New Orleans Bee.

Office, 78 Chartres street. NEW ORLEANS, MONDAY MORNING, DECEMBER 1, 1862. Vol. XVII—New Series. Vol. XXXVI.—Whole No 12,548.

NEW ORLEANS:

MONDAY MORNING DEC. 1, 1862.

[illegible]

Wreck of the Schooner Ontonagon, at Oswego—Rescue of the Crew—A Thrilling Scene.

[From the Oswego Times, Nov. 3.]

During last night a gale arose, which increased in severity until it had acquired terrific force.

The schooner Ontonagon, of this port, and the Farmer, of Sackett's Harbor, failed to make the harbor, and both went ashore about one hundred and fifty rods below the east pier. The former was owned and commanded by Captain James Pape, of this city, and had a cargo of wheat shipped at Toledo and consigned here to Messrs. Ames & Randall. The terrific force of the gale split her foresail, and the proper navigation of the vessel was by this means prevented. Striking upon the rocks, she quickly declined broadside to the sea, which, with tremendous force, was continually breaking over her. This disaster occurred early in the morning, and, as soon as known, a large number of our citizens assembled on the shore to render assistance in rescuing the crew from their perilous situation.

The great force of the sea threatened at any moment to break the craft in two, and, as she surged in the large breakers, it was anticipated every instant to see her spars carried by the board. When we visited the scene of disaster, shortly after daybreak, the sight was terribly sublime. The storm king rode triumphant on the high billows, and, as the wind howled through the creaking cordage of the ill fated vessel, it sounded like a requiem for the unfortunate [illegible] aboard. There, near the forecastle [illegible] group of mariners, anxiously watching the efforts of those on shore for their relief. The spray, in dense volumes, [illegible] every instant dash over them, partially [illegible] from view [illegible] deeply the minds of the spectators with the necessity of prompt action for their relief.

A boat was procured, but it was found impossible to use it on account of the tremendous surf. After a while, a line was secured from the vessel, and scores of sturdy hands seized it. [illegible] rapidly with anxiety for his fate. [illegible] midway between the vessel and [illegible] rolling of the vessel would slacken [illegible] that the man would be completely submerged. Finally, the fastening on board gave way, and the man for an instant was lost to view. [illegible] The unfortunate sailor, however, retained his hold of the line, and was quickly drawn through the heavy surf without receiving any injury further than the chilling effects of his exposure to the elements.

[illegible] Captain Pape was in the vessel, completely exhausted from his exposure. The mate, however, proved himself fully [illegible] to which he was placed. Unassisted by any of the crew, he coolly set [illegible] for their escape. Attaching another line to a piece of plank, which, after some difficulty was secured by those on shore, he made it fast near the after part of the vessel; he then by means of the first line obtained another from the shore. Next making a sling he attached the latter line to it. The howling of the wind and the roaring of the surf prevented any communication by the voice, and signs alone could be used or understood. Capt. Pape, being the most exhausted of any on board, was assisted in the sling, and but a moment [illegible] was most placed in the frail conveyance. [illegible] would fall by a rope. She was safely brought on shore, and assisted by ladies present to a place of warmth and comfort.

The remainder of the crew were rescued in a similar manner. The mate—noble fellow—was the last to leave the vessel. We have not ascertained his name; but he has shown that he possesses true courage in the hour of peril.

The vessel and cargo are a total loss. We learn that there is an insurance of $3000 on the former. We have not ascertained what insurance [illegible].

[illegible] near the Ontonagon [illegible] over her less fortunate companion in distress. Her small size and light draft allowed her to approach close to the sea wall. The crew escaped without any difficulty. She also will prove a total wreck.

Captain Preble's Personal Statement and Appeal—His Appeal to the President and Secretary of the Navy.

Commander Preble, late of the navy, who was dismissed for his negligence in permitting the Oreto [illegible] to run into Mobile, has presented the following appeal to the President and Secretary of the Navy:

APPEAL TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

United States Steam Sloop Oneida,
Off Mobile, October 8.

To the President of the United States:

Sir—I do not believe you [illegible] to do intentional injustice to any one; [illegible] me the most cruel injustice [illegible] from a service to which I have [illegible] seven years of my life, without trial, without a hearing, and on insufficient and incomplete evidence.

