

VESPASIAN ELLIS, Editor. R. M. HEATH, Assistant.

Agents for the "American Organ."

JOHN T. AUBLEY, St. Asaph street, two doors from King street, Alexandria, Virginia. SARTER & FONS, 150 Broad street, and 194 Main street, Richmond, Virginia. W. S. CHURCH, 146 Baltimore street, Baltimore, Maryland. JOHN P. HILTON, our agent for Cincinnati and other cities in the west. V. B. PALMER, the American Newspaper Agent, is the only authorized Agent for this paper in the cities of Boston, New York, and Philadelphia, and is daily empowered to take advertisements and subscriptions at the rates required by us. His receipts will be regarded as payments. His offices are—Boston, No. 74 Building; New York, Tribune Buildings; Philadelphia, north-east corner Third and Chestnut sts. The "AMERICAN ORGAN" will be found for sale at ADE & YATES, No. 22 Bookman street, New York.

We commence the publication of the Organ some weeks earlier than we originally contemplated, and our arrangements for procuring city items and matters of local interest are not entirely completed. Our patrons must indulge us in those, and some other particulars, for a few days.

Those daily papers who receive this number of the American Organ will please exchange with us daily. Our New York exchanges will please send their afternoon editions.

A few persons will receive our first number, as a specimen copy of the Organ, but subsequent numbers will be sent to actual subscribers only.

In consequence of the large number of advertisements received this morning, we are obliged to exclude a portion of our editorial matter prepared for this day's number.

OUR PRINCIPLES.

On presenting the first number of the "American Organ" to the public, for its patronage and support, we deem it proper to announce, without reserve, the principles and measures we intend to advocate.

Referring to our prospectus in another column, for the general reasons which induced the establishment of this paper, and for a general view of our political opinions, we proceed to express, with precision and clearness, the specific doctrines we shall maintain, and the specific objects we seek to accomplish.

First. We shall advocate a repeal of the laws of naturalization, or if that cannot be accomplished, then such a modification of those laws, as will prevent future immigrants from becoming citizens, short of a residence of twenty-one years, after taking the oath of allegiance to the United States, and of abjuration of all other powers, potentates, and princes.

Second. We shall advocate the passage of a stringent law by Congress to prevent the immigration hither of foreigners, who are either paupers or criminals, and to send back to the countries from which they come all such foreigners of these classes as may, in violation of such law, hereafter reach our ports; and to require the President of the United States to demand from any government, which may send hither such classes of its subjects, immediate and ample satisfaction for such outrage, and a proper indemnity against the repetition thereof.

Third. We shall oppose the election or appointment of any foreign-born citizen to any office of trust, honor or emolument, under the Federal or State governments, or the employment or enlistment of such persons in the army or navy in time of war; maintaining, as we do the opinion, that the native-born citizens of the United States have the right to govern the land of their birth; and that all immigrants from abroad should be content with the enjoyment of life, liberty and property, under our institutions, without seeking to participate in the execution, administration, or execution of our laws.

Fourth. We shall advocate and urge the adoption of such an amended form of an oath to support the Constitution of the United States, and to be administered to all persons elected or appointed to any office of trust, honor, or emolument, under the Federal or State governments, as will effectually exclude from such offices all persons, who shall not directly and explicitly recognize the obligations and binding force of the Constitution of the United States, as paramount to all obligations of adhesion or allegiance to any foreign prince, power, potentate, or authority whatever, under any and all circumstances.

Fifth. We shall maintain the doctrine that no one of the States of this Union has the right to admit to the enjoyment of free suffrage any person of foreign birth, who has not been first made a citizen of the United States, according to the "uniform rule" of naturalization prescribed by Congress, under the provisions of the constitution.

Sixth. We shall oppose, now and hereafter, any "union of Church and State," no matter what class of religionists shall seek to bring about such union.

Seventh. We shall vigorously maintain the vested rights of all persons, of native or foreign birth, and shall at all times oppose the slightest interference with such vested rights.

Eighth. We shall oppose and protest against all abridgment of religious liberty, holding it as a cardinal maxim, that religious faith is a question between each individual and his God, and over which no political government, or other human power, can rightfully exercise any supervision or control, at any time, in any place, or in any form.

Ninth. We shall oppose all "higher law" doctrines, by which the constitution is to be set at naught, violated, or disregarded, whether by politicians, by religionists, or by the adherents or followers of either, or by any other class of persons.

