noted this struggle to secure the control of the public schools to the administration of those who pay the taxes. It is going on in Canada, where military power has been required to compel one sect of Christians to send their children to the same school with others. The same principle of separate schools, the Bible no school book, and the right of the taxpayer to organize the public schools, has been asserted in the United States. Neither principle is, however, within the scope of the American system. It is alike public duty and public policy to educate everybody. The schoolhouse is no place to propagate politics or religious opinions.

We should oppose the reduction of the school fund below the sum sufficient to educate well every child in the State. No one can say whose child should be deprived of education, and very few, except the very hidebound holder of a tenement for rent, would be willing to see the many poor women who now receive a pittance from the school fund for their useful service remitted to original and unmitigated poverty. The arrogance and ignorance of wealth can not show itself in a more hateful form than in denying to the children of the poor the blessing of a little education.

It is fortunate that in this republic neither kings nor priests can deprive the people of this right, or, indeed, of any other which they deem indispensable to their freedom, happiness and intelligence. We deal with the taxpayer here as France deals with her soldiers. We make him pay for the defense of his property by educating youth to industry and above crime. France arrests the poor young man and makes him stand guard over the houses and stores of the taxpayer. We think ours the best system, and defy any one to change it against the will of the men and women who have children to be educated.

ANOTHER CASE OF AGGRESSION AND PUNISHMENT.

The Democratic city of Annapolis, in the thoroughly orthodox State of Maryland, has just disgraced itself in the way peculiar to localities afflicted with that style of politics. It was only a small election, but it was a pretty big fuss. The subservient news reporter, as usual, throws all the blame on the negroes, by declaring that they threw the first brickbat. But other parts of his statement do not sustain the charge. The trouble originated in the attempt of a Democrat to vote. As the negroes made opposition to this, we presume there were valid reasons why the offered vote should be rejected. At all events, the colored citizens had a right to challenge it and be satisfied of its legality before the commissioners received it, or, if they could not be easily convinced, the judges of election ought to have overruled the objections of the challengers and permitted them to file protests.

Instead of this, however, a melee arose, and some harmless shooting followed. All the people around having by this time lost their temper, the whites especially being terribly incensed, a grand row was the most natural thing in the world. Some negroes were strolling about with cudgels in their hands. A white man thought strolling about was a luxury belonging exclusively to the superior race. He therefore remonstrated with them and pointed out the enormity of their conduct. For this piece of intermeddling, and perhaps other conduct omitted by the reporter, the negroes fired and wounded two men. The Democrats thereupon went to work in earnest, and eight or ten wounded negroes was the result. The affray was finally terminated by the interference of white men of both parties.

So long as one race, whether superior in numbers or not, assumes to override the other and dictate their actions, so long will these disgraceful scenes occur. The more intelligent of the two is generally the more blamable. We have seen so much of it in this city, that we are familiar not only with the means employed to incite riots, but the plausible inventions which are subsequently resorted to to lay the blame on the weaker and less guilty party.

ALL LIPS APPLIED TO ALL EARS.

The quid nuncs were in a high state of excitement yesterday over the news announcing changes in official positions here. "What could it all mean?" Some thought Casey did it. Others laid it on Packard, though all admitted that no one knew anything about it. One very green young man with long flaxen hair and a cigarette factory in his pocket was sure it all proved that Senator West had lost his grip in Washington. But as he was hardly noticed by anybody, he retired abashed and disappointed.

A Yankee from the Rhine was puzzled because Mr. Parker is asked to give up a fat position, where the pay is good and the duty light, for one in which these conditions are reversed. That beats his knowledge of human nature. He does not happen to know that a man of Mr. Parker's active temperament *loves* work, and that he has a soul above the hireling. We suppose the man of Teutonic origin would rather be a swineherd with good pay and light duty than fill an honorable position that did not pay so well.

Everybody seemed satisfied with the changes. The only doubt was as to the causes which produced them, the agents who brought them about and the motives which could induce Mr. Parker to prefer a situation of hard work to a comparative sinecure. This reform business has taken such complete hold of the average New Orleans politician that he can think of nothing else but the science and ethics of office holding.

POSTMASTER PARKER.

