The New Orleans Bee.

Office, 73 Chartres street. NEW ORLEANS, WEDNESDAY MORNING, APRIL 2, 1862. Vol. XVII—New Series. Vol. XXXIV.—Whole No. 12,266.

BY TELEGRAPH.

[TRANSMITTED TO THE NEW ORLEANS BEE.]

From Texas.

GALVESTON, March 29.—Dates from Brownsville to the 17th report the British frigate Mersey, 50 guns, has just arrived at the mouth of the Rio Grande.

Gen. Jos. Carvajal had informed the authorities of Matamoras that there should be no further interference with Mexican commerce.

A Spanish and a French map-of-war were expected in a few days.

Trade being re-established is said to be interrupted again.

The British Vice-Consul at Matamoras is taking all in Mexican hands.

There are twenty five merchant vessels waiting to be discharged.

[SECOND DISPATCHES.]

From Augusta.

AUGUSTA, April 1.—A special despatch to the Augusta press, dated Newnan, the 1st, says three companies of Georgians yesterday attacked the enemy on Wilmington island, below Savannah, killing, and capturing a large number, and six pounder. Our loss was wounded, feared mortally.

From Richmond.

RICHMOND, March 31.—Twenty-nine Yankee prisoners were brought in to-night from Rappahannock, captured during a skirmish on Friday.

Wheat's Battalion engaged the enemy and drove them back after they had crossed the river.

The enemy are reported to be advancing in that direction.

From Memphis.

MEMPHIS, April 1.—News from Humboldt, Tenn., confirms the report of Col. Pickett's Tennessee cavalry regiment being surprised and captured at Union City, twenty-six miles south of Columbus, by 2,000 Federals. One hundred of them were taken prisoners, together with 300 horses and all their camp equipage.

England and the Blockade.

The English papers contain some interesting intelligence relating to the blockade of the Southern ports. Many voluminous papers on the subject have been submitted to Parliament. Among the most important of these are the opinions, one of Lord Brougham, and several naval officers, Consul Bunch, of Charleston, against the blockade. Each of these opinions is very decisive, while Consul Bunch, of Charleston, declares that the blockade is not effective. Even the Times, and that which is considered the official organ of the Government, the London Herald, are decidedly against the blockade as it now exists. The Mayor mentions the fact that Mr. Fabbi stood as a very proper building lot, and that the Confederate States would be the purchasers of the present occupant.

Mr. Thomas B. Miller & Co., who contracted to supply the Confederate States with arms, have failed. Their bill is duly presented a petition asking to have that rate reduced to a reasonable amount to prevent such a fate. The petition was referred to the Finance Committee.

Resolutions authorizing the "Substitute Committee" to issue or pay the pay roll the issuance of warrants and the payment of the same, and that they were duly passed by them and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

The ordinance adopted by the upper Board, by which the Governor is empowered to take charge of the powder mill, was concurred in by the Assistant Board of Aldermen, after being amended so that the officers of this city shall be elected by the Council.

The ordinance appointing Messrs. Wm. Hyde, Jr., and Jos. Hosking, P. T. Green, E. Montgomery, Richard Irvin, Jr., and Gerard Stith, Commissioners for the Powder Mill, was passed.

JULES GARSAUD, Secretary. apl 2

Dissolution of Copartnership.

NEW ORLEANS, March 31, 1862.

THE firm of P. C. JOHNSTON & CO. is this day dissolved by mutual consent. P. C. JOHNSTON will use the name of the late firm for the settlement of its business.

The Hat business will be continued by me as heretofore.

P. C. JOHNSTON,
ADOLPHE SARRAZIN.

apl 2t

Light! Light!! Light!!!

At the Suspension of Light may be found the best materials for that purpose, such as the

CONFEDERATE ILLUMINATING OIL,

which burns in the Coal Oil Lamps with a steadier flame of the white tallow of the burner; also pyroline COAL OIL, refined COTTON SEED OIL, for burning in Coal Oil Lamps; CAMPHENE, BURNING FLUID OR SPIRIT GAS, with an assortment of Lamps suitable for the above.

ANDERSON HILL,
mh31 tf No. 6 Chartres street.

LUBRICATING OIL.

