

# The Semi-Weekly Republican.

TERMIN--\$5.00 PER ANNUM, INVARIABLY IN ADVANCE.

ST. FRANCISVILLE, LOUISIANA, FRIDAY, MARCH 15, 1872.

NEW SERIES--VOL. I. NO. 3.

Friday at 4 P. M.  
Editor.  
Dime  
Advertiser  
Agent

ing the duty on tea  
the house at Wash-  
day, and at the  
to abolish duty or  
d to pass.

Mich.) girl is claim-  
on record to take  
p-year. She pro-  
ful dry goods clerk  
defray all expenses,  
al young man de-  
s.

in officer in India,  
ngly mutilated and  
tle, after mature re-  
le his comrade to  
othed in England,  
from the bridal en-  
noble reply was wor-  
oman: "Tell him  
h of his body left to  
I shall hold him to

1872, there were  
20 daily newspa-  
s; 2 tri-weeklies;  
7 monthlies; 2 bi-  
1 quarterly. There  
lished in the Ger-  
1 in the Norwegian;  
enian, and 1 in the  
eally, 167 are Re-  
2 Democratic. The  
eather neutral or de-  
onal, agricultural, or

ey says that the ma-  
of hens may be sti-  
managed. To keep  
ng she must be brace-  
e best way is to tie  
r, and let her head  
is not necessary in  
eg her neck, unless  
athers for something.  
straw, or the last  
o last feather, that  
el's back. Some say  
eak the camel's back  
ade him "hump."  
show signs of decor-  
t of some feed will  
hen's appetite is al-  
hy. A great many  
ortication.

argument of the At-  
of England, Sir John  
ho appears for the  
celebrated Tichborne  
er perhaps the very  
ever heard of. It was  
14th of January, and  
ants it had not been  
entire trial which  
ch time as has been  
his address would or-  
ne a long one; and  
ossible that a speech  
rdinary length could  
uously interesting.  
days after he began,  
or jury showed any  
the distinguished ad-  
eaking. Before pro-  
at day, he remarked  
genious persons who  
of the facts had crit-  
not restricting himself  
a half. But it was  
much as the jury were  
for the first time a  
unt of the case from  
he should still detain  
owever, he would not  
longer than was ab-  
ary. Both the Lord  
and the jury at once  
opinion that the At-  
had not wasted a  
since he began to

## The Treaty of Washington.

(From Harper's Weekly.)

The English excitement about the claims of the United States under the Treaty of Washington is most unreasonable, while the American unanimity and moderation of feeling are most honorable. The exuberant wrath of the English at what are called indirect or consequential damages both now and upon the delivery of Senator Sumner's speech is difficult to explain. When Mr. Sumner spoke of such damages there came an indignant reply from England that the island of Great Britain, and all the men, women and children upon it, should sink before such a preposterous claim was acknowledged. And now when in the "case" of the United States submitted at Geneva the same possible demand is made, Mr. Gladstone, the British Prime Minister, says that the American demands are preposterous and absurd, and such as no people in the last extremity of war or the lowest depth of national misfortune would ever submit to.

Yet the American "case" has always been the same, and has always been known to England. It was stated by Mr. Seward and by Mr. Sumner; and after the speech of the latter upon the Johnson treaty, in which this very point of indirect losses was strenuously urged, the Senate of the United States maintained it by a vote which, except for one Senator would have been unanimous. The case of the United States was stated again in the dispatch of Secretary Fish to Mr. Motley of Sept. 25, 1869; and Mr. Cobden had anticipated it during the war, and declared in Parliament that England would certainly be called to a reckoning. And that there might be no pretext for misunderstanding the American case, it was set forth by the American commissioners at the opening of the negotiations for the Treaty of Washington.

On the 4th of May, 1871, a protocol, or official record of the negotiations, was read in the Commission, and approved by it. From this record it appears that on the 8th of March the American Commissioners stated the American case. This was really composed of two parts, the direct and the indirect losses. The former comprised the capture and destruction of vessels with their cargoes, together with the expenses of pursuit by the national cruisers; the latter comprised the transfer of American commerce to the British flag, the enhanced payment of insurance, the prolongation of the war, and the consequent immense increase of expenditure to carry it on. The amount of claims actually preferred for losses was then about fourteen millions of dollars, and the expenses of pursuit could be easily estimated; and the protocol added "that in the hope of an amicable settlement no estimate was made of the indirect losses, without prejudice, however, to the right to indemnification on their account in the event of no such settlement being made." The American Commissioners, therefore, proposed the amicable settlement by an expression of regret from England, and the payment of a sum to be agreed upon.

