THE DAILY BEE.
PUBLISHED BY
G. P. WEISSE & CO.
G. P. WEISSE, | H. HARDY,
H. DUFOUR, | N. DUFOUR,
Daily paper, (one year in advance).....$12
Country paper, same weekly.....5
In all cases, subscribers must give one week's notice in writing before they can be allowed to discontinue. Any persons sending the paper through mistake of carriers, or otherwise, will be considered as a new order, and obliged to pay, unless due notice is given of the fact to the office.

The New Orleans Bee.

OFFICE, 83 CHARTRES ST. NEW ORLEANS, TUESDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 12, 1858. VOL. XVII—NEW SERIES. VOL. XXXII—WHOLE NO. 10,786.

RATES OF ADVERTISING.
One Dollar per square TEN lines, in each insertion on the first insertion, and HALF that price for each subsequent one.
Advertisements on the first page One Dollar per square each insertion.
Advertisements inserted at intervals charged One Dollar for every TEN lines of ordinary language, for each insertion.
The privilege of Annual Advertisements is strictly confined to those who advertise in the Daily Bee, and in extent to yearly contracts.
No subscription taken for less than one month. No subscription to advertising will be discontinued unless arrearages are paid, as well as the subscription to the proprietors.

THE DAILY BEE.

TUESDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 12.

ENGLAND, MEXICO AND THE UNITED STATES.

In another column we publish an article from the London *Times*, written in a most objurgatory and dissatisfied vein. For some weeks the *Times* has been laboring under a fit of the spleen touching matters on this side of the Atlantic. It has remembered to forget all its assumed good nature and amiability towards its American kindred, and has resumed its former arrogant and censorious tone. The *Times* did not admire the New York celebration of the laying of the Atlantic cable—not because it considered it with many sensible persons that the demonstration on that occasion were extravagant at all unnecessary, but forsooth, because America thought proper to honor their own countrymen, and to remember their merit and distinction in preference to those less founded ones of Englishmen. For to the "Thunderer" waxed irate, and indulged in an intemperance of language not consistent with that prate of late years. The article from the *Times* in our columns to-day does not show that true humor of that journal has been at all sweetened. It undertakes to read American unwillingness to take possession of Mexico, and berates us for failing to do that or doing which it abused us most heartily during the period of the Mexican war. Because we fought Mexico for trespasses on the soil of Texas and shedding blood on American soil, the same London *Times* denounced us with brutal violence. Now it is ready to revile us with equal severity because our government is unwilling to profit by the internal conflicts of Mexico, and to enforce upon territories which the latter would be unable to protect or preserve.

The reader must understand that there is no consistency in the conduct of the London periodical at all may appear. When the British press traduced us for invading Mexico it was actuated by a permanent feeling of envy and jealousy which dictated a policy and sentiment hostile to every project of American aggrandizement. The campaigns in Mexico added to our reputation and to our possessions, and were therefore regarded by England with jaundiced eyes.—Besides, Mexico was deeply indebted to British bondholders, and the necessity of raising funds to combat the Americans necessarily lessened her resources, and impaired her ability to pay. Hence there was an element of interest blended with that of jealousy—a motive for Great Britain to look coldly on the advance of the American giant. Now, the case is of interest paramount, and of minor considerations. Mexico must not, nor ever can, be suffered to fall into the hands of any foreign power. She is so exposed by her contiguous territory and her local system of government, that she must be protected. There is no alternative but that the United States will take upon itself the duty of protectorate. Let us see how in its unpleasant and undesirable part it will be with the United States. Swallowing, therefore, her hatred and repugnance, she has appealed to our government to interfere in Mexican affairs, put a stop to the civil warfare going on in that most unfortunate country, and establish a protectorate. Our government, after some delay, has resumed its former arrogant and censorious tone. The *Times* did not admire the New York celebration of the laying of the Atlantic cable—not because it considered it with many sensible persons that the demonstrations on that occasion were extravagant at all unnecessary, but forsooth, because America thought proper to honor their own countrymen, and to remember their merit and distinction in preference to those less founded ones of Englishmen. For to the "Thunderer" waxed irate, and indulged in an intemperance of language not consistent with that prate of late years. The article from the *Times* in our columns to-day does not show that true humor of that journal has been at all sweetened. It undertakes to read American unwillingness to take possession of Mexico, and berates us for failing to do that or doing which it abused us most heartily during the period of the Mexican war. Because we fought Mexico for trespasses on the soil of Texas and shedding blood on American soil, the same London *Times* denounced us with brutal violence. Now it is ready to revile us with equal severity because our government is unwilling to profit by the internal conflicts of Mexico, and to enforce upon territories which the latter would be unable to protect or preserve.

The reader must understand that there is no consistency in the conduct of the London periodical at all may appear. When the British press traduced us for invading Mexico it was actuated by a permanent feeling of envy and jealousy which dictated a policy and sentiment hostile to every project of American aggrandizement. The campaigns in Mexico added to our reputation and to our possessions, and were therefore regarded by England with jaundiced eyes.—Besides, Mexico was deeply indebted to British bondholders, and the necessity of raising funds to combat the Americans necessarily lessened her resources, and impaired her ability to pay. Hence there was an element of interest blended with that of jealousy—a motive for Great Britain to look coldly on the advance of the American giant. Now, the case is of interest paramount, and of minor considerations. Mexico must not, nor ever can, be suffered to fall into the hands of any foreign power. She is so exposed by her contiguous territory and her local system of government, that she must be protected. There is no alternative but that the United States will take upon itself the duty of protectorate. Let us see how in its unpleasant and undesirable part it will be with the United States. Swallowing, therefore, her hatred and repugnance, she has appealed to our government to interfere in Mexican affairs, put a stop to the civil warfare going on in that most unfortunate country, and establish a protectorate. Our government, after some delay, has resumed its former arrogant and censorious tone. The *Times* did not admire the New York celebration of the laying of the Atlantic cable—not because it considered it with many sensible persons that the demonstrations on that occasion were extravagant at all unnecessary, but forsooth, because America thought proper to honor their own countrymen, and to remember their merit and distinction in preference to those less founded ones of Englishmen. For to the "Thunderer" waxed irate, and indulged in an intemperance of language not consistent with that prate of late years. The article from the *Times* in our columns to-day does not show that true humor of that journal has been at all sweetened. It undertakes to read American unwillingness to take possession of Mexico, and berates us for failing to do that or doing which it abused us most heartily during the period of the Mexican war. Because we fought Mexico for trespasses on the soil of Texas and shedding blood on American soil, the same London *Times* denounced us with brutal violence. Now it is ready to revile us with equal severity because our government is unwilling to profit by the internal conflicts of Mexico, and to enforce upon territories which the latter would be unable to protect or preserve.

Our