THE DAILY BEE
PUBLISHED DAILY (SUNDAYS EXCEPTED) AT
No. 73 Chartres street.

Subscriptions taken by the week at the rate of twenty-five Cents for the six numbers, payable to the carrier.

Daily Paper, one year (in advance).....$12
Weekly Paper, one year.....$4

In all cases subscribers must give one week's notice in writing before they can be allowed to discontinue.

Any person receiving the paper through error or the carrier, or otherwise, will be considered as a subscriber who is bound to pay, unless he notifies the office of the fact.

NEW ORLEANS:
WEDNESDAY MORNING, MAY 11.

Sales at Auction This Day.

By J. E. Cozzet, at No. 195 St. Ann street, at 10 o'clock, furniture.

By E. T. Montgomery, at 79 Camp street, cotton gins and shelves. O. Tchoupic street, between Dauphin and Burgundy, match horses, saddles, harness, buggies, &c.

By D. L. Hoeffly, at Brickblock, at Post 17, First District, 10 o'clock, furniture. At 8 o'clock, Gravier Dry street, furniture.

By Fagan & Autry, at Brickblock, at 38 and 40 Old Levee street, the whole City Hotel package.

By E. M. Jacobs, at 10 o'clock, at corner Magazine and Erebomia streets, the contents of a grocery.

D. E. Murphy, auctioneer, sells this day, at 10 o'clock, A. M., on the Levee, Post No 17, First District, 1000 boxes scaled herrings. See advertisement.

Dealers in imported wines will find it to their interest to attend the sale of 300 boxes Vermouth, Noilly Prat, advertised to be sold this day, at 10½ o'clock, P. M., by D. E. Murphy, auctioneer, on the Levee, head of Ursulines street, Second District.

We are requested to state that the sale of the cargo of molasses ex schooner Lottie, which was advertised to take place this morning, at 10 o'clock, by Bernard Tonnelier, auctioneer, has been postponed until further notice.

For Bayou Lafourche.—The new and fine passenger packet Ewan, W. R. Greathouse, master, leaves New Orleans regularly, on Wednesday and Saturday, at 5 o'clock, P. M., for Bayou Lafourche. See advertisement in another column.

B. P. Etheridge & Co.—B. P. Etheridge Co. and 51 Poydras, have received a lot of flour, corn, meal, pork and lard, which they will sell at moderate prices.

Messrs. Phipsey & Amy will sell this day at 12 o'clock M., at the S. M. Marshall's Warehouse, Nos. 38 and 40 Old Levee Street, the Schooner Lilly, her tackle, apparel and furniture, and her cargo. For particulars see advertisement.

We are assured, as a Southern paper, be one familiar with the country, that Red River differs from the other large streams of the West, in having no "bluff" and we can readily believe it, since, by inspection of the map it will be seen that it is not a mountain stream, but rises in a comparatively low region. The "bluff" spoken of is rather a ledge, causing a considerable falls, the river not to be stemmed by any craft in low water.

Constitution and Convention.

Tuesday, May 10, 1864.

Mr. Sommerville, for the resolution of Messrs. Bouchelle and Bonfoy, for compensation to loyal owners of the cap.

Mr. Cutler offered a substitute, that the President appoint a committee to make an estimate for the purpose, to loyal citizens for their unappropriated claims.

Mr. Abell moved an amendment, that the amount of compensation be limited to the amount of taxes paid into the Treasury of the United States under the confiscation laws.

Mr. Bonfoy, in reply, said the amount of taxes paid was very small.

Mr. Cutler said it was not material to the question, whether the amount of taxes paid was small or large.

Mr. Abell said the amount of taxes paid was two million, and he was willing to pay them with gold in exchange for Confederate bonds and Confederate Treasury Notes, which the enemy has been collecting all the time.

Mr. Cutler said he preferred the C. S. District Court to the Treasury Department. The policy of the Government should be, not to discourage the trade—but to encourage it.

I consider it unfair that loyal persons residing within the lines of national military occupation cannot purchase outside of such lines anything whatever, either of loyal or disloyal persons in other words, I answer your first question in the negative.

