THE NEW ORLEANS DAILY BEE.
DUPOUY & LIMET, PUBLISHERS.
No. 73 Chartres Street.

TERMS OF THE BEE:
Mode of Subscription—Daily, per annum, in advance, $10; half-yearly, $6; quarterly, $4.
Price of the paper—Single copies, 10 cents.
Tri-Semi-Weekly to published every Tuesday and Saturday. Subscription, $5 per annum, invariably in advance.
Rates of Advertising—Transient advertisements having the run of the paper, first insertion $1 50 per square, each subsequent insertion, 75 cents per square.
First, or Editorial Page Transient Advertisements, each insertion, $1 50 per square.
A few treatments inserted at intervals, to be charged as new each insertion.
Fifth, or Editorial Page, Monthly Advertisements, inch square, $20 net per month.
Regular advertisers, who advertise largely, shall be allowed such discount from the above reduced transient rates as may be agreed upon. In no case shall such discount exceed 25 per cent.
Business Notices of Advertisements to be charged 20 cents net per line, each insertion.
All Transient Advertisements must be paid for in advance.
All Advertisements not marked for any number of insertions, will be published six times.
All bills with regular advertisers shall be rendered monthly.

NEW ORLEANS:
SATURDAY MORNING, MAY 23, 1868.

AUCTION SALES THIS DAY.

By S. Guinault, at 12 o'clock, m., at the Merchants and Auctioneers' Exchange, Royal street, real estate.
By Chas. E. Fortier, at 12 o'clock, m., at the Merchants and Auctioneers' Exchange, Royal street, real estate.

THE FRENCH OPERA.—The subscribers to the opera for next season are requested to meet to-night in the *Foyer* of the Opera House, at half-past 7 o'clock, when important business will be laid before them.

The State Seminary at Alexandria.

We are indebted to the attention of Professor D. F. Boyd, Superintendent of the Louisiana State Seminary at Alexandria, for a copy of his Annual Report made to the Board of Supervisors, for the year ending Dec. 31, 1867.

The Seminary has participated in the prevailing poverty of the State, but notwithstanding all drawbacks, its operations have been carried on with a great degree of success, thanks to the assistance of benevolent individuals and to the earnest labors and perseverance of the Superintendent and his colleagues of the Academic Board. There are 136 cadets receiving instruction at this institution, 93 of whom are appointed by the State, the remainder being private pupils. The Academic Board consists of eight professors and an instructor in writing, whose names are as follows:

D. F. Boyd, Professor of Mathematics and Latin.
Samuel H. Lockett, Professor of Engineering.
James M. Boyd, Professor of Natural Philosophy.
James W. Wilson, Professor of Chemistry.
William A. Seay, Acting Professor of Greek.
Rev. J. P. Bellier, Professor of Modern Languages.
Rev. Edward P. Palmer, Professor of Moral Philosophy and English Literature.
John B. McAuley, Assistant Professor of Modern Languages.
S. B. Robinson, Instructor in Writing and Book keeping.

Speaking, in his Report of the State or Beneficiary Cadets, the Superintendent says:

"The State Cadet, regarded in his true light, as educated by the State to become, in turn, a teacher of Louisiana youth, is a most interesting feature of the Seminary, one which makes it really a *State Normal School*, and must cause all, who feel a deep interest in the education and advancement of Louisiana, to wish the more earnestly for the success of this institution. The people at large must see and freely instruct the education of the beneficiaries and when graduates that class begin to leave the institution and enter upon their duties as teachers throughout the State, they will be found among our people a high regard and strong attachment for the Seminary, with a determination that it shall ever prosper and shall be to us a benefit and an honor to Louisiana, and respecting the military feature of the institution, which is at present unpressed, the Superintendent believes it will soon be restored."

The next session begins September 2d and closes June 25. The course of study embraces a Preparatory and an Academic Department, including a literary, scientific and optional course, a special school of civil engineering and a commercial school.

SENATOR TRUMBULL'S ARGUMENT AGAINST IMPEACHMENT.