This proposition was declined, and the Commission proceeded to frame the treaty, which opens with the declaration of a desire to settle amicably all causes of difference. It continues with an expression of regret for the escape of the cruisers, and then defines the manner in which "the case" of each country is to be submitted to arbitration; and it concludes by declaring that the result of the arbitration shall be regarded as a "full, perfect, and final settlement" by each side. The indignant declaration of English opinion now is that the United States had no right under the treaty to make such a "case" as they have submitted, and that if they persist in making it, Great Britain will withdraw from the treaty. But upon what ground can Great Britain require that the United States shall accept her view of what "the case" might properly include? The original statement by the American Commissioners mentioned indirect losses as a cardinal part of the American case. Had the proposition been accepted to apologize and pay a gross sum, the settlement would have been final. But that was declined, and the American Commissioners, having expressly reserved all their rights, put into their case the substance of what they had always stated to the British Commissioners as the whole American claim. Evidently it is the tribunal, and not one of the parties, which must de-

cide both whether such a claim should be satisfied, and whether it should be urged.

It is too late for Great Britain to say that she would never have concluded the treaty if she had understood that such preposterous and absurd claims were to be presented. If she did not know it, it was certainly her own fault. The American Commissioners concealed nothing; and when they signed the treaty, they left the tribunal to decide not only whether such damages should be considered and paid, but whether any damages whatever for actual losses should be paid. The London Times asks with warmth how indirect damages can possibly be estimated in money, and suggests that the vagueness of such a proposition is fatal to it. "If the American claim be true," says the Times, "there is nothing to prevent any neutral being called upon to pay a large share in the expense of any war." Very possibly. But does not the Times see that that is the very question, among others, which the tribunal is called upon to decide? If the United States should declare that the English refusal to pay such damages is preposterous, and that unless they will consent to pay them, if adjudged, the United States will not submit to arbitration, it would be no more childish than the present attitude of English opinion. Mr. Gladstone is certainly aware that under the treaty the equally "preposterous" English demand has been made upon the Claims Commission sitting in Washington to recognize the rebel debt as valid, and that the United States counsel, Mr. Hale, pursued the only proper course in objecting before the tribunal. Yet here was a claim involving probably not less than four thousand millions of dollars. Nobody ever supposed it could be or would be presented under the treaty. But it was the right of England to make her case as she chose, and because this claim was presented does any Englishman think that the United States should have threatened to withdraw from the treaty?—And because the United States claim before the Geneva tribunal what they have always claimed, and what England always knew that they claimed, do Englishmen gravely propose to withdraw from the treaty?

The object of an arbitration is to determine losses and provide for their settlement, and also to define certain international rules. This is plain. If, therefore, the British Government wishes to withdraw from the treaty under the plea that its Commissioners did not know what they were doing, and therefore did what they did not mean to do, too desirous may perhaps properly be considered. But in the light of the full text of the official documents and of the ordinary meaning of words to declare that the United States have demanded what they were honorably bound not to demand is most unreasonable. If, as English opinion insists, our demand is, in the nature of things, preposterous, the tribunal will so declare, and we shall be left without sympathy. But surely the tribunal must be considered competent to decide what, under the treaty, may properly be brought before it. If it can not do this what is it competent to do? If each country is to decide in advance the propriety of the case of the other, why was any tribunal constituted? And unless each country may make its own case, however absurd, and present it in its way under the treaty, the regulations of the two countries are more critical than if there had been no commission and no treaty.

London papers relate curious stories of the blunders made by Oxford under-graduates in the Scripture examination which they have to pass before taking their degrees. It is told of one that when asked who was the first King of Israel, he was so fortunate as to stumble upon the name of Saul. He saw that he had hit the mark, and wishing to show the examiners how intimate his knowledge of the Scriptures was, he added, confidently, "Saul—also called Paul." Another was called upon to mention "the two instances recorded in Scripture of the lower animals speaking." The under-graduate thought for a moment, and replied, "Balaam's ass." "That is one, Sir. What is the other?" Under-graduate paused in earnest thought. At last a gleam of recollection lit up his face as he replied, "The Whale. The whale said unto Jonah, 'Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian!'"

## Russia and the Alabama Claims.

The correspondent of the *Eastern Budget* at St. Petersburg says, writing on the 3rd inst:—

The difficulties which have arisen between England and America in regard to the Alabama claims inspire extraordinary interest here. The *Exchange Gazette* thus expresses its joy at this incident: "The intervention of England in European questions has now for a long time been rendered impossible. England, humiliated in Europe and America, loses her influential position in the West—and that without a struggle, without bloodshed, without the honors of war, while America continues to form new bonds of friendship with Russia and promises to be an important element in all future European questions. Russia can only congratulate herself on such a change in the situation, and rejoice at her friendly relations with the American nation." On the latter point the *Moscow Gazette* assures its readers that the Catacazy affair has had no unpleasant consequences so far as Russia and America are concerned. M. Catacazy could only have expressed his private opinion in the Anglo-American dispute, and his influence in the matter was over-estimated by the people who forgot that Washington is not Constantinople. "The Times," adds the *Gazette*, "is wrong in supposing that it was Russia's interest at that time to paralyze England on account of the Black Sea question, for that question was so rapidly and satisfactorily settled that Russia had no necessity to use such means for obtaining what she wanted."