You have assailed my honor, which is dearer to me than life, and you have caused it to be proclaimed that I failed to do my utmost to take and capture a vessel of the enemy, and omitted to perform the most ordinary duty of an officer. This sentence and this opinion you have directed to be read in the assembled [illegible] of every vessel in commission in the navy, and entered upon [illegible] that I did do my utmost to overtake, capture or destroy the Oreto, and that, omitting no duty, I performed my whole entire duty, energetically and faithfully, as I have ever done while in the service.

I demand, therefore, a fair, and full, and instant investigation of all the circumstances before a court of inquiry, and, when acquitted, that my innocence shall be proclaimed in the same manner as the sentence has been promulgated, and that the record of my dismissal shall, by official order, be expunged from the log books of the navy.

As Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy, I ask of you this justice, which I am sure you will grant.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,
Geo. H. Preble, Commander.

APPEAL TO THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

United States Steam Sloop Oneida,
Off Mobile, October 8, 1862.

Sir—I have read in a newspaper a "general order," issued by yourself, by direction of the President, dismissing me from the navy for the neglect of duty in permitting the armed steamer Oreto to run the blockade off Mobile, said order stating that I failed to do my utmost to overtake [illegible] destroy [illegible]. Such is not the opinion of [illegible] squadron, who are knowing to all the circumstances, and I am ready and able to prove I did my duty, and my whole duty, fairly, energetically and zealously, and demand the privilege of a court of inquiry, anticipating, when the circumstances are known, a revocation of your order as public as it has been made, and a restoration to this command.

I have not waited for the receipt of the official announcement of my dismissal, as the disgrace inflicted on my honored name is more than I can bear.

[illegible]

I do not understand what "plain and ordinary duty" I omitted.

I do not think that either yourself or the President would do me an intentional injustice, and believe action has been taken hastily, under erroneous impressions.

I therefore ask for a full and fair investigation before a court of inquiry or court-martial, and that the decision or sentence may be made as freely public as your orders.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,
Geo. Henry Preble, Commander.
Hon. Gideon Welles, Secretary of the Navy, Washington, D. C.

Singular Casualty.—Last night about nine o'clock, as a poor Irish mother, with her babe upon her lap, was sitting in her [illegible], a sudden crash was heard, and in an instant mother and babe were hurled [illegible] of coal [illegible]. A third was wrenched from its connection by a violent twist, and deflected from the track upon a switch leading into a coal yard. Dashing along the sidetrack, it was wrenched from its running gear, that was dropped by a heap of coal, and projected with violence against the side of a small brick tenement, which it utterly demolished, killing in its flight the poor mother and her infant.—*Baltimore letter.*

When your wife is silent, hold the baby for her. Perhaps it is as much as she can do to hold her tongue.

Don't fret on account of your bankruptcy. Your creditors will do it for you.

A Contribution to the History of the War—Correspondence relative to the Reinforcement of the Forts in Charleston Harbor.

[From the National Intelligencer, Nov. 4.]

The subjoined correspondence, relating to the proposed reinforcement of Forts Moultrie and Sumter, during the winter of 1860-61, by volunteers from the city of New York, has been communicated to the *National Intelligencer* for publication, as belonging to the history of that period:

J. A. HAMILTON TO GEN. SANDFORD.

(Private.) *Nevis, Dobbs' Ferry Post Office, December 28, 1860.*

Dear General—I write to you in the strictest confidence, because what I am about to propose might be defeated by premature disclosure.

The President having exposed a handful of brave men in Fort Moultrie to slaughter, and the [illegible] opportunity to disgrace, [illegible] of New York [illegible] citizens volunteer to go to Charleston harbor in a [illegible] to reinforce Major Anderson. [illegible] taken by a few hundred brave men, would rescue the garrison and save the fort, and this, having been done without any participation on the part of the government, could not be considered by South Carolina as an act offensive to her which would invite, much less justify, an assault. Think of this, and, if you approve, turn in your mind whether so many men could be induced to volunteer. We would have no difficulty in getting money to charter a steamer and to put on board of her a store of provisions. Absolute secrecy must be observed. Let me know where I can find you. I will be in the city to-morrow (Saturday).

[illegible]
Major Gen. Sandford, New York.

GEN. SANDFORD TO J. A. HAMILTON.

