The New Orleans Bee.

OFFICE 83 CHARTRES ST. NEW ORLEANS, FRIDAY MORNING, MARCH 28, 1856. VOL. XVII—NEW SERIES. VOL. XXIX—WHOLE NO 9005.

THE DAILY BEE.

FRIDAY MORNING, MARCH 28, 1856.

THE NORTHERN MAIL failed yesterday from beyond Washington.

Subscriptions by the Week.

The carriers of the Bee are authorized to receive subscriptions by the week, at the rate of 25 cents.

A SPEECH FROM THE MINORITY.

In the Baton Rouge Gazette of the 12th inst., we find an address to the people of Louisiana, signed by ten Senators and thirty-four Representatives—comprising, we believe, every member of the American party in the present Legislature. The address is a review of the conduct of the majority of the Legislature in the contested elections which came before that body, and in the removal of Sheriff Hiriart. It is a document of considerable length, and we must content ourselves with a synopsis of its views and arguments.

The address states that as soon as the Legislature assembled, a resolution was presented by the dominant party to remove from their seats Messrs. Bonzo, Bouvier and Mouton, and award the seats to Messrs. Hyde, St. Paul and Wiltemore; that a fair and impartial hearing was refused to the sitting members, and that in the absence of any testimony taken contradictorily with the contestees, the Democratic majority vacated the seats of the American Senators, and awarded them to the contestants—not allowing the minority an opportunity to make a counter report. This act was accomplished by the majority going outside of the ballot-box, and taking into account votes that had never been deposited, while refusing to the contestees an opportunity of doing the same thing. The conduct of the Legislature is denounced as tyrannical, dangerous and violative of the constitution.

The expulsion of Mr. Monegan, of the Ninth Representative District, and of Messrs. Duvall and Lemmon, of the Fourth, is refreged to, and commented upon in severe language, the address declaring that ex parte testimony was alone appealed to, and was taken in conformity to the act of 1814, which is absolutely repealed by that of 1855. The case of Duvall and Lemmon was the more flagrant, as they received no notice that their seats would be contested, or that testimony would be taken for the purpose of unseating them. Thus the law of 1814 was not complied with in the action of the Legislature in this case. The address says:

When the intention of the majority of those who composed the committee was known to this contradiction or their previously assumed position, those of the minority were coolly informed that the Contested Committee of the Democratic party had decided in New Orleans upon the course to be pursued in all these cases.

The contradiction in the conduct of the majority is further illustrated by their treatment of the cases of Lescomy and Harmson vs. Laramee and Wiams, and Lombard vs. Mackey, recommending the Legislature to send for persons and papers, and collect evidence before a commissioner, thereby acknowledging a principle which they denied in some of the contestants. In the case of Hiriart vs. Strickland, a similar inconsistency was manifested, for although the election of Strickland was contested on the most frivolous grounds, the election was sent back to the people, who returned the American candidate by an increased majority. The address goes on to affirm that in every case of contested election, the minority were willing to submit the decision to the people, but that the proposition was repulsed by the majority.

A large portion of the address is occupied with an argument on the removal by address of Major Hurry. It is alleged that the action of the Legislature is a violation of the spirit and meaning of the constitution; in the teeth of the law; unjust in itself, and pernicious as a precedent; that the election of Hurry had been declared legal by the jury impannelled to try the suit; that this judgment being rendered in strict conformity to existing statutes, it was incompetent for the Legislature to reverse it, that department having no cognizance of suits determined by the judicial tribunals of the State; that the Legislature has no power to remove a civil officer, or cause an accusation to his election; that it proposed to evict Mr. Hurry for actions of which he is accused while he was but a private citizen of the state; that he was not charged with malfeasance in office, but with participation in riots and outrages alleged to have taken place during the November election. The address then declares that the prosecution and removal of Hurry have been conducted in a positive violation of the act of 1855, page 370, No. 304, of which it cites the passages bearing on the subject, as follows:

The first section of said act reads as follows: "That whenever any person shall wish to accuse a public officer before the Legislature, he shall address the House of Representatives a memorial containing a brief exposition of the acts of such public officer which are supposed to be contrary to law; the memorial shall be sworn to and signed by him who presents it, and shall contain a list of the witnesses by whom he will give information relative to the facts set forth, with a notice of the several charges which each individual is called to prove, which notice shall be given by his testimony." The second section provides that the memorial shall be referred to a committee, when the public officer thus accused is to be cited to appear before them at a day to be fixed by the committee, which day may be either during the same session, or any subsequent session; that the witnesses both for the prosecution and defense shall also be summoned to appear at the day fixed for the trial, and the third section thus: "That at the appointed time the committee shall proceed to swear the witnesses both for and against the accused, whose testimony shall be taken down in writing; they shall then make their report to the House of Representatives, and shall declare in the conclusion, whether they are of the opinion that the charges are well founded, in which case the House itself, after having obtained all the necessary information, shall decide whether it be expedient to proceed by means of impeachment or by address."

No memorial was presented to the House of Representatives complaining of the acts of the Sheriff, and the committee named in the 3d section was never appointed. For a long while the Hungarian had been in habit, in the Senate, of proposing to the House of Representatives to appoint a committee of seven gentlemen to take notice of every handsome child they meet, and of giving it boquets and bonbons; and it is to be presumed that the committee of seven, after a remarkably thankful day of Hour or five passed out, had her carriage stopped, the moment she was up to her, and the child had been brought to her, and the child had been duly kissed, and the boquets and bonbons had been duly given, the committee would go