50 Barrels TALLOW OIL, for sale by
A. F. SCHLAIR & SALE,
mh30 tm 30 Levee and 31 Poydras st.

Kerosene or Coal Oil, and Lubricating Oil.

AT wholesale and retail, at C. CEPHIGAL, Druggist, corner of Chartres and Bienville streets. Price for Kerosene Oil, at the rate of $1 50 a gallon; for the Lubricating Oil, and $3 for the Kerosene. mh17 tm

GOOD INVESTMENT.

Lands for U. S. Bounds or C. S. Notes!

PARTIES desiring to make investments in Lands to locate Bounty Land Warrants, can be accommodated by calling at the Land Office of the undersigned, No. 6 Carondelet street. Price from $1 25 to $3 00 per acre, payable in C. S. Treasury Notes.

apl 2t A. J. DOWELL, Counsellor at Law.

A Proposed Loan.

PERSONS desiring to invest their money for a term of years, and who are willing to carry out the patriotic policy of the Government, will find a safe and profitable investment in the Confederate Bonds.

Address "BONDS," Bee Office.

Volunteers' Relief Commission.

CITY HALL, Room No. 16,
New Orleans, March 31, 1862.

The Committee appointed by the Common Council and the Committee of Public Safety, to make and fill all the functions of volunteers now in the field, or who may hereafter be called into the field, and their families, have organized themselves into a Board of Administration, and have appointed Messrs. Campbell, Bowling & Co., Commission Merchants, Camp street, opposite Lafayette Square, Agents.

Wanted, also, BUCKSKINS. mch31 tf

Volunteers' Relief Commission.

CITY HALL, Room No. 16,
New Orleans, March 31, 1862.

The Committee appointed by the Common Council and the Committee of Public Safety, to make and fill all the functions of volunteers now in the field, or who may hereafter be called into the field, and their families, have organized themselves into a Board of Administration, and have appointed Messrs. Campbell, Bowling & Co., Commission Merchants, Camp street, opposite Lafayette Square, Agents.

Wanted, also, BUCKSKINS. mch31 tf

Succession of Agnes Blevens.

SECOND DISTRICT COURT OF NEW ORLEANS.
No. 16,200.—Notice is hereby given to the creditors of the above estate and to all other persons interested, to show cause, within ten days from the present notification, (if any they have or can) why the account presented by the administrator of said estate should not be homologated and approved, and the funds distributed in accordance therewith.

By order of the Court.
E. MICHOT, Deputy Clerk.
mh28 2t apl2

Succession of Agnes Blevens.

SECOND DISTRICT COURT OF NEW ORLEANS.
No. 16,200.—Notice is hereby given to the creditors of the above estate and to all other persons interested, to show cause, within ten days from the present notification, (if any they have or can) why the account presented by the administrator of said estate should not be homologated and approved, and the funds distributed in accordance therewith.

By order of the Court.
E. MICHOT, Deputy Clerk.
mh28 2t apl2

CITY INTELLIGENCE.

The Common Council.—The two Boards of the city Council met last night, with Mr. Dubuclet in the chair, and Messrs. Jourdan and Englund, as Pages of the House.

The Finance weekly report was read, showing that the total of small city notes of the second issue now in circulation is $180,500, and that he had in the City Treasury a balance of $1,000.

The Mayor sent in two messages, one instituting a new Police District, to be called the Second District, and to consist of the Second and Fourth Wards, and to have a Station House on Bayou St. John, and the other appointing Commissioners of Pilotage to their respective districts, to serve for two years.

The Mayor sent in a message, also, recommending the appointment of Commissioners to examine and report on the subject of the purchase of the Custom House, and certain naval property, the Council Room, of Charities, granting the blockade of that port extremely inefficient, while Consul Mure, of New Orleans, declares that the blockade of the Mississippi is strictly enforced. Commodore Lyons, of *The Racer*, admits on the 19th December that the blockade of Charleston and Wilmington had been broken, and Capt. Bunch, of the *Desperate*, thinks the blockade of Galveston may be easily evaded.