We believe this whole community will thank the President for the reappointment of Mr. Parker to a position in which but a few years ago he won golden opinions from all sorts of people. Not that there was any dissatisfaction with Mr. Ringgold, or any desire for a change. The public do not consider it in that light. But it appears Mr. Ringgold is wanted by his government in another place. He has been called to a field of duty in which his experience is a guarantee of efficiency. And of all the men in the State to become the successor of Mr. Ringgold, J. M. G. Parker is the most acceptable that we know of. He has an absolute talent for the position. All the people regard him as a born postmaster, as one who is willing, if necessary to leave a party of friends at midnight, or any other hour, and go to his office, take off his coat, and wrestle with the mail bags like a good clerk or a lusty porter.

We may be sure that the eye of the new postmaster will visit every department, his firm but just hand be felt by all, and his fidelity and zeal inspire the whole force.

A SOLUTION IN SIGHT.

We are almost persuaded to believe that the *Price Current* and the *Times*—the latter being aided by intelligent outsiders—are about to solve the city debt problem. The first named journal has been wrestling with the question for many years. In fact both have been put on record by their proprietors for the time being on the best plan how not to do it.

When there was a Republican city administration, the REPUBLICAN intimated that the best thing to do with the city debt was to pay it, and the best way to avoid future burdens resulting from interest and depreciated city scrip was to faithfully collect the taxes and keep expenditures within the receipts. This happened at a time when it was the policy to starve out the Republican administrations, both State and city, and our contemporaries withheld their approval of our suggestions until such time as a Democratic administration should occur. They are ready to adopt it now, and credit the opposition with the glory of having made a discovery.

$30,000 TO LOAN.

LIFE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, Louisiana Department, No. 139 Gravier street.

Thirty thousand dollars to loan on first mortgage of improved real estate in this city.

J. B. HOOD, President.

SAMUEL FLOWER, Secretary. ap7 1w

NOTICE.

$25,000.

The undersigned has in his hands a sum of about $25,000, to be loaned out upon good mortgage security and at a reasonable rate of interest, in amounts of from $500 to $2000.

F. D. SEGHERS, Notary Public, No. 26 St. Charles street, up stairs.

ap1 1m

A CARD.

The grand drawing of the single number tickets, Louisiana State Lottery, will take place on SATURDAY NEXT, the tenth day of April, 1875, at 11 A. M., over the rooms of the company.

CAPITAL PRIZE $20,000.

Only 10,000 Numbers.

Tickets Only $10.

The public are invited to witness the drawing. The doors will be opened at 10:45 A. M. Entrance on Union street. ap7 3t 2p

NOTICE.

BOARD OF AUDIT OF THE FLOATING DEBT.

To All Whom It May Concern.

Take notice that the Board of Audit of the Floating Debt is prepared and authorized, in accordance with act No. 17, approved March 27, 1875, to receive, classify and approve all the floating debts and obligations which may be legally due or which have accrued or become due prior to the first day of January, 1874. Holders of such debts or obligations will make their applications (in duplicate) and deposit their vouchers with F. N. Scholtz, secretary, at the office of the board, State House.

E. F. HERWIG, Chairman.

F. N. SCHOLTZ, Secretary.

New Orleans, March 30, 1875. mh31 2p

EXTRA SESSION.

PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR.

STATE OF LOUISIANA, Executive Department, New Orleans March 24, 1875.

Whereas, the existing condition of public affairs presents, in my judgment, an extraordinary occasion within the meaning of article sixty-four of the constitution of the State, I, William P. Kellogg, Governor of the State of Louisiana, by virtue of the power in me vested by the constitution and the laws enacted thereunder, do hereby convene the General Assembly of the State of Louisiana to meet in extra session, at the State House, in the city of New Orleans, on WEDNESDAY, the fourteenth day of April, 1875, at the hour of twelve o'clock M.; and in accordance with act No. 19 of the General Assembly of Louisiana, approved February 16, 1870, I hereby indicate ten days as the length of time for which said session shall continue, commencing WEDNESDAY, April 14, as aforesaid, at the hour of twelve o'clock M., and ending SATURDAY, April 24, at the hour of twelve o'clock M. And I do further specify the following objects of legislation which shall take precedence of all other business which may be brought forward at such extra session:

1. Joint resolution in relation to the adjustment of the political difficulties heretofore existing in this State.
2. Revenues of the State and the mode of collecting and disbursing the same.
3. Amendment of the funding law with respect to the number of members composing the Funding Board and with respect to the manner of preventing the funding of illegal obligations of the State.
4. Revenues, financial condition and government of the city of New Orleans.
5. Relief of the commerce of New Orleans from excessive port charges, fees, etc.
6. To consider the incorporation of the Board of Trade of New Orleans.