Tenth. We shall maintain and defend the constitution as it stands, the Union as it exists, and the rights of the States, without diminution as guaranteed thereby; opposing at all times, and to the extent of our ability and influence, all who may assail them, or either of them.

Eleventh. We shall oppose no man, and sustain no man, on the ground of his opposition to, or his support of, Democratic measures, or Whig measures; but we shall oppose those who oppose our doctrines, and sustain those who sustain our doctrines.

Twelfth. And lastly, we shall use our utmost exertions to build up an "American party," whose maxim shall be:

AMERICANS SHALL RULE THEIR COUNTRY!

PARSON'S TROUSERS commence a series of concerts this evening at Odd Fellows' Hall.

OUR DEMOCRACY.

It is not a matter of the slightest importance to the country, or to our readers, whether the editor of this paper has been hitherto recognized as a Whig or as a Democrat, in his party associations. The only question of interest touching our opinions, is simply this: Are the measures and principles we now advocate such as should command the support of the American people? The doctrines of the "American party" are either just or unjust, and their justice or injustice cannot be determined by an inquiry into the political antecedents, or into the personal motives of those who advocate, or of those who oppose them. Such, at least, are our views of this matter. We are led to these suggestions by the perusal of a recent editorial in the Richmond, Va., Examiner, from which we extract the following, to wit:

"But it is reported in the country that Mr. V. Ellis, whose name appears in connection with the Know-Nothing organ about to be established in Washington is a Democrat. To the friend who asks us for information on this point, we here communicate all that we know: Mr. Ellis while a member of the Virginia Senate, was one of the strongest Whigs of that body. He afterwards became a supporter of Mr. Tyler's administration, and obtained office under it. From this office he was ejected by Mr. Polk, and the next report we had concerning him was that he had returned to the Whig party. Of his recent political whereabouts we are not advised. He is a New Yorker by birth, and we presume in politics also; belonging, perhaps, to the class so aptly described by John Randolph in the following passage: 'In New York, sir, a radical change of sentiment is so easy and natural, that a man goes to bed at night warm (Unionist), and rises in the morning a Bucktail of the first water.'"

"Doubtless there are men of Mr. Ellis's instability of purpose, sometimes Whigs, sometimes Democrats, and all the time camp-followers, who have gone into the Know-Nothing ranks. There are, also, we suppose, numbers of honest Democrats who have been drawn into it from curiosity, or from a misapprehension as to its tendency and objects. But all such, we believe, will retire in detestation, rather than acknowledge a sworn obligation to war upon the men and principles of their old party."

We are unwilling to believe that a paper, conducted in the spirit of candor and justice, would scantly misrepresent our political antecedents, however decided it may be in its opposition to our doctrines.

Nevertheless, both in statement and in supposition, the above extract is, in all important particulars, erroneous and unjust. The Examiner says, "Mr. Ellis, while a member of the Virginia Senate, was one of the strongest Whigs of that body." What sort of a Whig? What Whig measures did we advocate? Does the Examiner mean that we favored a National Bank? that we supported Henry Clay? We never did either, at any time, in the Senate, or out of it. In 1828 and in 1832, we advocated the election of Andrew Jackson to the presidency—he received the first vote we ever gave. In 1836, we voted for Hugh Lawson White for President, against Martin Van Buren, on the ground that Van Buren was a Federalist and an Abolitionist. Did this vote make us a Whig? In the spring of 1836, we were elected to the Virginia Senate as a supporter of Judge White, and this fact may be found stated in the Norfolk (Va.) Herald of May, 1836. Were we right or wrong in our opinions of Van Buren, and in our support of Hugh L. White? Right or wrong, we stood on the same platform with the Hon. Henry A. Wise, Hon. Thomas H. Bayly, Hon. Charles J. Faulkner, Hon. R. K. Meade, and many other now prominent and leading Democrats of Virginia! It is true that, from 1836 to 1842, many distinguished members of the present Democratic organizations in Virginia, were called "impracticable Whigs," for the reason that while opposed to Van Buren, they refused to affiliate with the Clay Whigs. We for one, never voted either for Van Buren, or for Clay. Nor did we ever advocate a National Bank, but on the contrary, we introduced and advocated in the Virginia Senate, a resolution opposing the re-charter of the Bank of the United States, as may be seen by reference to the Senate Journals from 1836 to 1838. Were we then a Whig? If opposition to a National Bank and to Henry Clay, and to Martin Van Buren also, constituted us a Whig, then be it so. In 1840, when residing in Missouri, we again opposed the election of Van Buren to the presidency, and we advocated the election of Harrison and Tyler, as republicans of the school of Jefferson. A letter written by us, and published in the Missouri Republican in the summer of 1840, (in June probably) will distinctly show that we opposed Van Buren on the ground that he was both a federalist and an abolitionist. We knew him to be such, and then had, and still have conclusive proofs on these points. Now, if the Virginia Democrat had known Mr. Van Buren as we then knew him, and as they and all the world, "and the rest of mankind" now know him, would they have sustained him? If not, can it with propriety be alleged, that because we opposed him in 1836 and in 1840, on the grounds above stated, that we were therefore a Whig? We think it proves rather our consistency and our independence as a Democrat.