Earl Russell, under date of February 15th, addresses a letter to Lord Lyons, in which he substantially decides that the blockade is effective. *Here dynamite.*

Her Majesty's Government, however, are of opinion that, under the circumstances which have been specified, and also that a number of ships is sufficient really to prevent access to it, or to create an evident danger of entering or leaving it, and that these ships are vessels of sufficient force to resist the attempts which may be made to run the blockade, and that these ships are stationed sufficiently near the port to render their intention manifest, Her Majesty's Government are of opinion that the blockade of Charleston is effective.

Mr. Seward, in a letter dated March 4, 1862, to Lord Lyons, in which he states that he had been prepared for discussing the barbarous law which has been enacted, and that it is not likely that any others will be.

The subject has been discussed in the House of Lords, but merely in a cursory manner. The press comments upon Lord Russell's position—the London Herald animadverting upon it in a strongly denunciatory spirit. The article is worth reading, and we therefore present it below:

[From the London Herald, March 1.]

Lord Russell's is an initial blunder to take, of all remarks, the view of the case favorable to the interests of the North, and injurious to those of England. It was essential that, in defiance of usage and international law, we should be put on record against the validity of a blockade derived from the escape of "various ships;" for we had documents in his hands which showed that the blockade of Charleston have come and gone again broken the blockade with impunity; and if any number of such escapes would prove its invalidity, the Northern ports were already in that condition. Then if, in consequence of inquiries to recognize a blockade where the number of escapes was equal to that of captures; that where two vessels escaped for one captured, it was impossible to say that it was to obtain efficiency for the operations of his squadron; but when, as we believe to be now the case, the captures are not to the contrary in the proportion which is necessary to constitute a blockade, that blockade is effective in this law there is difficulties, and the risk of "various ships" having escaped is not one to make more than a remote contingency. The evidence laid before our Government conclusively establishes that the blockade did not exist—did not approach the fulfillment of the definition declared to be enacted by the Treaty of Paris—and that the number of vessels which have succeeded in running the blockade is sufficient to prevent access to the country's coast. But when that treaty works adversely to the wishes of the framers, we have not, however inadequate they may be at any moment of discharged from the other side, our Whig statesmen have no hesitation whatever in disregarding its provisions.

Finally, we would ask Lord Russell whether his own condition inquisitive to the discharge of a blockade—the question of neutral rights—does not substantially decide that the blockade is effective. Has he not received an official communication; he was not likely to receive them if he was averse to do so. But has he or has he not been made aware that all the most eminent European jurists have pronounced the pretended blockade of the South ports to be inadequate and illegal, and the sinking of the stone fleet an act of hostility to mankind, a gross violation of neutral rights and international law? And if so, what further proof of the "content of neutrals" does he require? Two months—France and England—are evidently interested in the answer; and we believe we shall not be behind many in the intelligence there is hardly a difference of opinion on the subject.

Why, then, the blockade is pronounced to be no longer a blockade, and consequently, a matter of fact and evidence, and one as to which the public opinions may be entertained, a neutral State ought to exercise the greatest caution with regard to the recognition of a blockade *de facto* and *de jure* established blockade, and regard for a declaration of such, except when it contains a conviction which is shared by neutrals generally, having an interest in the question that the power of blockade is abused by a State under trouble in maintaining it, or unwilling, from some motive or other, to do so.

Among the papers in a letter from Lord Lyons to Earl Russell, in which he states that he had before Mr. Seward the objection of the British Government to the stone blockade of Charleston. Mr. Seward replied that all the vessels taken while the vessels had been prepared for obstructing the harbor had been already sunk, and that it is not likely that any others will be.

The subject has been discussed in the House of Lords, but merely in a cursory manner. The press comments upon Lord Russell's position—the London Herald animadverting upon it in a strongly denunciatory spirit. The article is worth reading, and we therefore present it below:

[From the London Herald, March 1.]