Given under my hand, and the seal of the State hereunto attached, this twenty-fourth day of March, in the year of our Lord eighteen hundred and seventy-five, and of the independence of the United States the ninety-ninth.

WILLIAM P. KELLOGG.

By the Governor:
P. G. DESLONDE, Secretary of State. mh25

LOTTERIES.

SPLENDID SCHEME.

ONLY 10,000 NUMBERS.

LOUISIANA STATE SINGLE NUMBER LOTTERY

Capital Prize..............$20,000.

LOUISIANA STATE LOTTERY COMPANY.

(Incorporated August 17, 1868).

CLASS E,

To be drawn in public at New Orleans, On Saturday, April 10, 1875.

SCHEME.

10,000 Tickets ....Tickets only $10

Halves, Quarter and Eighths in proportion.

1 prize of $20,000 is	$20,000
1 prize of 10,000 is	10,000
20 prizes of 500 are	10,000
200 prizes of 100 are	20,000
200 prizes of 50 are	10,000
APPROXIMATION PRIZES.	
9 approximations of $300 each for the nine remaining units of the same ten of the number drawing the $20,000 prize are	2,700
9 approximations of $200 each for the nine remaining units of the same ten of the number drawing the $10,000 prize are	1,800
440 prizes, amounting to	$74,500

EXPLANATION OF APPROXIMATION PRIZES.

The nine remaining units of the same ten of the numbers drawing the first two full prizes will be entitled to the eighteen approximation prizes. For example: If ticket No. 1246 draws the $20,000 prize, those tickets numbered 1241, 1242, 1243, 1244, 1245, 1247, 1248, 1249 and 1250 will each be entitled to $300. If ticket No. 231 draws the $10,000 prize, those tickets numbered 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239 and 240 will each be entitled to $200.

Whole Tickets, $10; Halves, $5; Quarters, $2 50; Eighths, $1 25.

PRIZES PAYABLE IN FULL WITHOUT DEDUCTION.

Orders to be addressed to LOUISIANA STATE LOTTERY COMPANY, Lock box No. 692, Postoffice, New Orleans.

Send postoffice money order, or register your letter. ja2 1y

DRAWING OF THE LOUISIANA STATE LOTTERY FOR APRIL 7, 1875. CLASS 82.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
11	14	58	32	47	42	70	20	59	29	38	63	50	35

The above drawings are published in the principal papers, and are drawn in public daily, at the rooms of the Company.

Witness our hands at New Orleans, Louisiana, this seventh day of April, 1875.

H. PERALTA,
ADAM GIFFEN,
Commissioners.

BEWARE OF BOGUS LOTTERIES. ap17

LEGAL NOTICES.

CIRCUIT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

FIFTH CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA.

HENRY R. JACKSON ET AL VS. VICKSBURG, Shreveport and Texas Railroad Company and other defendants, pending in the court aforesaid—No. 5033.

BY AUTHORITY OF THE COURT AFORESAID, I have been appointed special master in the cause aforesaid, to receive proofs of the bonds bona fide issued by the said corporation under the mortgage dated the first of September, 1857, and made to John Ray or bearer, comprehending the railroad property and effects of the said corporation, and described in the bill in this case.

Proof can be made at the office of the clerk of court aforesaid from the hour of twelve o'clock M. to 2 P. M. of each day, Sundays excepted, until Wednesday, the twenty-second of April next, from the date of this notice.

Every holder of such bonds will file the same with his application and such other proof as he may be advised is proper to be made.

At the same place, on the twenty-third and twenty-fourth of April, 1875, after the closing of the proofs aforesaid, I will be there at the same time, with a view to making up the report of the master in respect of the debt.

The decree on which the proofs are to be made is on the record of the court.

F. A. WOOLFLEY, Special Master.

mh23 20t

THE STATE OF LOUISIANA.

SIXTH DISTRICT COURT FOR THE PARISH OF ORLEANS.

JOSEPHINE MOITRIER VS. JEAN DAULON, HER husband—No. 7302.

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT ON THE FIRST DAY of March, 1875, judgment was rendered in this court in the following entitled suit, in the words and figures following, to wit:

Josephine Moitrier vs. Jean Daulon, her husband—No. 7302.