The Examiner says, and truly, that we supported Mr. Tyler's administration, and obtained office under it. Is this any evidence that we were a Whig? Did not Messrs. Wise, Cushing, Wilkins, Porter, and even John C. Calhoun, with hundreds of other Democrats, also hold office under President Tyler?

The Examiner might have also stated, with truth, that we defended the bank veto of President Tyler; that we were the first editor west of the Alleghany mountains who openly took ground in favor of the annexation of Texas; and that we sustained Democratic measures under the Tyler administration, until we resigned the position of editor of the "St. Louis Old School Democrat," in the fall of 1844! Were we then a Whig? Does the Examiner know our course in the contest of 1844, between Messrs. Clay and Polk? If not, we can exhibit to him the "Old School Democrat," (which we then edited), with the names of Polk and Dallas at its head! Were we then a Whig?

But the Examiner says that we were "ejected" from office by Mr. Polk, and the "next report he had" of us, was that we "had returned to the Whig party!"

We held the appointment given us by Mr. Tyler as Chargé to Venezuela for some months after our commission had expired, at the request of Mr. Secretary Buchanan, and which commission was simply not renewed by Mr. Polk; but we have written evidence and living witnesses to prove, that we were not superseded on the ground of any political or personal objection made to us by the Polk administration, but that we were recalled to gratify the wishes of a distinguished personage from Missouri, then high in power and influence, but who has himself been recently prostrated by the un-

ring votes of the "American party," and who is now politically defunct, with "none so poor as to do him reverence."

But whence did the Examiner derive the report that we had "returned to the Whig party?" Will he please inform us? For the last five years we have resided in Washington, engaged in professional pursuits, and the only vote we have ever given here was cast for John W. Murrey, the Democratic candidate for Mayor! Did this vote make us a Whig? We never voted against any Democratic candidate for the presidency except Van Buren.

But we pass on to that portion of the Examiner's editorial which says, "Mr. Ellis is a New Yorker by birth, and we presume in politics also." This statement conclusively demonstrates the utter ignorance of the Examiner's informant. We shall apply to him no harsher term, for "the sin of ignorance shall be forgiven."

"Mr. V. Ellis is not a New Yorker by birth—never was a New Yorker in politics—never voted for a New York politician," and never will vote for any one of that class of "New York politicians" who originated the obnoxious maxim "to the victors belong the spoils!" We suppose the Examiner is not ignorant of the paternity of this miserable maxim, and he is welcome to hurl his anathemas at "that class so aptly described by John Randolph," until it suits his own purposes to desist.

If the Examiner's friends do not complain of his indiscriminate denunciation of "New York politicians," we, who opposed the "favorite son of New York" in 1836 and 1840, when the Virginia Democracy sustained that "northern man with southern principles," will never object to his denunciations of such politicians. Is it not however, rather unkind in the Examiner to assail such "New York politicians" in view of certain existing political relations at home and abroad?

But, we repeat, that neither we nor any of our kindred, lineal or collateral, were born in New York, as alleged by the Examiner; but in making this correction of a misstatement, we must not be understood as intimating that it is any disparagement to be a native of the Empire State. Many, very many of our sons have been distinguished both for patriotism and for intellect. It is true that New York has produced her BURNS, VAN BURENS, and SEWARDS, but she has also produced her CLINTONS, DICKINSONS, and FILLMORES!

But the Examiner, in closing his observations upon our Democracy, has seen fit to impute to us "instability of purpose." This is its imputation—where are its specifications? When or how have we manifested such "instability?" Was it in opposing Van Buren, from first to last, for the presidency? Others might call it consistency.