Lord Russell's is an initial blunder to take, of all remarks, the view of the case favorable to the interests of the North, and injurious to those of England. It was essential that, in defiance of usage and international law, we should be put on record against the validity of a blockade derived from the escape of "various ships;" for we had documents in his hands which showed that the blockade of Charleston have come and gone again broken the blockade with impunity; and if any number of such escapes would prove its invalidity, the Northern ports were already in that condition. Then if, in consequence of inquiries to recognize a blockade where the number of escapes was equal to that of captures; that where two vessels escaped for one captured, it was impossible to say that it was to obtain efficiency for the operations of his squadron; but when, as we believe to be now the case, the captures are not to the contrary in the proportion which is necessary to constitute a blockade, that blockade is effective in this law there is difficulties, and the risk of "various ships" having escaped is not one to make more than a remote contingency. The evidence laid before our Government conclusively establishes that the blockade did not exist—did not approach the fulfillment of the definition declared to be enacted by the Treaty of Paris—and that the number of vessels which have succeeded in running the blockade is sufficient to prevent access to the country's coast. But when that treaty works adversely to the wishes of the framers, we have not, however inadequate they may be at any moment of discharged from the other side, our Whig statesmen have no hesitation whatever in disregarding its provisions.

Finally, we would ask Lord Russell whether his own condition inquisitive to the discharge of a blockade—the question of neutral rights—does not substantially decide that the blockade is effective. Has he not received an official communication; he was not likely to receive them if he was averse to do so. But has he or has he not been made aware that all the most eminent European jurists have pronounced the pretended blockade of the South ports to be inadequate and illegal, and the sinking of the stone fleet an act of hostility to mankind, a gross violation of neutral rights and international law? And if so, what further proof of the "content of neutrals" does he require? Two months—France and England—are evidently interested in the answer; and we believe we shall not be behind many in the intelligence there is hardly a difference of opinion on the subject.

Why, then, the blockade is pronounced to be no longer a blockade, and consequently, a matter of fact and evidence, and one as to which the public opinions may be entertained, a neutral State ought to exercise the greatest caution with regard to the recognition of a blockade *de facto* and *de jure* established blockade, and regard for a declaration of such, except when it contains a conviction which is shared by neutrals generally, having an interest in the question that the power of blockade is abused by a State under trouble in maintaining it, or unwilling, from some motive or other, to do so.

Among the papers in a letter from Lord Lyons to Earl Russell, in which he states that he had before Mr. Seward the objection of the British Government to the stone blockade of Charleston. Mr. Seward replied that all the vessels taken while the vessels had been prepared for obstructing the harbor had been already sunk, and that it is not likely that any others will be.

The subject has been discussed in the House of Lords, but merely in a cursory manner. The press comments upon Lord Russell's position—the London Herald animadverting upon it in a strongly denunciatory spirit. The article is worth reading, and we therefore present it below:

[From the London Herald, March 1.]

Lord Russell's is an initial blunder to take, of all remarks, the view of the case favorable to the interests of the North, and injurious to those of England. It was essential that, in defiance of usage and international law, we should be put on record against the validity of a blockade derived from the escape of "various ships;" for we had documents in his hands which showed that the blockade of Charleston have come and gone again broken the blockade with impunity; and if any number of such escapes would prove its invalidity, the Northern ports were already in that condition. Then if, in consequence of inquiries to recognize a blockade where the number of escapes was equal to that of captures; that where two vessels escaped for one captured, it was impossible to say that it was to obtain efficiency for the operations of his squadron; but when, as we believe to be now the case, the captures are not to the contrary in the proportion which is necessary to constitute a blockade, that blockade is effective in this law there is difficulties, and the risk of "various ships" having escaped is not one to make more than a remote contingency. The evidence laid before our Government conclusively establishes that the blockade did not exist—did not approach the fulfillment of the definition declared to be enacted by the Treaty of Paris—and that the number of vessels which have succeeded in running the blockade is sufficient to prevent access to the country's coast. But when that treaty works adversely to the wishes of the framers, we have not, however inadequate they may be at any moment of discharged from the other side, our Whig statesmen have no hesitation whatever in disregarding its provisions.

Finally, we would ask Lord Russell whether his own condition inquisitive to the discharge of a blockade—the question of neutral rights—does not substantially decide that the blockade is effective. Has he not received an official communication; he was not likely to receive them if he was averse to do so. But has he or has he not been made aware that all the most eminent European jurists have pronounced the pretended blockade of the South ports to be inadequate and illegal, and the sinking of the stone fleet an act of hostility to mankind, a gross violation of neutral rights and international law? And if so, what further proof of the "content of neutrals" does he require? Two months—France and England—are evidently interested in the answer; and we believe we shall not be behind many in the intelligence there is hardly a difference of opinion on the subject.