(Private.) *New York, Dec. 29, 1860.*

My Dear Sir—There would be no difficulty about the men if the arrangements could be made under the sanction of Gen. Scott. A confidential person could be sent on to see him, and, with his approval, the scheme would be perfectly legal, and acceptable, no doubt, to the officer in command.

I am, very respectfully, your ob't serv't,
Chas. W. Sandford.
James A. Hamilton, Esq.

J. A. HAMILTON TO LIEUT. GEN. SCOTT.

(Private.) *Nevis, Dobbs' Ferry Post Office, December 29, 1860.*

Dear General—It is proposed to reinforce Major Anderson by volunteers to be sent from the city of New York by a steamer to be chartered for that purpose—the funds to be raised by private subscription. Gen. Sandford promises to provide as many good men and true as may be required, say from one to four hundred. He, however, suggests that this enterprise should receive your sanction, as far, at least, as by your giving me a letter of introduction to Major Anderson, intimating to him that those who accompany me will be his guests, and of course subject to his command. If it is right that you should countenance the enterprise, do me the favor to send me such a letter, addressed to the Major, as you please; and also to inform me of the number of men required, and of the kind and quantity of provisions to be taken with us. As I am the originator of this project, of course I intend to be one of the volunteers.

With my best wishes for your continued health and usefulness to our beloved country, I remain your friend and servant,

James A. Hamilton.
To Lieut. Gen. Scott, Washington.

LIEUT. GEN. SCOTT TO J. A. HAMILTON.

Washington, Jan. 1, 1861.

Sir—Lieut. Gen. Scott desires me to acknowledge your letter of the 29th ultimo, and to inform you that he read it to the President of the United States. Both appreciated its patriotic spirit, but they coincided in the opinion that the *immediate* military needs of the country require no appeal to militia or volunteers in aid of the regular force.

I am, respectfully, your obedient servant,
George W. Lay, Lt. Col. A. D. C.
James A. Hamilton, Esq.

J. A. HAMILTON TO MAJOR GEN. SANDFORD.

Nevis, Dobbs' Ferry Post Office, January 3, 1861.

Dear General—Referring to my letter to you of the 28th ultimo, your answer thereto, and our conversation on the subject of that correspondence, I now enclose Lieut. Gen. Scott's answer to the letter I addressed to him under your advice on the 29th ultimo, and have the pleasure to say that your readiness to co-operate with me in the movement to reinforce Major Anderson was alike honorable to your patriotism, [illegible].

You perceive that the word "*immediate*" in the General's letter is underscored, which implies the conclusion that the future may require such an appeal. I am sure you will without delay thoroughly examine your military condition and arrange such plans as may be best to be put into execution whenever the militia and volunteers may be needed, and the impending condition of our country may require action on their part. I hope I may be allowed to believe that if I can be useful in any way you will not overlook me in such an enterprise.

I have the honor to be,
Your friend and servant,
James A. Hamilton.

P. S. You will probably concur with me in opinion that this correspondence is not proper to be given at present to the newspapers.

J. A. H.
Major General Sandford, New York.

The Draft Resistance in Wisconsin.

[From the Milwaukee News, November 11.]

On Saturday evening, and again yesterday, considerable excitement prevailed in the city as to the draft. [illegible] with music and banners, and a general [illegible] between the military force stationed here and our citizens. Last week the Draft Commissioner, Dea. Whiting, resigned, and Hon. W. A. Prentiss was appointed in his place. Yesterday Mr. Prentiss resigned, and it is understood that the papers were turned over to Col. Lewis, of the Twenty-eighth Regiment, stationed at Camp Washburne, and that the draft was postponed, but temporarily, upon the authority of a telegraphic dispatch from the Governor.

The cause of all the excitement upon this matter is said to be alleged unfairness in the designation of the number to be drafted from the several wards. Doubtless, however, some of the feeling exhibited originates in a desire to avoid the disagreeable alternative of a draft altogether.

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel, November 11.]

We learn that the Draft Commissioner had a decidedly unpleasant experience of it in his attempts to perform his duty in the inhospitable latitude of Ozaukee county. Had his difficulties presented themselves in the ordinary and expected form, he could have got along with them. But they did not. The women were the matter. The men looked on complacently and willingly. Apparently they had no objections to the draft. But the women had no notion whatever of letting them go, and to prevent such a possibility they made a dead set on the Commissioner with clubs; broke his head and his draftsboxes at the same time, and brought all proceedings to a summary close. The Commissioner telegraphed to Madison for protection against these Amazons.