Is the Examiner aware, that thirteen years ago, we commenced the advocacy of native American doctrines, and continued it until we sacrificed the earnings of a dozen years' laborious practice at the bar? In now resuming the advocacy of the same principles, with fairer prospects, do we manifest instability? It may be, and probably is true, that experience, observation and discussion, have changed some of our opinions on matters of policy, but we are not aware that on any political principle, we have changed our sentiments during the last thirty years. Will the Examiner please attempt to demonstrate our "instability?"

But we desire here to state, that we do not admit the right of any man or set of men, to decide, ex cathedra, upon our Democracy. We are willing that our speeches and votes shall be scanned and discussed, and be tested by original Democratic principles, and that the people shall pass a verdict upon our claims as a Democrat of the school of Jefferson.

We shall not, however, consent to be denounced as no Democrat, on the ground of our opposition to an old-fashioned federalist and an abolitionist, in 1836 and 1840; for, while we censured those Virginia Democrats who sustained Van Buren, while we opposed him, we must be permitted to express the belief, that they would have voted as we voted, had they then known him as we knew him. And if the maxim be a just one, that "in politics a blunder is worse than a crime," we, at least, were then guiltless of the blundering error of aiding in the support of a "New York politician!" Can the Examiner and its confidants say as much?

A few words more and we are done with the question of our political antecedents, a matter to which we would not have adverted, were it not that the question was raised for the purpose of diminishing the influence of our paper at the South.

We doubt not that all candid men will assent to the truth of the position, that a father can in no more solemn manner, indicate his political bias, than in giving names to his children. Our two elder sons received family names, and our three younger sons received the names of prominent politicians, to wit: William Henry Crawford, De Witt Clinton, and Thomas Jefferson! The two former of these three sons are now living, and all of them were born in Virginia. What political bias do these names indicate? Our readers may decide that question. We now leave the Richmond Examiner to persist in, or to correct its errors, in relation to our political antecedents, or not, as its editor may think right and honorable, assuring him however, that no misrepresentation of our opinions or principles, whether intentional or unintentional, can disturb our equanimity.

We have a duty to perform to our party and to the country, which would be illy performed by wasting our time and space in crimination and recrimination, nor would we now have trespassed upon the patience of our readers, by inserting this refutation of an otherwise unimportant misstatement, were it not that the administration presses throughout the country have combined to create the impression (which is unjust and untrue) that all the prominent advocates of the "American party" are Whigs in disguise! No sillier act of desperation was ever committed by an expiring dynasty.

THE ADDRESS.

We commence to-day the publication of "an address to the citizens of the United States," prepared by us, and published in 1841, in defence of the doctrines of our party, and in refutation of the objections taken thereto at that period. It will be continued during the week, until concluded, and go into our first weekly, entire. It does not become us to pass any opinion upon the merits of the address, but we may be permitted to say, that although nearly fourteen years have elapsed since we wrote it,

there is neither a sentiment nor a sentence in it we would change. We now copy it from the "Missouri Pennant and Native American," published February 11th, 1841, at St. Louis, Missouri. We presume that those who desire to understand our doctrines will give the address a perusal.

INFLUENCE OF FOREIGN VOTES.

The administration presses and other opponents of our doctrines have, on various occasions, sought to underrate the importance of the foreign vote cast at our elections, and have essayed to prove that such vote does not, to any perceptible extent, control our elections, because it is scattered and diffused throughout the country. It is not denied by our opponents that almost the entire foreign vote is usually cast on the same side. We shall endeavor to demonstrate, by calculations and facts which cannot be controverted, that the foreign population have now the power to decide the election of President of the United States, in any contest between the two former rival parties, Whigs and Democrats, when the old political lines are drawn between these parties.

We may here, in advance of exhibiting our figures, advert to the well-known fact, that it was considered extremely doubtful on which side the foreign votes would be cast, as between Generals Pierce and Scott in 1852, until within a very few days before the election. It is even said and believed, that negotiations were carried on for some time between certain distinguished emissaries of a "higher power" and the recognized friends of the rival candidates, touching the consideration or value of the foreign vote, and that the results of these negotiations are too manifest, not to be well understood by all who pay attention to the political huckstering of corrupt partisans.

If it be true, as we think we shall demonstrate, that the foreign voters in our country can, by acting in concert, control our presidential elections, and if it be true, as we have been led to believe, and as we shall at some not very distant day, attempt to show, that nearly all the foreign vote can be controlled by a "higher law" influence, surely the patriotic of all other parties will unite with us in our efforts to defeat the machinations of demagogues who may hereafter seek to obtain political place and power, by means of such influences! Without further allusion to this point now, we shall present our figures. We shall exhibit the statistics of fourteen States in this connection, whose aggregate electoral vote was one hundred and fifty-two at the last election, that number being two more than a majority of the whole electoral vote cast for President. We have made our calculations on the usual basis, that one-seventh of the general population of the States are voters. We doubt not that one-fifth of the foreign population are voters, because there is a smaller proportion of adult females and of children among them, than in the same number of native-born population. Still we adhere to the usual basis of calculation.