The argument of Senator Trumbull against the conviction of the President on the articles preferred by the House of Representatives, is a compact and invincible piece of legal reasoning. It is worthy of his reputation as one of the ablest jurists the Senate contains. We give below the introduction and close of this powerful argument, together with a brief abstract of the points made.

To do impartial justice in all things appertain ing to the present trial, according to the Constitution and laws, is the duty imposed on each Senator by the position he holds and the oath he has taken, and he who falters in the discharge of that duty, either from personal or party considerations, is unworthy his position and merits the scorn and contempt of all just men.

The question to be decided is not whether Andrew Johnson is a proper person to fill the Presidential office, nor whether it is fit that he should remain in it, nor, indeed, whether he has violated the Constitution and laws in other respects than those alleged against him. As well might any other 54 persons take upon themselves by violence to do the duty of Andrew Johnson, because they believed him a bad man as to call upon 54 Senators, in violation of their sworn duty, to convict and depose him for any other cause than those alleged in the articles of impeachment. As well might any citizen take the law into his own hands, and become its executioner, as to ask the Senate to convict outside of the code made. To raise to such a principle would be destructive of all law and all liberty worth the name, since liberty unregulated by law is but another name for anarchy.

Guilt for President as the people may regard Andrew Johnson, and much as they may desire his removal, in a legal and constitutional way, all, save the unprincipled and depraved world stand with infamy and contempt the man or any Senator who should violate his sworn convictions of duty to accomplish such a result.

Keeping in view the principles by which, as honest men, we are to be guided, let us inquire what the case is.

Senator Trumbull then proceeds to examine the articles in their regular order. His judgment upon the *first article* is summed up as follows:

Laying out of view what was said at the time of the passage of the Tenure-of-Office act, as to its not interfering with Mr. Johnson's right to remove the secretaries appointed by his predecessor, and the unreasonableness of a construction of the act which would secure them in office longer than the secretaries he had himself appointed, and fasten them for life on all future Presidents, unless the Senate consented to the appointment of successors, the conclusion seems inevitable, from the terms of the Tenure-of-Office act itself, that the right to remove Mr Stanton, the Secretary of War appointed by his predecessor, is not affected by it, and that, having the authority to remove that officer under the act of 1789, he did not violate either the Constitution or any statute in issuing the order for that purpose. But, even if a different construction could be put upon the act, I could never consent to convict the Chief Magistrate of a great people of a high misdemeanor, and remove him from office for a misconstruction of what must be admitted to be a doubtful statute, and particularly when the misconstruction was the same put upon it by the authors of the law at the time of its passage.

To the second article he says:

Considering that the facts charged against the President in the second article are in no respect contrary to any provision of the Tenure-of-Office act, that they do not constitute a misdemeanor, and are not forbidden by any statute, that it is a matter of grave doubt whether so much of the act of 1795 as would expressly authorize the issuing of the letter of authority to Gen. Thomas is not in force, and if it is not, that President Johnson still had the same authority for issuing it as his predecessor had exercised for many years without objection in the navy, interior and post-office departments, it is impossible for me to hold him guilty of a high misdemeanor under that article. To do so would, in my opinion, be to disregard, rather than recognize, that impartial justice, I am sworn to administer.

The remainder of the articles are then disposed of briefly and without much trouble, the gravamen of Mr. Johnson's offense, being charged in the first and second articles, which Mr. Trumbull analyzes at considerable length, and to which he addresses the weight of his reasoning:

What has been said in regard to the second article applies with equal force to the third and eighth articles: there being no proof of an unlawful intent to control the disbursements of the moneys appropriated for the military service, as charged in the eighth article.

Articles four, five, six and seven, taken together, charge, in substance, that the President conspired with Lorenzo Thomas and other persons with intent, by intimidation and threats, to prevent Edwin M. Stanton from holding the office of Secretary of War, and by force to seize and possess the property of the United States in the Department of War, also that he conspired to do the same things contrary to the Tenure-of-Office act, with no any allegation of force or threats. The record contains no sufficient proof of the intimidation, threats, or force charged, and as the President had, in my opinion, the right to remove Mr Stanton, his order for that purpose, as also that to General Thomas to take possession, both personal and