A New Italian Development.—A Turin letter in the London *Daily News* contains these important announcements:

A pamphlet is about to be published with the title "The Temporal Power of the Popes condemned by the Diplomatic Opponents of Italian Unity." It is a collection of official documents of the Courts of Naples and Tuscany, of the Sardinian Government when it was in the hands of the retrograde party, and of the Austrian Government. It will contain some surprising letters of that Marchese Bargagli who is still at Rome as representative of the Grand Duke. The Marchese manifests in them anything but good will to the Roman court. A letter of the Secretary of State will prove *the thorough persuasion of the Papal Government that its existence would become impossible from the moment there was a constitutional Government in Italy*, or even an enlightened despotism; that it was therefore bound, on its own account, to oppose any and every reform in Italy, and that it sometimes yielded for a moment to necessity, it did so with a firm intention to return to the old habits as soon as circumstances should have ceased. The compiler of this collection of hitherto unpublished documents is Signor Giacomelli, the author of an interesting history of the Duchy of Parma. I believe that the pamphlet will be eagerly read, and will serve to demonstrate that diplomatists [illegible] as the Pope, that the Pope's Government is [illegible], and that its existence in Italy is a perpetual cause of turbulence, and a hindrance to all upright modes of administration. All the diplomatists and reactionary writers say to the contrary is the grossest hypocrisy. They know the truth, but interest makes them belie it.

The [illegible] would be the cap of liberty—it wore [illegible].

He [illegible] a person of very [illegible] standing—he is always standing upon his dignity.

A farmer [illegible] cold weather [illegible].

City Intelligence.

The Rent Question.—Judge Whitaker, of the Second District Court, rendered on Saturday the following decision in a case the subject matter of which is of general interest:

Pierre Gallet vs. Thos. McCluskey et al.—Second District Court, No. 19,673.—This suit was filed on the 24th October last, claiming rent to the amount of $750, from 1st May to 1st November, 1862, of the upper part of the house corner of Canal and Dauphine streets, in this city. Edward Reilley was surety for the payment of the rent, and the household property were used in suits. A writ of provisional seizure was issued, and the furniture in the house taken into the possession of the Sheriff.

There is no question made in the answer but that the rent is due under the contract of lease between the parties; but it is alleged that the dullness of the times, the general derangement of business, and many troubles incident to a state of war, have made him unable to pay his rent, and he reduction to the extent of two-thirds of the amount is claimed.

Testimony has been taken in this case at some length to show that there has been, within the past year, a great depreciation of rents—dependent, in part, on locality, in part upon the class of houses leased, and amounting, in some cases, to one-half, in others, to two-thirds; that business has been almost at a stand; that the defendant, a dry goods clerk by occupation—his wife a dressmaker—for months past has been entirely unemployed. It is further shown that certain of the apartments of the house heretofore let out by defendant as furnished rooms, have, with the exception of one, been unoccupied. It is further shown that at the [illegible] business in the city has ceased, and that in consequence of the war, this has become utterly annihilated.

The Code of France, Art. 1722, provides "that if during the pendency of the lease, the thing leased is wholly destroyed by fortuitous chance, the lease is dissolved by full right; if it is destroyed but in part, the lessee can, according to circumstances, demand either a diminution of the price, or the cancellation of the lease itself." Marcadé, in commenting on this article says, that it may apply also to the total or partial loss of the enjoyment of the thing leased in consequence of a fortuitous event. He instances several cases, "when, in time of war, the lessee is forced to leave the property leased, in consequence of the troops taking possession," he is entitled to ask a diminution, but the commentator immediately after makes this distinction, "if in time of war the lessee, by wise precaution and his own will, leaves the premises, his obligation to the lessor continues." Again, he says, "if the lessee of an inn on a public road sees the road approved, so that his house, his stables and other dependencies cease to be of use to his inn, in all such and analogous cases, he can ask according to circumstances, either cancellation of the lease, or for the time occasion of payment of rent; but this would be quite the reverse, if, instead of the road being stopped, it had continued as before, while another road near at hand was established, by which passengers had ceased to frequent his inn, taking the other route. The house is not by that deprived of the use for which it was rented. It is still an inn as before, and the lessee can no more demand a deduction for those things, than could the lessor demand an increase of rent if a second road had been joined to the first in front of the inn, and he custom had thereby increased."