In this case, by reason of the law and the evidence being with the plaintiff, it is ordered, adjudged and decreed that the judgment by default herein entered on the fifteenth of February last be now confirmed; that there be judgment in favor of plaintiff Josephine Moitrier, Widow Leon Thalamas, and against defendant, Jean Daulon, her husband, decreeing a separation of property between the said parties, and a dissolution of the community existing between them, and that plaintiff do recover of the defendant, her husband, the sum of $1000, with legal interest from judicial demand, and costs of suit, with the mortgage and privilege in such cases granted by law to married women.

Judgment signed March 6, 1875.

A. SAUCIER, Judge.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the said court, at the city of New Orleans, on this eighth day of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seventy-five.

EDWARD H. GANNON, Deputy Clerk.

mh9 23 ap8*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT.

DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA.

IN THE MATTER OF MARTHA KNIGHT, BANKRUPT.

In Bankruptcy—No. 1198.

WHEREAS MRS. MARTHA KNIGHT, OF NEW Orleans and district aforesaid, duly declared bankrupt under the act of Congress of March 2, 1867, has this day filed in said court a petition praying for a discharge and certificate thereof from all her debts and other claims provable under said act.

Notice is therefore given to all creditors who have proved their debts, and to all other persons in interest, that the seventeenth day of April, 1875, at 11 A. M., is assigned for the hearing of the same and that they may then and there attend and show cause, if any they have, why the prayer of the said petition should not be granted; and further notice is given that the bankrupt will undergo an examination before Register Kellogg on the fifteenth day of April, A. D. 1875, at 11 A. M., at his office, Customhouse building.

Clerk's office, New Orleans, March 24, 1875.

mh25 apl 8 E. LOEW, Deputy Clerk.

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA.

IN THE MATTER OF DAVID ARENT, BANKRUPT.

In Bankruptcy—No. 1408.

THE UNDERSIGNED HEREBY GIVES NOTICE of his appointment as assignee of the estate of David Arent, of the parish of Union, State of Louisiana, within said District, who has been adjudged a bankrupt upon his own petition by the District Court of said District.

ap7 25 my6 JOHN M. GOULD, Assignee.

LEGAL NOTICES.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT.

DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA.

IN THE MATTER OF TEUTONIA NATIONAL BANK vs. Hugh Cassidy, bankrupt.

In Bankruptcy—No. 1422.

TO THE HONORABLE THE JUDGE OF THE District Court of the United States for the District of Louisiana, sitting in bankruptcy—The petition of Berry Russell and N. A. Wilcox, of the city of New Orleans, herein appearing as assignees in bankruptcy of the estate of Hugh Cassidy, bankrupt, respectfully represent that among the assets surrendered by the bankrupt, and belonging to the aforesaid estate in bankruptcy, there is the following described real estate, situated in the State of Louisiana, in the parish of Orleans, to wit—

1. A certain lot of ground, with the buildings and improvements thereon, situated in the square bounded by Union, Carondelet, Gravier and St. Charles streets, First District of this city, designated as lot No. 1, as per plan of Joseph Pilie, annexed to an act passed before G. R. Stringer, notary public, on April 13, 1832. The said lot measures 49 feet 4 inches front on Gravier street, and is bounded on the side adjoining lot No. 2 by a line measuring 87 feet, and on the opposite side adjoining the property of Steptoe Blackwell by a line running 49 feet toward Union street, thence 5 feet 4 inches toward St. Charles street, thence 29 feet 2 inches to its intersection with the rear line, which measures 45 feet 4 inches; which was purchased by Hugh Cassidy from John Hincks, by act before P. C. Cuvellier, notary, on the thirty-first day of March, 1866.

2. A certain lot of ground, with the buildings thereon, in the square bounded by Gravier, Carondelet, Union and St. Charles streets, in the First District of this city, known as lot No. 2, as per plan of Joseph Pilie, surveyor, annexed to an act passed before G. R. Stringer, notary public, of the thirteenth of April, 1832, and measures 25 feet front on Gravier street, 24 feet 7 inches in width on the rear line, by a depth of 87 feet on the side line adjoining lot No. 1, and of 91 feet 6½ inches on the side adjoining lot No. 3. Purchased by Hugh Cassidy from Mrs. C. M. Wray, wife of George W. Pritchard, by act before William L. Poole, notary, of the fourteenth of September, 1859.

