The New-Orleans Bee.

No. 1334 Vol. X.—NEW SERIES. Vol. XXIX—Whole No. 6283.

OFFICIAL PAPER OF THE STATE ..... NEW-ORLEANS, WEDNESDAY MORNING, NOVEMBER 13, 1850

WAGNE & WEISSE, Proprietors, No. 83 CHARTRES STREET.

TERMS OF THE BEE.

DAILY (one year in advance) $12 00
BEE-LINE, semi weekly, (one year) 5 00

Subscribers must give one week's notice of stopping before he can be allowed to discontinue.

ADVERTISING.—One Dollar for every TEN lines each language, on the first insertion, and half price for each subsequent one. No advertisement inserted at less than one dollar for each language.

Advertisements specified as to time will be published accordingly, and charged accordingly.

Advertisements inserted at intervals will be charged a dollar for every TEN lines for each language and for each insertion.

Subscriptions to Annual Advertisers is limited to a business strictly within the line of their business, and to an extent to one square every other day.

The New-Orleans Daily Bee.

Official Journal of the State, General Council, First Municipality and Board of Liquidators.

Wednesday Morning, Nov. 13, 1850

WE SOULE—ANOTHER CORRESPONDENCE.

Sixty-five leading members of the Democratic party of New Orleans and Lafayette—which numbers over five thousand—have signed a letter addressed to the Hon. PIERRE SOULE, expressing admiration of his course in the Senate of the United States, and declaring that they have yet to learn that Mr. SOULE's views on the institutions and constitutional rights of the South justifies the suspicion of disloyalty to the Union. Among the signers we find the names of forty of forty well known and leading Democrats. The remainder consist of equally respectable citizens, who may not unreasonably be supposed to sympathize with Mr. SOULE, and to impute in some measure the opposition he has encountered, to the fact that he is a Democrat of the manor born. This is, perhaps, a gigantic mistake, but it arises out of a misapprehension at once natural, and within proper limits, praiseworthy.

Mr. SOULE's reply is as follows:

NEW ORLEANS, Nov. 11, 1850

GENTLEMEN: I have before me the communication signed in my hands on yesterday by a very great number of my fellow citizens of New Orleans and Lafayette, in which you express and endeavor to justify their admiration of my conduct in reference to the Compromise Bills passed into laws by the Congress of the United States.

Permit me, gentlemen, to express my great gratitude for the feelings which have dictated your address to me, for so flattering an expression of your sentiments and kindness of your language, which I shall ever remember with pleasure, and which would not, in fact, be in the slightest degree weakened therefore, if I made in the defence of my conduct, which I was specially commissioned and instructed by the Democratic party of Louisiana and Orleans. I regard these as a fresh testimonial to match or surpass in the political duty I have marked out for myself, and to deny, as I trustingly hope, the effect of that great instrument of one who stands among the greatest, and whose great common country, knowing "no North, no South, no East, no West," we will stand by and maintain the supremacy of the laws against sectional feeling and factious opposition.

Resolved, That we believe the welfare and prosperity of our Union, mainly depends upon the preservation, among all sections of the country, of the conservative feelings which have heretofore generated the Whig party of the Union; that we deprecate and deplore the conduct of those, who, by arraying section against section, interest against interest, South against North, or North against South, seek to disturb and destroy that spirit of common harmony and amity, without which the Union must and will crumble to ruins; and that we will, by every honorable exertion, discountenance and strive to allay further excitement and agitation.

STRONG SEMI-OFFICIAL DECLARATIONS.—The Washington *Republic* of Saturday week, in a lengthy article on the present state of affairs at the North and the South, makes the following emphatic declaration relative to the President:

"It is his simple duty to see that the laws are executed. This duty he will perform, whether the laws are resisted by the organized rebellion of a State, or the vagrant insurrection of a mob.

"At the South as well as at the North, we believe that *all* the laws will be executed, and we know that if they are subverted or successfully resisted in any quarter, it will not be from any hesitation on the part of the President to employ all the power with which he is invested to maintain the Constitution and to preserve the Union."

MARYLAND REFORM CONVENTION.—This body assembled at Annapolis on the 4th instant, but was unable to organize, through want of a quorum. It is considered probable that Hon. Wm. Cost Johnson, a Whig and Reform delegate from Frederick county, will be selected as President of the Convention. Some of the ablest citizens of Maryland have been elected to a seat in that body.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE VIRGINIA REFORM CONVENTION.—The Virginia Convention has been engaged for some days upon a proposition to adjourn over its proceedings until the 1st of January, upon the ground that they could not prosecute their labors successfully in the adjustment of the basis of representation and the ratio of taxation, until they had before them the statistics of the First Auditor on the taxable property of the State, and the Census of the United States, of the population of each section of Virginia. The question was finally disposed of on Saturday, when, by a vote of ayes 66, noes 62, it was agreed to adjourn, yesterday until the first Monday in January next.

INDIANA CONVENTION.—Yesterday, the debate was resumed on the separate submission of the question of negro suffrage to a direct vote of the people. An amendment providing that such an extension of the elective franchise should be positively placed in the constitution was voted down—ayes 1, noes 124. An amendment to the amendment, offered by Mr. May, that such extension should be under such restrictions, &c., as the Legislature might determine, had been previously rejected. The question then recurring on the original resolution, it was carried by—ayes 60, noes 62—the chosen vote of the session. This settles the question of negro exclusion unless the minds of members undergo a change, as many who voted in the affirmative stated expressly that they did so only out of courtesy to the mover, the resolution being one of inquiry merely. Close upon this vote was another to an imperative resolution to make the prohibition of negro testimony a constitutional provision, which was carried, *nem. con.*—ayes 84, nays 1.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]