The New Orleans Bee.

NEW ORLEANS, MONDAY MORNING, JUNE 4, 1860. Vol. XVII—New Series. Vol. XXXII.—Whole No. 11,693.

Office, 73 Chartres street.

THE DAILY BEE.
PUBLISHED BY
C. P. WEBBER & CO.
Daily Paper, one year (in advance).....$12
Country Paper, semi-weekly.....$5
In all cases, subscribers must give our agents time to collect before they can be allowed to discontinue. Any persons receiving the paper through error of the carrier or otherwise, will be expected to subscribe, and call to pay, unless they contrive to prevent the first publication.

NEW ORLEANS:
MONDAY MORNING, JUNE 4, 1860.

SUBSCRIPTIONS BY THE WEEK

The carriers of the BEE are authorized to receive subscriptions to our paper, at the rate of 25 cents a week, payable in all cases to the carrier themselves.

Sales at Auction To-Day.

By T. F. Foster, at 10 o'clock, on Victory, between Levee Feeder and Frenchmen streets, household furniture.

The Election.

We still not bore our readers with appeals in favor of this or that candidate for office. All that is necessary is for every voter to cast his ballot for those he conscientiously believes to be most capable and worthy. If this is done, we shall have no fears of the future. If evildoers pursuers would but lay aside, on occasions like the present, the excited cause of political opinion, and sustain the arguments for municipal station who can furnish the most satisfactory guarantees of qualification and fidelity, we should seldom have to complain of the mal administration of city affairs. Let every man approach the ballot box and vote just as if he were selecting some one who has supreme control over his regular and resources. If the citizen would use discriminate, we are sure their choice will prove excellent. Meanwhile we hope that those who are entitled will neglect to use the important privilege of suffrage.

PARTISAN DETRACTION.

Heretofore it has been but too customary to suppose that defamation and abuse were legitimate weapons to be used indiscriminately against all candidates for public office; and that the higher the station sought the more fierce and unbridled should be the assault. Of course wherever a nomination for the Presidency was made, the people of the United States considered themselves entitled qualitatively to a boundless privilege of invective, detraction and abuse. The individuals who had been selected as the standard-bearers of party, became broad and permanent targets for every vile and filthy missile that could be directed against them. Neither age, nor intellect, nor public services, nor an unspotted life sufficed to blunt the envenomed shafts of partisan hostility. Nay, the more eminent the character and claims of the candidate, the more foul, reckless and malignant were the slanders and calumny to which he was exposed. The more virtuous a man was not considered by one party. If Mr. CLAY was styled a gambler, an abolitionist and a duellist, Mr. POLK was branded as a spiritless dastard, if General SCOTT was the victim of unmeasured ridicule for his vanity, and was even charged with want of courage. Mr. PIERCE was declared to be a politroon, and his late making experiment at Casanova, and in fainting at Chapultepec were handled about in every opposition journal, and made standing themes for the wit of every sympathetic orator. In fact the proclivity to traduce political adversaries is a vice common to all parties. It has been practiced in every canvass, from the days of Jefferson down to the present time, and although on such occasions well bred gentlemen and true-hearted patriots have usually entered their protest against the excesses, reprobation has availed but little to check its discontinuance.

Still, as the reprehensible habit has in part resulted from extreme political excitement, it might not unreasonably be expected that when such excitement was unmarked by an extraordinary effervescence of popular opinion, the party organs could afford to deal with their adversaries in a somewhat magnanimous and impartial spirit, or, at least, they could adopt a resort to vituperation and low personalities. The present would seem a favorable opportunity to inaugurate this reform, especially in the South Here, for instance, we shall have nothing whatever to do with the distinguished nominees, and can safely ignore the ballot box and vote just as if it were a mere matter of form. We are sure their choice will not even be recognized in the South. The only nominations in which we shall have a vital and practical interest are those of the Constitutional Union Convention, and those which the adjourned National Democratic Convention at Baltimore may please to bestow upon the country. Now, as these nominations possibly exist between the two tickets, as there are honest and good men, faithful to the South, and zealous for her welfare, who may be found on both sides, there can be no possible excuse for the indulgence of that unwarrantable license of intemperate and personal crimination which has characterized all preceding Presidential contests.

We have been induced to throw off these remarks by observing in a Southern political paper that the old slang of and slavery has been revived in reference to one of the candidates—John Bell of Tennessee, having been accused of being a quasi Abolitionist. We do not notice the silly allegation with any intention of refuting it. The game is not worth the candle. Mr. Bell is a Southerner and a slaveholder, identified with Southern institutions and interests for more than half a century. The libel is simply ridiculous, but not more ridiculous in the case of Mr. Bell than in that of Mr. CLAY, or of General TAYLOR, or of Mr. WM A. GRAHAM, and a dozen other men of the South, who, being aspirants for public office, were constrained to endure the same tissue of flippant falsehoods. We notice the absurd thing merely for the purpose of expressing our opinion of the unexpediency as well as inanility of resuscitating this system of hurling garbage at candidates, and especially of the plan of wholesale detraction so common in preceding elections. There is not the slightest necessity for recommencing it, and we trust that the public mind is sufficiently sobered down to perceive its vicious features and to discontinuance its employment. If the party organs desire to set forth the merits of the gentlemen they sustain, it is all right and proper. If they seek to point out what they conceive to be the political heresies of their opponents, there can be no possible objection to that, provided it be done with courtesy and dignity. But for the sake of decency and our own self-respect, as well as the regard of foreign nations, let us resolve for once at least to eschew the wretched personalities formerly in use. Let us take for granted what will most probably be found true, viz. that the candidates on all sides are gentlemen, whose views we may nevertheless condemn, and whose opinions we may deem subversive of the safety of the country or injurious to the interests of particular sections. But we have no earthly right to conclude that a man cannot possibly be honest because his sentiments differ from ours, while it is the height of injustice to imagine that he must necessarily be a rogue and a scoundrel because his convictions are diametrically opposed to our own. We have quite enough to contend with in the South there, for instance, in the shape of Black Republicanism, and can safely afford to take no special note of a ticket which