The parties defendant in this case have the same enjoyment of their house as in 1850. They have not been compelled to leave it. There has been no one disturbing them in possession. The streets and ways have not been interrupted. These examples of diminution of rent would seem entirely inapplicable. We find Pothier and Troplong both repeating similar examples as illustrative of the text of article 1722, but these are merely the comments of the learned jurisconsults. They cite no decision, and even if they did, we could easily reply that they have little weight with us, the constitutional charter of France having no one provision analogous with that relative to contracts found in our fundamental law.

In *Magna Charta* there is no provision like that found in our Constitution in reference to the impairing of contracts by legislative or judicial authority, and yet, so founded on common sense is the principle, so accorded with every man's reason, that we hesitate not to say that it is a principle of the unwritten law of England, and it would be vain to seek in any decision of her judges a departure from it as a rule of action.

But, says the defendant, this is not a question of annulling or impairing a contract; it is relief sought by way of equity, where the law is silent. There have arisen circumstances not anticipated when they entered upon this contract. They did not anticipate [illegible] business. They did not anticipate the breaking out of this fearful and devastating war. They did not anticipate the [illegible]. These incidents have been beyond their control, and without any fault of theirs.

But let us look at what is really the equity of the case. The contract exists. The law for carrying it into effect exists. The judge is guided by these; but the principle of carrying contracts into effect being of universal force, the Court is now called on, in a particular case, to depart from the ordinary rule of action. We are told that this is a case eminently calling for the interposition of the Court. When we leave the plain rules of law, and enter on the path of the judge, but of the legislator, it behooves the Court to move warily, lest he forget the very existence of the law and the wise rules laid down for his guidance—lest he embark without chart or compass upon a sea of uncertainties.

At the time this lease was made prosperity prevailed in New Orleans, and it was easy to pay high rent; but while the prosperity lasted the tenant profited, as he would not so long have continued in the premises. Suddenly his business has fallen off, in consequence of events he could not control, and he claims a reduction of his rent. It is understood that the property rented to him remains unimpaired, that he is not deprived of any enjoyment of it. He can use it, or has desired, to disturb him in the enjoyment of it. But he claims that, because of a public calamity, which has affected the whole community, the lessor perhaps as much as the lessee, the Court should interfere in his behalf. The Court may inquire, in certain instances, into the reason or spirit of a lease, the acceptance of the supreme power of the State, and may soften, in particular cases, its asperity or rigor; but when parties enter into a contract such as the one before the Court, clothed as it is with the forms we have described, the Court would be clearly an interloper, and would be overstepping its judicial functions, to interfere for the purpose of impairing or abrogating the obligation of either to the other. Here is no room for equity.

The tenant in a community like ours, and in the present position of affairs in New Orleans, has little to fear. Let this be as it may, the Court cannot by way of equity interpose to change or modify these contracts. Far better that the law should suffer, than that by a mischievous precedent, the solemnity of contracts between man and man should be set at naught by judicial license or authority.

Our code defines a contract to be "an agreement by which one person obligates himself to give, to do, or permit, or not to do, something expressed or implied by such an agreement." The contract of lease, like that of sale, has certain essentials: the thing, the price and the consent, and the price should be certain and determinate. Again, by our law, to make a contract valid it must have parties capable of contracting, consent legally given, a certain object and a lawful purpose. There is no question as to either of these requisites in the present case, and in making this contract, there was neither error, fraud, violence nor threats. The contract was then a legal agreement, and our civil code article 1946, "legal agreements having the force of law upon the parties, none but the parties themselves can abrogate or modify them," and further, "*no general or special legislative act can be so construed as to avoid or modify a legal contract previously made, but are bound to give legal effect to all such contracts according to the true intent of all the parties.*"

These parties have made a legal agreement, an agreement is existing, and in the statement form known to our law. One of them calls upon the Court to enforce this contract according to its tenor. The other, admitting its validity, calls upon the Court to render void or to modify its provisions for his interest, regardless of the assent of the other, and to his prejudice.

I have cited article 1946 of the code, as the law upon these matters, but there is higher authority than this.

