THE DAILY BEE.
PUBLISHED BY
G. P. WEISSE & CO.
G. P. WEISSE, S. HARDY,
E. DUVERGER, B. DUPOUY.
Daily paper, (one year in advance).....$12
Country paper, semi-weekly.....5
In all cases, subscribers must give one week's notice in writing before they can be allowed to discontinue. Any person receiving the paper through error of carriers, or otherwise, will be considered as a subscriber, and obliged to pay, unless due notice is given of the fact to the office.

The New Orleans Bee.

RATES OF ADVERTISING.
One Dollar for every Fifty Lines, in such language, as the first insertion, and HALF that price for every subsequent one.
Advertisements on the first page One Dollar per square each insertion.
☞ Advertisements inserted at intervals will be charged One Dollar for every Fifty Lines for each language, for each insertion.
The privilege of Annual Advertisers is limited to advertisements strictly within the business of their business, and to extent of one square only for each day.
No subscription taken for less than one year; no subscription to advertise by the square; accounts of arrearages are paid, unless at the option of the proprietors.

OFFICE, 83 CHARTRES ST. NEW ORLEANS, TUESDAY MORNING, AUGUST 17, 1858. VOL. XVII—NEW SERIES. VOL. XXXI—WHOLE NO. 10,712.

THE DAILY BEE.

TUESDAY MORNING, AUGUST 17.

THE GRAND CONSUMMATION.

We have the infinite satisfaction this morning of presenting to our readers the first fruits of the Atlantic Telegraph, in the shape of a message of congratulation on this grand achievement from Queen VICTORIA to President BUCHANAN. Our readers will, we are sure, on perusing it, experience a kindred thrill of pleasurable emotion to that which stirred our breasts on receiving it. The union of the two continents is now complete. May the telegraphic cable which binds them by an electrical chain prove symbolical of an eternal and unbroken ligament of peace and concord.

THE RIGHT OF SEARCH.

The brief sketch of the discussion in the British House of Lords embraced in our summary, of the European news confirms the opinion advanced by several journalists that the British government has abandoned the question of the right of search in an absolute and unqualified manner. Nothing can be clearer than the avowal made by the venerable Lord Lyndhurst on the occasion. Commenting upon the expression of Mr. Dallas that the right of search and visit has been given up, he objected to the phrase on the ground that there was really nothing to give up; that the right had no existence, that it had no foundation in law, and had been expressly renounced by the most distinguished authorities on international law in England and America. The sea, said Lord Lyndhurst, is common to all nations; on it all nations are equal; any ship on the open sea is as sacred as the territory of the nation it belongs to; a compulsory visit is tantamount to a violent landing or invasion; and, as no nation can be prejudiced by the crime of another nation, so the assumption of the American flag by foreigners does not justify us in any outrage on that flag borne by a vessel with a right to it. The acknowledgment, it is seen, is ample and complete as can be desired.

The comments of the London *Times* on this debate are unusually forcible and suggestive. Says that journal:

> The smallest exhibition of force to a foreign ship in the open sea falls under the ban of all law, if the distinguished lawyers quoted in this debate. A civil question, of course, is not an exhibition of force. If one vessel hails another, and asks the time, the longitude, or any other question, leaving it entirely to the discretion of the stranger to reply or not, there is plainly, that is a forbidden question, to which no exception can be taken, and which cannot be brought before a court of law, because it is not the sort of dispute supposed in the discussion. It is only when the investigation is carried further, and attempts are made to board the vessel, when the strange vessel has been put to actual inconvenience, detained, annoyed, and insulted, that it becomes a matter for a cable interpretation. If Lord Aberdeen meant as much as this, or if he meant any thing more than this, the question is the weakest ever put in high quarters. In the strong sense, then, we are persuaded his lordship was in error in supposing that he had settled the question of the right of search.

What other states demand, and what we have contended recently as it appears to us, and as Lord Aberdeen himself admits, is simply to let the smallest act of force or exhibition of superior strength, to the almost slightest interference or even inquiry, be considered an outrage on a friend. We must do it on the speculation that if we turn out wrong, we shall have to make a proper apology, or, if we are right, we shall be the suspected vessel. We have to be suspected and back upon. It is, as the Attorney-General said, a parallel case to the assault on a peaceful criminal. If he turns out an innocent man, we are liable to an action for assault or false imprisonment, and we must, of course, make the best of it. We must do it,