3. A certain lot of ground, with the buildings and improvements thereon, situated in the Second District of this city, on the north side of Dorgenois street, between Canal and Customhouse streets, designated as lot No. 7 on a plan drawn by J. Communy, city surveyor, of the fifteenth of September, 1844, and deposited in the office of P. P. Labarre, late a notary in this city, and measures 32 feet 9 inches 2 lines front on Dorgenois street by 112 feet 9 inches 5 lines in depth.

4. A certain lot of ground, situated in the same district, on the north side of Dorgenois street, between Canal and Customhouse streets, known as lot No. 8, measuring 37 feet 9 inches front on Dorgenois street, by 112 feet 9 inches 5 lines in depth, and contiguous to the lot above described. Purchased by Hugh Cassidy from Widow Felix Cheval and William L. Cheval by act before R. Hogan, notary, on the twenty-seventh of August, 1873.

5. Three lots of ground, with the buildings thereon, situated in the Second District of this city, in the square bounded by Canal, Customhouse, Dorgenois and Broad streets, designated by the Nos. 9, 10 and 11, and measuring as follows: No. 9 2 feet 1 inch 4 lines front on Customhouse street by 100 feet in depth; lots Nos. 10 and 11 each 30 feet front on Customhouse street by 100 feet in depth, lot No. 11 forming the corner of Customhouse and Dorgenois streets. Which three lots of ground were purchased from Miss Peggy Cox by act before A. Dreyfous, notary, on the thirty-first of January, 1866.

6. Six lots of ground, in the square bounded by Broad, Customhouse, Canal and Dorgenois streets, designated as lots Nos. from 13 to 18, as per plan of N. Tourne, of the fifteenth of March, 1864, deposited in the office of S. Magner, late notary, as plan No. 79; lots Nos. 12 to 17 measures 30 feet front on Customhouse street by 166 feet 8 inches in depth, between parallel lines; No. 18 63 feet 7 inches 7 lines front on Customhouse street by 156 feet 8 inches in depth, which were purchased by Hugh Cassidy from the succession of L. Millaudon, April 19, 1864.

Your petitioner further represents that the said hereinbefore described real estate is, as appears of record, incumbered and charged with the following hereinafter specified mortgages, judgments, liens and privileges resting thereon, and against Hugh Cassidy, to wit:

1. The draining privilege in favor of the city of New Orleans.
2. The conventional mortgage in favor of John N. Hincks, by act before P. C. Cuvellier, notary, of March 31, 1866, to secure $30 000, interest, etc., reduced to $15,000, resting on lot No. 1.
3. The conventional mortgage in favor of J. N. Moore, before same notary, of August 27, 1870, to secure $10,000 on same property as above.
4. The conventional mortgage in favor of Widow D. Wilcox, by act before W. J. Castell, notary, of March 3, 1870, to secure $4000, on the lot No. 2.
5. The conventional mortgage in favor of Widow Felix Cheval and others, act before E. R. Hegan, notary, of August 27, 1873, to secure $800 and interest, on the lot No. 7.
6. The conventional mortgage in favor of Charles Gallagher, act before J. Mossy, notary, December 16, 1873, to secure $2500 and interest on the lot No. 2.
7. The general mortgage in favor of Margaret Hennessy, wife of Hugh Cassidy, for $2450.
8. The conventional mortgage in favor of E. Dufaur, act before J. Mossy, notary, of February 21, 1874, to secure $10,000 and interest on the lot No. 2.
9. The mortgages and privileges in favor of the State for the following taxes:
   State tax for 1871, $62 35.
   State tax for 1871, $3 50.
   State tax for 1872, $967 50.
   State tax for 1873, $870.
   State tax for 1874, $1482 50.
10. The general mortgage in favor of the city for $37 50, recorded February 14, 1872.
11. The general mortgage in favor of the city for $61 50 for taxes of 1865.
12. The general one in favor of J. N. Moore, resulting from a writ issued from the Sixth District Court the twelfth of May, 1874, on the lot No. 1.
13. The general mortgage in favor of the city from a judgment for taxes rendered the sixth November, 1874, for $1342 50, and recorded the twenty-eighth January, 1875.

All recorded in the office of the recorder of mortgages of the city of New Orleans, as appears from the certificate annexed hereto and made a part hereof.