The Northern Feeling in Baltimore.—A correspondent writing the New York *Herald* from Baltimore:

It is impossible to ascertain by what means the people of Baltimore who sympathize with their South have informed us to the movements, hopes, to some extent, and state of feeling at the South. That they do keep us informed has been often demonstrated to be doubted. It is believed by them that the recent retreat of the rebel army of the Potomac is a strategic movement of the first water, and that while part of that army has gone to attack Burnside, the main body have only fallen back to a defensive line, on which they can protect Richmond to better advantage than they could at Manassas.

They laugh to scorn the idea that the war is nearly at its termination now than it was in January. They say, indeed, that the war has only just begun; that the South has never been invaded before now, and that the Union armies will meet with reverses that will annihilate them before they can gain any permanent success in the heart of the South. They ridicule the idea of there being any latent Union feeling at the South, and that the Southern States are united as one man in their determination to achieve their independence, and that their present reverses will only nerve them to renewed efforts. They may be mistaken, but this view is corroborated by all the intelligent prisoners who have recently been, and it is certainly not the part of wisdom to ignore it.

The 1st Question.—Several of our exchanges ask, with great propriety, why, since the limited supply of tea now in the Confederate States be secured for the use of the hospitals. This is a matter to which the forbearance of the military authorities should be directed. In a few weeks of the summer season the war can hotels, ice-cream saloons, and soda water fountains would exhaust the present supply, and to deprive the sick of getting *genuine* article of this most indispensable necessary. We are not aware of the quantity in Charleston, but we have been informed that it is sequestrated for the use of the Confederate States. If so, it should be reserved for the use of the hospitals.—*Char. Mercury.*

CITY INTELLIGENCE.

The Common Council.—The two Boards of the city Council met last night, with Mr. Dubuclet in the chair, and Messrs. Jourdan and Englund, as Pages of the House.

The Finance weekly report was read, showing that the total of small city notes of the second issue now in circulation is $180,500, and that he had in the City Treasury a balance of $1,000.

The Mayor sent in two messages, one instituting a new Police District, to be called the Second District, and to consist of the Second and Fourth Wards, and to have a Station House on Bayou St. John, and the other appointing Commissioners of Pilotage to their respective districts, to serve for two years.

The Mayor sent in a message, also, recommending the appointment of Commissioners to examine and report on the subject of the purchase of the Custom House, and certain naval property, the Council Room, of Charities, granting the blockade of that port extremely inefficient, while Consul Mure, of New Orleans, declares that the blockade of the Mississippi is strictly enforced. Commodore Lyons, of *The Racer*, admits on the 19th December that the blockade of Charleston and Wilmington had been broken, and Capt. Bunch, of the *Desperate*, thinks the blockade of Galveston may be easily evaded.

Earl Russell, under date of February 15th, addresses a letter to Lord Lyons, in which he substantially decides that the blockade is effective. *Here dynamite.*

Her Majesty's Government, however, are of opinion that, under the circumstances which have been specified, and also that a number of ships is sufficient really to prevent access to it, or to create an evident danger of entering or leaving it, and that these ships are vessels of sufficient force to resist the attempts which may be made to run the blockade, and that these ships are stationed sufficiently near the port to render their intention manifest, Her Majesty's Government are of opinion that the blockade of Charleston is effective.

Mr. Seward, in a letter dated March 4, 1862, to Lord Lyons, in which he states that he had before Mr. Seward the objection of the British Government to the stone blockade of Charleston. Mr. Seward replied that all the vessels taken while the vessels had been prepared for obstructing the harbor had been already sunk, and that it is not likely that any others will be.

The subject has been discussed in the House of Lords, but merely in a cursory manner. The press comments upon Lord Russell's position—the London Herald animadverting upon it in a strongly denunciatory spirit. The article is worth reading, and we therefore present it below:

[From the London Herald, March 1.]