Article 105 of the Constitution of our State forbids "any law to be passed impairing the obligation of contracts." Judges simply interpret the laws, but even if they made them, the fundamental law of the State forbids their impairing or changing of their will the solemn contracts made between the citizens of the commonwealth.

Again, superior even to the fundamental law of our State, there is yet a higher law that forbids it. The Constitution of the United States prohibits any State from "passing any law impairing the obligation of contracts."

In France there is, as we have said, no provision like this found in their constitutional charter. If—there being no fundamental law to the contrary—the commentators on their code have indulged [illegible] departure in certain cases [illegible] lease, yet there is no reason why we, with the Constitution of our country to guide us, should introduce into our jurisprudence a precedent that would lead to such [illegible] consequences. Even if there were decisions, without number, in the *Journal du Palais*, establishing the principle contended for by this defendant, these should be disregarded in the presence of the plain letter of our Constitution. But we have shown that there are no decisions, at least none that have been cited to the Court, and that even the comments of Marcadé, Troplong and Pothier, do not go so far as contended for by the defendant.

In these times, when the very frame-work of society is shaken, it is specially necessary for the judiciary to stand by the law and the Constitution. Let them at least hold fast to the sacred trust handed down to our generation by the fathers of the commonwealth. The Union of these States is assured to us and to unborn generations so long as the judiciary are true to this palladium of our rights and liberties, so long as they permit no open or covert violation of its sacred provisions.

The Court considers the contract of lease in this case binding on the parties to it, and declines to modify or change it. Let there be judgment for the plaintiff.

Accident on the Cars.—A well known physician of this city, whilst riding in the Magazine street cars on Saturday, met with a serious accident, against the recurrence of which it were well that the public should guard. The gentleman to whom we refer was seated near the door, with his arm extended along the window-sill next to the door. Near the railroad stood a cart without its driver, so close to the track that it was impossible for the car to pass without coming in contact with the protruding board in front of the cart, which is used by cartmen as a seat. Instead of stopping his vehicle, the car-driver kept on at the same gait with the persistent nonchalance which characterizes that class of men. The passenger, who was so seated as not to perceive the danger with which he was threatened, was only brought to a sense of his position by the violent shock of the collision, and the crushing of his arm between the board and the car. It was at first believed that his arm had been broken, but it was fortunately only severely bruised, without injuring any of the bones of the arm. In referring to this accident, we only wish to put passengers on their guard against the occurrence of similar accidents, at the same time that we call upon the Railroad Company to take such precautionary measures as will check the reprehensible conduct of the drivers.

COMMERCIAL.

OFFICE OF THE BEE,
Saturday Evening, Nov. 29, 1862.

SUGAR.—The stock is light and the supplies are mostly for account of the government [illegible] is a good inquiry for [illegible]

MOLASSES.—The supply is limited. [illegible]

LARD.—Prime in kegs is retailing at 18c. ℔ lb.

BACON.—The retail demand is supplied at [illegible]

FEED.—The retail demand is supplied, at [illegible] for Hay, [illegible] for Bran, and [illegible] for Corn and Oats.

BUTTER.—Goshen is retailing at [illegible]

FREIGHTS.—We quote as the rates by sailing vessels for Northern ports [illegible] of Sugar, and [illegible] bbl. for Molasses.

[illegible]

Cattle Market.

JEFFERSON CITY, December 1 [illegible]

[illegible]

MARINE NEWS.

Port of New Orleans, Dec. 1, 1862.

CLEARED SATURDAY.

[illegible]

ARRIVED SATURDAY.

[illegible]

ARRIVED YESTERDAY.

[illegible]

TOWBOAT REGISTER.

[illegible]

BELOW, [illegible]

EXPORTS.

NEW YORK—[illegible]
BOSTON—[illegible]
NEW YORK—[illegible]

RECEIPTS FROM THE COAST.

COAST—[illegible]

RECEIPTS BY RAILROAD.

[illegible]

DIED.

Yesterday, at [illegible] o'clock, A. M., PAUL [illegible] [illegible]

TO BAKERS.

MAYORALTY OF NEW ORLEANS,
City Hall, Nov. 29, 1862.

The price of Flour [illegible] Bakers are required to give, during the ensuing week, commencing on SUNDAY, the weight [illegible] as follows, until further notice:

[illegible]

Purchasers of bread from Bakers' wagons are requested will report their names, the name of the baker, [illegible] Assistant Provost Marshal.