In California, however, where there are seventeen males to one female, and but few children, we assume that about one-half of the whole foreign population are voters, and we have estimated the foreign vote at ten thousand, in a foreign population of twenty-one thousand six hundred and twenty-eight persons. On these principles, we now present our statistics, taken from the census of 1850, and the American Almanac for 1854:

Table with 5 columns: States, Foreign population, Foreign vote, Pierce's majority, Electoral vote cast for Pierce.

It is thus demonstrated, that in each of these fourteen States, the foreign vote was larger than the majority given for General Pierce, and it is also demonstrated that the aggregate foreign vote of these fourteen States, is more than twice the whole number of the aggregate of General Pierce's majorities in said States. If even one-half of the foreign vote had been given to General Scott, he would have been elected instead of General Pierce!

In North Carolina, too, the foreign vote was 366, and General Pierce's majority was but 686, so that if Scott instead of Pierce had received this foreign vote, he would have received the electoral vote of North Carolina by a majority of 148 votes!

It is therefore, clear beyond controversy, that if General Scott had bargained for and obtained that portion of the foreign vote, which it is assumed was under the influence of a higher law power, he would now, instead of General Pierce, have been President of the United States! But passing over this consideration, we ask if it be not alarming to reflect, that our presidential elections are thus distinctly shown to be under the control of the naturalized citizens of the United States? We trust our readers will scrutinize, and then ponder upon these statistics.

The time is not distant when even Virginia, by the increase of foreign voters, will be under their influence and control, if the contests in that State continue to be carried on between the former rival parties, and if a presidential candidate can be found who will place the necessary number of secretarieships and foreign missions at the disposal of the "higher law" power!

We shall resume the examination of this subject, ere long, when we propose to dissect and comment upon the various positions taken by the Hon. Henry A. Wise, in his recent very able and eloquent letter published in the Richmond Enquirer, in opposition to our doctrines. We only postpone our examination of that document, awaiting the receipt of numerous lists of subscribers promised from the "Old Dominion," because we especially desire to place our comments upon Mr. Wise's texts, before our Virginia friends and patrons.

"Two Strong Facts."—The New York election shows that the Know-Nothings are incapable of triumphing without the Whigs, and that the Whigs are incapable of triumphing without the Know-Nothings. It is the first time that an attempt has been made by the one to do without the other.

The Washington Union of the 11th, contains the above statements, under a very inappropriate head. It so happens that the Know-Nothings elected Mr. Mott, of Pennsylvania, without

the aid of the Whigs, and in opposition to them; and it also so happens that the Whigs have triumphed in New York, in the election of Clark, published February 11th, 1841, at St. Louis, Missouri. We presume that those who desire to understand our doctrines will give the address a perusal.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We have received several communications, discussing questions affecting the Catholic creed, and either directly or indirectly assailing the Catholic Church and its tenets. We are obliged to our friends for the kindness they thus manifest in furnishing us with their views and arguments on such matters. Our paper, however, is not a religious, but a political paper, and will be devoted mainly to the discussion of political questions; hence we are obliged to decline publishing such essays. Any and all proper articles which furnish evidence that a political power is wielded by Catholics as such, or by any other church, will be carefully considered, and properly used.

We assail no man's religious faith—that is a matter, in our opinion, beyond human jurisdiction. It is only when we discover a tendency in religious associations to grasp political power, or to influence political movements, that we shall seek to interpose and arrest it. We believe that the Roman Catholic hierarchy has, in all ages, claimed and exercised temporal power, and that such is its claim at the present day; but this belief furnishes us with no justification for assailing the members of that church, on account of their religious opinions. Who ever made converts by denunciation and abuse? Were it our province or our purpose to make proselytes to Protestantism, we would offer argument, and not denunciation. But that is not our province.

We repeat, that ours is a political paper. We war upon foreign influences. If the Pope and his representatives seek to influence our political destinies, in any form, or by any means whatever, we shall do all we can to defeat their efforts. We would reason with those who conscientiously act under such influences. We would advise to clothe such persons with power; we would resist all Papal encroachments, if necessary, with force. Denunciation and abuse, however, are poor weapons in our contest. If our correspondents will give us facts and proofs, we will use them editorially, but we have no room for theological disquisitions, nor any inclination to publish sectarian assaults.