Lord Russell's is an initial blunder to take, of all remarks, the view of the case favorable to the interests of the North, and injurious to those of England. It was essential that, in defiance of usage and international law, we should be put on record against the validity of a blockade derived from the escape of "various ships;" for we had documents in his hands which showed that the blockade of Charleston have come and gone again broken the blockade with impunity; and if any number of such escapes would prove its invalidity, the Northern ports were already in that condition. Then if, in consequence of inquiries to recognize a blockade where the number of escapes was equal to that of captures; that where two vessels escaped for one captured, it was impossible to say that it was to obtain efficiency for the operations of his squadron; but when, as we believe to be now the case, the captures are not to the contrary in the proportion which is necessary to constitute a blockade, that blockade is effective in this law there is difficulties, and the risk of "various ships" having escaped is not one to make more than a remote contingency. The evidence laid before our Government conclusively establishes that the blockade did not exist—did not approach the fulfillment of the definition declared to be enacted by the Treaty of Paris—and that the number of vessels which have succeeded in running the blockade is sufficient to prevent access to the country's coast. But when that treaty works adversely to the wishes of the framers, we have not, however inadequate they may be at any moment of discharged from the other side, our Whig statesmen have no hesitation whatever in disregarding its provisions.

Finally, we would ask Lord Russell whether his own condition inquisitive to the discharge of a blockade—the question of neutral rights—does not substantially decide that the blockade is effective. Has he not received an official communication; he was not likely to receive them if he was averse to do so. But has he or has he not been made aware that all the most eminent European jurists have pronounced the pretended blockade of the South ports to be inadequate and illegal, and the sinking of the stone fleet an act of hostility to mankind, a gross violation of neutral rights and international law? And if so, what further proof of the "content of neutrals" does he require? Two months—France and England—are evidently interested in the answer; and we believe we shall not be behind many in the intelligence there is hardly a difference of opinion on the subject.

Headquarters Hogwasher Artillery,

CREATED him on Company on Friday night, the Marshal in a Professor by birth, dark complexion, gray eyes, and a foot 6 inches in height. He keeps a boot and shoe store on West Lake, and his (which company) was ordered back by Gov. Moore; and he went to see. He is also a manager in the city, and any information given at his store will be thankfully received at the headquarters of my company.

CHARLES PROVOST, Captain.

apl 1st, 1862.

Confederate Guard Response Co. A.

WANTED FOR FIRE WARDS—One hundred able bodied men. Superior uniforms and equipments furnished. For bounty and further particulars, enquire at No. 16 Franklin street, of Capt. H. R. ZACHARIAH, apl 1t for Committee.

A Light Battery for the War.

THE applications of Young Men will be received for the formation of the required number, to serve in a Light Battery for the war.

The independence, efficacy and future of this young State is a sure guarantee for those entering the field. Apply at the Secretary's office, Bank of the United States, corner of Carondelet and Common streets, between the hours of 10 and 12 A. M., and 3 and 5 P. M.

For particulars apply to

R. M. ISAACSON,
mh31 tf 116 Common street, down stairs.

Blankets Wanted for the Confederate Troops.

A GOOD PRICE will be paid for new or second hand BLANKETS, by the Confederate Tobacco Factory, corner of Bienville and Bourbon streets. Apply to Capt. LOWELL, Quartermaster, at the Factory, or to Capt. Lowell, Quartermaster, Camp street opposite Lafayette Square.

Wanted, also, STOCKINGS. mch31 tf

Volunteers' Relief Commission.

CITY HALL, Room No. 16,
New Orleans, March 31, 1862.

The Committee appointed by the Common Council and the Committee of Public Safety, to make and fill all the functions of volunteers now in the field, or who may hereafter be called into the field, and their families, have organized themselves into a Board of Administration, and have appointed Messrs. Campbell, Bowling & Co., Commission Merchants, Camp street, opposite Lafayette Square, Agents.

Wanted, also, BUCKSKINS. mch31 tf

Succession of Agnes Blevens.

SECOND DISTRICT COURT OF NEW ORLEANS.
No. 16,200.—Notice is hereby given to the creditors of the above estate and to all other persons interested, to show cause, within ten days from the present notification, (if any they have or can) why the account presented by the administrator of said estate should not be homologated and approved, and the funds distributed in accordance therewith.

By order of the Court.
E. MICHOT, Deputy Clerk.
mh28 2t apl2