By order of GEORGE C. [illegible]

[illegible]

STATE OF LOUISIANA, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, New Orleans, November [illegible], 1862.

GENERAL ORDERS, No. 32.

[illegible]

By order of BRIG. GEN. G. F. SHEPLEY, [illegible]
JAMES F. MILLER, Lieut. [illegible]

Wood-Choppers and Laborers Wanted.

On the plantation of A. W. WALKER, [illegible] below the Barracks, [illegible]

One dollar and seventy-five cents per cord [illegible]

For Upper Coast.

[illegible]

WILLIAM [illegible]

[illegible]

For Sale.

[illegible]

Office of the Central Board of Commissioners,
City of New Orleans, Nov. 27th, 1862.

NOTICE TO THE ELECTORS OF THE PARISH OF ORLEANS.

THE election on WEDNESDAY, the 3d of December, will be held at the following named places, and under the Superintendence of the following named Commissioners. Each Poll will be known as follows:

FIRST DISTRICT.

First Precinct—Poll No. 1: Engine-House Fire Company No. 10, on Tchoupitoulas street, between Race and Orange. Commissioners: W. R. Crane, A. W. Hodge, [illegible]

[illegible]

SECOND DISTRICT.

[illegible]

THIRD DISTRICT.

[illegible]

FOURTH DISTRICT.

[illegible]

ALGIERS.

[illegible]

[illegible]

By order of the Central Board of Commissioners,
CHARLES LEEDS [illegible]

Exchange.

AT SIGHT ON NEW YORK, in sums to suit, for sale by [illegible]

OFFICE PROVOST MARSHAL GENERAL OF LOUISIANA,
New Orleans, November 27, 1862.

[illegible]

JONAS H. FRENCH, [illegible]

PROVOST MARSHAL'S OFFICE, [illegible]

[illegible]

EDWARD PAGE, Jr., [illegible]

OFFICE OF PROVOST MARSHAL GENERAL OF LOUISIANA,
New Orleans, November 28, 1862.

[illegible]

OFFICE CHIEF QUARTERMASTER, DEPARTMENT OF THE GULF, [illegible]

[illegible]

OFFICE ASSISTANT QUARTERMASTER, [illegible]

CIRCULAR.

[illegible]

AMUSEMENTS.

VARIETIES THEATRE,
GRAVIER STREET.

Stage Manager........................LEWIS BAKER.

Opening of the Regular Dramatic Season

By a First-Class Company of Talented Artists, embracing several old New Orleans favorites, and a number of new Candidates for Public Favor, formerly of high standing in the Principal Theatres of New York and other metropolitan cities.

The following is a list of the Company:

[illegible]

Mrs. ALEXINA FISHER BAKER, her first appearance in New Orleans [illegible]

Mrs. W. C. GLADSTANE, first appearance in New Orleans [illegible]

Miss ANGELA [illegible], first appearance in New Orleans in three years.

Mrs. PRESTON, her appearance in New Orleans in three years.

[illegible]

MONDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1862,

Will be presented the [illegible] entitled

NINE POINTS OF LAW.

[illegible]

Overture by Orchestra. [illegible]

After which the [illegible]

THE LOAN OF A LOVER.

[illegible]

[illegible] Price of Admission—see small Hand-bills.

DUPREZ & GREEN'S

ORIGINAL NEW ORLEANS & METROPOLITAN

BURLESQUE OPERA TROUPE

Are daily expected, and will open at the

ACADEMY OF MUSIC,

NEW ORLEANS.

PROVOST MARSHAL'S SALES

Sale of Household Furniture.

BY D. W. C. FARRINGTON, Auctioneer.

Office, corner Camp and Common streets.

BY order of Colonel J. H. French, Provost Marshal General, will be sold at the salesroom, No. [illegible] street, on MONDAY next, December 1, at 10 o'clock, A. M.—

A large variety of superior FURNITURE and HOUSEHOLD GOODS, [illegible]

One Rosewood Piano Forte.
Terms—Cash in currency.

Sugar Sale.

BY D. W. C. FARRINGTON, Auctioneer.

Office, corner Camp and Common sts.