## Consequences of Withdrawal from the Treaty.

If, observes the *Morning Post*, our fears should be realized, and our attempt to obtain a withdrawal of the indirect claims should prove abortive, the result will be that the arbitration will not proceed. So much for the present. But how about the future? It is scarcely necessary to say that although the United States might if it pleased make our withdrawal from the arbitration a *casus belli*, it will not take such a course. It did not draw the sword when we refused to admit any liability whatever for the acts of the Confederate privateers, it will not do so now because an honest misunderstanding has arisen respecting the scope of a Treaty by which we referred the question of our liability to arbitration. The only immediate result, therefore, would be that the sore which we had endeavored to heal would by our unskillful surgery be rendered more extensive and irritating than before, and the evil consequences which we sought to avert by the Treaty of Washington would become more probable than they were before. The consideration for the large concessions we made by that Treaty was the expectation that in the event of our being engaged in a European war we would find in the United States an honest neutral. Our commerce would be at the mercy of Alabamas built in American ports; and we consented to an *ex post facto* law on account of the advantage accruing to us from its also having a future operation. All these hopes are now in danger of being dispelled. The Treaty of Washington will become absolutely inoperative in every particular if we withdraw from it, and the new rules which Great Britain and the United States agreed to observe for the future will fall to the ground. In a word, our position would be much worse than it was at first, and our cause for apprehension in the future will become much more real than before.

**VOTE BY BALLOT.**—The new mode of voting proposed by the Government in the bill to be brought in by Mr. Foster is thus described in Clause 2: "In the case of a poll at an election the votes shall be given by ballot. The ballot of each voter shall consist of a paper (in this Act called 'a ballot paper') showing the names and description of the candidates. At the time of voting it shall be marked at the back with an official mark, and delivered to the voter within the polling station, and the voter having secretly marked his vote on it, and folded it up so as to conceal his vote, shall place it in a closed box in the presence of the officer presiding at the polling station (in this Act called 'the presiding officer'), after having shown to him the official mark at the back."

## Taxes for the Year 1872.

We take the following extract from a circular issued by Auditor Graham, in relation to the taxes imposed for the year 1872, as it contains information of interest to all tax-payers:

According to the existing laws the rate of taxation for the year 1872, based upon the assessments of 1871, is as follows:

**State Tax, or General Fund**—Four mills on each dollar, "for the support of the Government of the State, of paying the public debt, and of promoting the public interest thereof," in accordance with section 1 of Act No. 42, session of 1871, 4 mills.

**School Tax, or Current School Fund**—Two mills on each dollar, for the support of the free public schools of the State, pursuant to the provisions of section 34 of Act No. 6, extra session of 1870, 2 mills.

**Interest Tax**—Six and one-half mills on each dollar, to provide for the payment of the interest to become due in 1872 upon all State bonds, except the interest on levee bonds, in compliance with section 8, Act 42 of 1871, which tax, when paid into the Treasury, shall be known as the "Interest Tax Fund," 6 1-2 mills.

**Levee Tax**—One and one-half mills on each dollar to meet the maturity of the coupons of interest to fall due in 1872, for the benefit of the levee bonds, issued under Act No. 115 of 1867, and known as the "Levee Tax Fund," and to conform to the requirements of section 6 of said act 1-1-2 mills.

**Special Levee Tax**—Two and one-half mills on the dollar, as provided for under Act 32 of 1870, for the payment of the interest and part of the principal of the bonds issued under the said act, which tax, when paid into the State Treasury, shall be known as the "Special Levee Tax Fund," 2 1-2 mills.

**Levee Construction Tax Fund**—Two mills on the dollar, as provided for in section 6 of Act No. 4 of 1871, as compensation to the Louisiana Levee Company, 2 mills.

**Levee Repair Tax Fund**—Two mills on the dollar, being in conformity with section 7, Act No. 4 of 1871, for the benefit of the Louisiana Levee Company, 2 mills.

The whole forming an aggregate of twenty and one-half (20 1-2) mills on each dollar.