But if I two persons are within our lines, I think one may purchase with the other for goods situated beyond the lines, and the purchaser, upon complying with the requisitions, &c., upon the oath prescribed by the President, may bring the property in here under the new Treasury Regulations, the vendor can only sell such goods as are already here—not such as he is yet to obtain in the enemy's country. They must not be made to encourage him, but they must be such as which he has not purchased beyond the lines. Such, I understand, is the constitution, as which a purchaser cannot have dealt with forfeiture for having been made without a permit. No legal permit can be granted by any Treasury Agent to trade beyond the lines, and illegal permits are void.

II. "In case the owner of goods and produce brought in for sale shall reside within the lines of national military occupation, and is loyal, within the meaning of the oath section of these regulations, by whom are the goods or products to be sold? by the Supervising Special Agent, or by the owner?"

I incline to the opinion that the sale of the property of resident owners, brought in under the Additional Regulations, is not to be made by you, unless it should be necessary to secure the government dues.

III. "Can a resident foreigner, without taking the oath prescribed by the Proclamation of Amnesty, of December 8, 1863, bring in his products under these regulations in the same manner as citizens who may take that oath? Would not the exclusion of a foreigner, by the requirement of an oath which he cannot take, be contrary to our treaty obligations?"

If he resides beyond the lines he may bring in his products, for regulation 52 authorizes all persons to do so, and is not confined to citizens. But the Supervising Special Agent could not pay to him twenty five per cent of the proceeds. (This property after sale, unless he should take the oath prescribed, as oath which none but a citizen can take; he could be receive the other three fourths after the war without proving his ownership, his citizenship, and his loyalty to the United States Government.

The advantages, therefore, which a resident foreigner, bringing his goods from the enemy's country would enjoy, are confined to exemption from liability to criminal prosecution for the act. In the absence of these Additional Regulations, such intercourse would subject him to indictment and conviction, under the statute forbidding the bringing of property within the lines of the United States unlawfully.

If he resides within the lines, he cannot avail him of all the privileges granted by the additional regulations for simple reason that he is not an owner of goods and produce which can take the oath prescribed by the President on the 8th December, 1863. I conclude, "Would not the exclusion of the foreigner, by the requirement of an oath which he cannot take, be contrary to our treaty obligations?" There is no treaty between the United States Government and any foreign power which obliges the former to grant licenses authorizing intercourse with persons in the enemy's country. The political power may grant a license to one citizen and withhold it from another, may grant it to one foreigner resident here, and withhold it from another, may grant it to citizens and withhold it from other residents; may grant it to other residents and withhold it from citizens, may grant it with or without conditions. What it has done is simply to impose the condition that all contracts of property beyond the lines, living within the lines, shall take the prescribed oath. If the foreigner and 2 hales relief, he cannot take it, that fact cannot affect the license of the citizen who can comply with the condition—nor can it, in any manner, affect the rights and privileges which the foreigner resident here enjoys under treaty existing between our Government and any other.

President Lincoln's
SENTIMENTS AND POLICY WITH REGARD TO SLAVERY.

Executive Mansion,
Washington, April 1

A. G. Hodges, Esq., Frankfort, Ky.

My Dear Sir—I took me to put in writing the substance of what I verbally said the other day, in your presence, to Governor Bramlette and Senator Dixon. It was about as follows:

I am naturally anti-slavery. If slavery is not wrong, nothing is wrong. I cannot remember when I did not so think and feel. And yet I have never thought that the Presidency conferred upon me an unrestricted right to act officially upon this judgment and feeling. It was my duty to do all I could, to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. I could not take the office without taking the oath. Nor was it my view that I might take an oath to get power, and break the oath in using the power. I took the oath before the election. Much has occurred since then. Various events have tended to change the public view of the question of slavery. I had publicly declared it on many times and in many ways. And I saw that, to this day, I have been as much in action more deeply to my abstract judgment and feeling.

I did understand, however, that my oath to preserve the Constitution to the best of my ability imposed upon me the duty of preserving, by every rightful means, the existence of the Union. I understood also that Constitution was the instrument which gave us the nation, and yet preserve the nation.

Perhaps at the outset of the Government, I could have done something to prevent the introduction of slavery. I had probably done so a many times and in many ways. And I saw that, to this day, I have done