WILL be sold by order of the Provost Marshal, on MONDAY, December 1st, at 10 o'clock, at the Upper Landing—

90 Hogsheads Superior Sugar,

Suitable for Confectioners.

Terms cash in Treasury notes.

Sugar Sale.

BY D. W. C. FARRINGTON, Auctioneer.

Office, corner Camp and Common sts.

WILL be sold by order of the Sequestration Commission, on MONDAY, December 1st, at 10 o'clock, at the Upper Landing—

100 Hogsheads Sugar,

Terms cash in Treasury notes.

Cotton Sale.

BY D. W. C. FARRINGTON, Auctioneer.

Office, corner Camp and Common streets.

Will be sold at public auction on MONDAY, December 1st, at 10½ o'clock, at Sugar Levee—

12 Bales Superior Cotton,

400 Bags [illegible] for Seed,

Terms cash in currency.

Plantation Wagons.

BY D. W. C. FARRINGTON, Auctioneer.

Office, corner Camp and Common streets.

WILL be sold on MONDAY, December 1st, [illegible] o'clock, A. M., at J. S. [illegible] Warehouse, [illegible] street, between First and Second streets—

30 New Plantation Wagons.

Terms cash on the spot in currency.

For Sale.

[illegible]

For Sale.

[illegible]

Sugar, Honey, Wool.

SIX HHDS. SUGAR,
[illegible] HONEY;
[illegible] bales WOOL,

[illegible]

Dissolution of Partnership.

[illegible]

For Sale.

[illegible]

For Sale.

[illegible]

Auction Notice.

[illegible]

Notice.

[illegible]

AUCTION SALES.

Succession of William Conners.

BY E. M. JACOBS, Auctioneer.

WILL be sold on FRIDAY, 12th December, 1862, at 11 o'clock, A. M., on Market street, between [illegible] by virtue of an order from the Honorable the Second District Court of New Orleans, dated 29th November, 1862, the following movable effects belonging to the aforesaid succession, to wit:—

One lot of HOUSEHOLD FURNITURE, consisting of Bedsteads and Bedding, Armoir, Bureau, Chairs, one lot of Wearing Apparel, &c.

Also, Four Boxes, one Cart, one lot of Iron, [illegible] and a lot of old Rope, and Cart Harness.

Terms—cash on the spot.

Claret, Champagne, Cigars and Tobacco at Auction.

BY R. T. MONTGOMERY, Auctioneer.

WILL be sold at auction on TUESDAY, December [illegible], at 12 o'clock, at store [illegible] Camp street—

[illegible] cases CLARET;
[illegible] CHAMPAGNE, First Heidsieck [illegible];
1,000 [illegible] CIGARS;
[illegible] Virginia TOBACCO.

Terms cash.

Unreserved Package Sale—Flannels, Prints, Delaines, Alpaccas, and Bleached Cottons.

BY HOFFMAN & HAYES.
J. HOFFMAN, Auctioneer.
Office, 42 [illegible] street.

WILL be sold on MONDAY, 1st December, at 11 o'clock, A. M.—

[illegible]

Peremptory Closing Out Sale of all the Goods and Corn in the New Engle Bonded Warehouse.

BY R. T. MONTGOMERY, Auctioneer.

WILL be sold at auction, on MONDAY, December 1st, at 12 o'clock, [illegible]

[illegible]

Barley! Barley!

BY E. M. JACOBS, Auctioneer.

WILL be sold on THURSDAY, [illegible] December, [illegible] at 11 o'clock, A. M., at the corner of Canal and [illegible] streets.

[illegible]

Prime Yellow Corn, Corn Meal and Bran at Auction.

BY R. T. MONTGOMERY, Auctioneer.

[illegible]

Extensive Sale of Wines, Brandies, Preserves, Sardines, Oils, &c. &c. Consignments.

BY D. E. MORPHY, Auctioneer.

[illegible]

Large Trade Sale.

BY D. E. MORPHY, Auctioneer.

[illegible]

Furniture........Furniture.

BY McCOMBER & [illegible]
G. W. McC[illegible], Auctioneer.

[illegible]

Succession of William O. [illegible]

BY J. [illegible], Auctioneer.

[illegible]

JUDICIAL SALES.

[illegible]

LEGAL NOTICES.

[illegible]

For New York Direct.

[illegible]

500 [illegible]

[illegible]