And your petitioners further represent that it is impossible for them to determine the validity of said incumbrances and the amount due thereon; that they can not ascertain the value of said property by agreement between themselves and the creditors holding said security, as provided in section twenty of the bankrupt act of 1867. And that it is necessary in order to ascertain the value of said property, and for the due, proper and speedy administration of said estate, and for the interest of the creditors therein, that said estate be sold at public auction, free and clear of all incumbrances. That all said judgments, mortgages, liens and privileges recorded against said property be canceled and erased, so that your petitioners can convey a clear and unincumbered title to any purchaser thereof, reserving to said city of New Orleans for the sum due for drainage and taxes, to the State, to John N. Hincks, to J. N. Moore, to the Widow D. Wilcox, to Widow Felix Cheval and others, to Charles Gallagher, to E. Dufaur, to all other persons, all their rights in law, to the proceeds of the sale of said property upon the distribution thereof.

Wherefore, your petitioners pray that they may be ordered and authorized to sell said property above described at public auction, free and clear from all incumbrances. That all said judgments, mortgages, liens and privileges recorded against said property be canceled and erased, so that your petitioners can convey a clear and unincumbered title to any purchaser thereof, reserving to said city of New Orleans, to the State, to J. N. Hincks, to J. N. Moore, to Widow D. Wilcox, to Widow Felix Cheval and others, to Charles Gallagher, to E. Dufaur, and to all other persons, all the rights in law to the proceeds of the sale of said property according to their rank. And he prays for all other necessary orders.

W. O. DENEGRE, Attorney.

On motion of W. O. Denegre, attorney of Berry Russell and N. A. Wilcox, assignees, and upon suggesting to the court that he has filed in this court the foregoing petition, it is ordered that the city of New Orleans, for its taxes for drainage and its city taxes, the State of Louisiana, John N. Hincks, J. N. Moore, Widow D. Wilcox, Widow Felix Cheval and others, Charles Gallagher, E. Dufaur, and all other parties in interest, do show cause upon the twenty-fourth day of April, A. D. 1875, at 11 A. M., before this court, why the said petition should not be granted and said property sold, as prayed for, and that all incumbrances recorded against said property should not be canceled and erased. And it is further ordered that notice of this petition and order be served upon said city of New Orleans, the State of Louisiana, John N. Hincks, J. N. Moore, Widow D. Wilcox, Widow Felix Cheval and others, Charles Gallagher and E. Dufaur, and all other persons, by serving a copy thereof upon them, or their agent or attorney, or by publishing a copy of said petition and order three times in the New Orleans Republican, a newspaper printed in New Orleans, the last publication to be made at least ... days before the day of hearing.

Signed March 27, 1875.

W. B. WOODS, Circuit Judge, Who makes this order during a vacancy in the office of United States district judge for the District of Louisiana.

Clerk's office, New Orleans, March 27, 1875.

A true copy:

ap1 8 15 J. A. CHARBONNET, Deputy Clerk.

THE STATE OF LOUISIANA.

SIXTH DISTRICT COURT FOR THE PARISH OF ORLEANS.

HELEN R. SOMPAGRAC VS. HUGH B. WALMSLEY —No. 7386.

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT ON THE SEVENteenth day of March, 1875, judgment was rendered in this court in the following entitled suit in the words and figures following, to wit:

Helen R. Sompagrac vs. Hugh B. Walmsley—No. 7386.

On motion of Hyams & Jonas, attorneys for the plaintiff in this cause, upon producing to the court due proof in support of her demand herein, the court being of the opinion that the law and the evidence are with the plaintiff, it is ordered, adjudged and decreed that the judgment by default herein entered on the fifth of March instant be now confirmed; that there be judgment in favor of plaintiff, Helen Rebecca Sompagrac, and against defendant, Hugh B. Walmsley, her husband, decreeing a separation of property between the said parties and a dissolution of the community of acquests and gains existing between them; that she be authorized to manage her affairs separate and apart from her said husband. It is further ordered, adjudged and decreed that plaintiff do recover judgment against her husband for the sum of $3295, with legal interest thereon from judicial demand, and with mortgage and privilege for the sum of $1200 from January, 1870; for $600 from January, 1871; for $500 from March, 1873, and for $795 from February, 1874, and costs of suits.

Judgment signed March 22, 1875.

A. SAUCIER, Judge.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the said court, at the city of New Orleans, on this twenty-fifth day of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seventy-five.

ap2 8 22 FRANK WALL, Deputy Clerk.