## The Sacramento Union of a recent date says:

"Among the passengers that arrived from the East by the last train that brought overland passengers was a couple enjoying their honeymoon. They were not juveniles, by any means, although they appeared to be deeply in love, but had arrived at the full years of discretion, the bridegroom being about seventy-five years of age, and the bride sixty-three. It transpired that they, in their youth, had been lovers, but some little quarrel occurred and they separated. Each married, and he came in due time to California. Eventually they became widower and widow. He returned to the States, married her, and now at last they are happy together. They remained in the city until Friday or Saturday, then left for their home in the interior, but while here they appeared as devoted to one another as though less than thirty years had passed over their heads."

**JOURNALISTIC AMENITIES.**—This is the way the *Ohio State Journal* glorifies a brother journalist: "The most attractive figure at the *Nitman* opera, in Cincinnati, we are told by visitors, is that of R—d S—h, of the *Cincinnati Gazette*. Dressed in an irreproachable lavender cravat and claw-hammer coat, with his blonde hair flowing in frizzled ringlets of ravishing workmanship, he is a joy forever. His gloves are the envy and despair of the young bucks of the Queen City. His generous hands are first encased in a canvas covering from one of Phipp's sugarcured hams, to corset them into shape; then this is covered with green kid of the finest quality, by a base-ball maker of the Red Stockings. Cockerill says he would be willing to die if he could achieve such a pair of gloves, and Halstead would give an eight-cylinder press to have such hair."

A young lady of Indianapolis was very sorry that her wedding, which was to take place at the same hour, would prevent her attending her sister's funeral.

The lesson taught by the conviction and imprisonment of the Chicago aldermen will be a salutary one. Three of them, Glade, Montgomery and Busse, are now rusticated in the Cook county jail, a situation eminently favorable to reflection on the enormity of the offense of public officers advertising to such of their constituents as were brought into business relations with the city government, that justice and honest dealing were not attributes of their administration. There are few crimes more disastrous to the public wealth than to make the administration of government a lie, and to corrupt with fraud the channels which ought to be as free and pure as the air we breathe.

**TENANT'S CAPITAL IN ENGLAND.**—A correspondent of *Hearth and Home* says: "In riding about the country here, I am constantly struck with the extent to which steam is used in agriculture. They have a portable steam engine that goes about on an ordinary four-wheeled wagon, which runs plows, thrashing machines, and all sorts of things. One day you see it at work in the field, another in the barn-yard. In fact, machinery of all kinds for farm labor seems to me to be much more in use here than with us. There is no such class of small, poor farmers as we have. Unless a man has from \$25 to \$30 an acre for working capital, he can't get a lease from a landlord. With so much capital and high rents, he has got to keep pace with all the improvements to make it pay."

The *Boston Transcript* says:—"The man who governs France is much in the situation of the sailor who caught a tiger under a tub. If he don't sit down on him all the time as hard as he can the tiger will lift the tub and be out and at him. If he finds the tub lifting on one side a shade, and sits more on that side to stop it, the beast beneath discovers a letting up on the opposite side of the tub and has his nose out there instanter. Would not the man on top sometimes like to take turns with somebody in governing France, so that he might sleep now and then out of reach and sound of the tiger?"

Rear-Admiral Ryder, of the British navy, has recommended the substitution of mattresses stuffed with granulated cork for those now in use not only on account of their great buoyancy, but owing to their economy in the first cost. A mattress of this kind, with eleven pounds of cork, will float an iron weight of sixty pounds. They are used in the Russian navy, and nearly the whole of a ship's company was recently saved by their instrumentality after a collision.

**SMALL-POX IN LONDON** carried off 8,000 of the inhabitants of the English capital during the past year. The ravages of the disease were at times frightful, and always alarming. The mortality records of the city shows that the yearly average of deaths from the disease during thirty-one years before was six hundred. The observance of sanitary precautions is inculcated with much force by the medical journals and scientists.

Peter Cartwright, the pioneer Methodist, used to be annoyed by a noisy but not over pious sister, who would go off on a high key every opportunity she got. At an animated class meeting one day the sunbarged sister broke out with: "If I had one more feather in the wing of my faith I could fly away and be with the Saviour." "Stick in the leaves, O Lord, and let her go," fervently responded Brother Cartwright.

At a trial not long since one of the witnesses, an old lady of some eighty years, was closely questioned by the opposing counsel relative to the clearness of her eye-sight. "Can you see me?" said he. "Yes," was answered. "How well can you see me?" persisted the lawyer. "Well enough," responded the lady, "to see that you're neither a negro, an Indian nor a gentleman." The answer brought down the house.

Boswell once asked Johnson if there was no possible circumstance under which suicide would be justifiable. "No," said Johnson. "Well," said Boswell, "suppose a man be guilty of fraud, and he was certain to be found out." "Why then," was the reply, "in that case, let him go to some country where he is not known, and not to the devil where he is known."