THE DAILY BEE, PUBLISHED BY
C. F. WEISSER & CO.
Editors and Proprietors,
C. F. WEISSER, G. MARBY,
E. DUVERGER, N. DUPOUR.
DAILY PAPER, (one year in advance,) $12 00
COUNTRY PAPER, semi-weekly, (one year in advance,) $5 00
In all cases, subscribers must give one week's notice in writing, before they can be allowed to discontinue.

The New Orleans Bee.

NEW ORLEANS, FRIDAY MORNING, DECEMBER 15, 1854.

RATES OF ADVERTISING
One Dollar for every TEN lines in each insertion, and HALF that price for each subsequent one. No advertisement inserted for less than one dollar in each insertion.
☞ Advertisements inserted at intervals will be charged one dollar for every TEN lines for both insertions for each insertion.
☞ The privilege of Annual Advertisers is limited to advertisements strictly within the line of their business, and in extent to one square every other day.

{Vol. XV.—NEW SERIES. Vol. XXVIII.—Whole No. 766.}

THE DAILY BEE.

Friday Morning, December 15, 1854.

THE NORTHERN MAIL brought yesterday papers from New York to the evening of the 7th, same dates from Washington and Baltimore, and dates from Charleston to the 10th inst.

THE HOMESTEAD LAW.

We have passed a few years back by the Legislature of the State, and which bore the appellation of Homestead Law, was abolished after a very short experience of its practical effects, and we can add with entire truth, with the concurrence of every enlightened and upright man. It was a law that originated in injustice and demagogism, and was designed to place the property of the poorer classes of creditors beyond the reach of their creditors. If the Legislature advanced a step further, it was a law that gave to the surviving widow or minor children of a decedent, who might be necessitous and not possessed in their own right of property to the amount of one thousand dollars, the right to demand and receive from the succession of their parent or spouse, a sum which called to the property owned by him or either of them, in their own right, to make up the sum of one thousand dollars, and declared that the sum should be paid from in preference to all other debts, except for the privilege of vendors, or expenses incurred for the sale of the property. The wife was to have the usufruct of the money during her widowhood, and after her death it was to revert to the children or their descendants.

The phraseology of this act is both compressive and exclusive—comprehensive, because it sweeps in its range by the gen, wife of its expressions, all decedents, whether they died in a state of indebtedness or not, and whether the property left by them was in reality or not, or to any privilege except the vendor's, saving, because it saves the rights of no creditor except those of the vendor and the person who sells the property. It will then be seen by the most superficial thinker, that thousands of nearly all persons were obliterated from the right that the law gave them, were they acquired by their contracts over property of the deceased, for their indemnity, or were taken away from them by the Legislature. This law remains in our State to the present moment. Vested rights were invaded, all the obligation of contracts was impaired, and substituted by an act, the mere title of which gave not guarantees of the constitution, it not in the letter, at least in the spirit.

How was the detestable act of legislative usurpation and confiscation, which took away the property of the deceased TITUS, which he had acquired during his lifetime to secure the wants of his widow and heirs, and bestowed it on his widow and children of TITUS—how, we ask, was this law, which would have disgraced even the authors and annals of the Long Parliament, received and treated by the supreme tribunal of the Government which is the guardian of the constitution and break water of our ship of state, designed to repel the storms of error and to arrest the waves of violence and strife? Let our Supreme Court speak for itself. It says that the Court thus highly honored, that the law announced intended nothing the constitutional objection, because it is such a conclusive manner, as we contended. An act to provide a home for the widow and children of deceased persons in the French text is *une maison*. A plain, unsophisticated man, the possessor of no special interpretation and not at all well acquainted in our State, or even with the occult science of *legal* phrases, would say, that the word *homestead* meant nothing in its vulgar acceptation, and means a home, or house and piece of land, for the dwelling of any one—the house in which the decedent domiciled. He would like wise think that one thousand dollars in money, whether notes or specie or bullion, would not a homestead or a *maison domicile*. But the wound later under a gross decision. The Supreme Court of Louisiana has a power which comprehends the relations of words better, and can see similitudes and identities where he could not. They have a keener perception of the metaphysical Hickman, who could see what was not to be seen. They solemnly declare that money is not a homestead, and therefore that the act was not unconstitutional.

We contend, we, with this law palpably in violation of our Constitution, which declares that every law enacted by the Legislature must embrace but one object, *and that shall be expressed in its title*. The law embraced, not one object, which was, to give a sum of money to the consort and children of the deceased, and that object was not expressed in the title of the law. The title of the law was for the giving of a *homestead* to those, and the body of the law gives them money. By what process of political alchemy can the transmutation of a house and the land on which it is erected, surpasses our comprehension, and we must refer the curious in the lessons of the Court, which convinces the Bar and an enlightened public in such a bath of remarkably easy faith. The highest judicial tribunal having given its most concurrence and deliberate sanction to a vicious and illegislative robbery, all the inferior courts followed, which we hope will be the last in the next session, and that time is now near. The necessary effect of such laws, is to exempt from seizure and sale, the homes of the owners a certain quantity of land or a house, and to confer on it a character of property enjoyed by the mass of property of the State. It is to be held in different title, by a different tenure, to be enjoyed and transmitted by a different law, from the property of other citizens. It is to be the same property in the hands of the deceased, and to confer on it a character of sacredness, which is to be lost in the operation of the calamities of bankruptcy and business. The law is unconstitutional, because it is a flagrant violation of contract and bank laws. A species of feudalism, in relation to the property of the State, is established by the law, and, if the benefit of one class of people, and an aristocracy of petty land owners, who are to have prerogatives and privileges to enable them to defraud their creditors of their property, to be free from seizure, for debts for medicines, groceries, or the necessaries of life, but their property is to be loaded for their debts. A creditor is to seize on the property of his debtor, and sell it to him to buy the necessaries of life, and to have a home for his family, and children, and to live on the furniture in the house which he rents, his wife and children, and to live on the furniture in the house which he rents, his wife and children, and to live on the furniture in the house which he rents, his wife