The distinguished comedian, Charles S. T. Burke, died of consumption, in New York, on Friday night last. He was well known to the citizens of Washington, having often appeared at the National Theatre, and always with the highest marks of popular approval.

RIOT IN WILLIAMSBURG.—Quite a serious riot occurred at Williamsburg a few days ago, between the Protestants and Catholics, growing out of the recent elections in New York. Some apprehension was felt that it would be renewed on last Saturday night, but a despatch dated yesterday states that all was quiet, though some anxiety existed that disturbances would break out during the day.

THE ELECTIONS.—In a day or two we will present our readers with a complete list of all the members elect to the next Congress, classifying them as accurately as possible.

CITY OF WASHINGTON.—We have had placed in our hands a new and revised edition of "Morris's Strangers' Guide to the city of Washington." This work is now illustrated with sixteen steel and twenty wood engravings, the former prepared expressly for this edition. From the first section we will give a few facts in relation to our city, interesting though not new.

The act of Congress locating the Capitol of the United States at Washington, and passed at the suggestion of General Washington, bears date July 16th, 1790.

After the passage of this act, the States of Virginia and Maryland ceded to the General Government ten miles square of land on both sides of the Potomac river, upon which were to be erected suitable buildings for Congress and the Executive Departments, to be called the District of Columbia, and over which the General Government were to have jurisdiction. The corner-stone of the District was laid in 1791, and that of the Capitol, by General Washington, September 18, 1793. The design of the city was planned and the streets laid out by Major Ellicott and Mr. Ellicott. The seat of Government, according to the act of 1790, was removed to Washington in 1800. The extent of the city, from northwest to southeast, is about four and a half miles, and from east to west about two and a half miles. The whole area of the city is 3,016 acres, with a circumference of fourteen miles.

NEW YORK ELECTION.

The fog has not yet quite cleared away, but the latest returns by mail would seem to indicate that Clark, the Whig candidate for governor, has been elected by a small majority. The remainder of the Whig ticket is undoubtedly elected. The Herald of yesterday morning says:

"We have returns now from about four hundred and ten thousand votes, with nearly the entire of Clinton county, Dutchess, Franklin, Herkimer, and Montgomery, and portions of Seneca, Warren, Chautauque, and two or three others, to have from which leaves probably fifty thousand votes yet to come in. Clark, as will be seen by our table, is some six hundred ahead of Seymour; but as nearly every batch of returns changes the aspect of the result, our next announcement may alter the position of the two prominent candidates. Our own table, carefully corrected and footed up, shows the following result:

Table with 2 columns: Name, Votes.

Clark's plurality thus far 108." The Legislature, as far as heard from, consists of 82 Whigs, 38 Democrats, and 3 temperance independent Democrats. Most of the Whigs are understood to favor the re-election of Mr. Seward to the Senate, while a large majority of the Democrats are known to be hostile to the administration.

But a considerable portion, both of the Whigs and Democrats, are known to belong to the order.

In the present Congress 23 members are classed as Democrats, including hardy and soft.

NEWS FROM EUROPE.

The steamer Atlantic arrived yesterday in New York, with four days' later intelligence from Europe. The news is not very important. We furnish below the most interesting items of intelligence:

FROM THE SEAT OF WAR.

Private accounts are later. They say that two of the outer forts of the harbor—probably the "White Tower," and an earth work at the quarantine fort—were destroyed by the fire of the English and French fleets on the 17th. The allies lost 100 killed and the Russians lost 500, including Admiral Ransell.

The French steamer which left the Crimea on the 21st, reports that the allied land force had effected a breach, but it was not deemed practicable to attempt an entrance.

The siege of Sebastopol was progressing slowly. A small breach had been made in one of the forts and the outworks silenced, but the Russians in a sortie spiked sixteen French guns.

The latest official news to the Anglo-French governments reports that the allied land force had effected a breach, but that it was not yet practicable to storm the fortifications.

The Russian official report of the 23d says, that the garrison had made a successful sortie, and destroyed the French battery, spiked sixteen French guns, and took (English) Lord Dunkelin prisoner.

MR. SOULE AND THE YEKCH GOVERNMENT.

The London Times justifies the French government's refusal to allow Mr. Soule to pass through that country on his return to Spain. The Times also says that Mr. Buchanan and Mr. Mason regard the insult to Mr. Soule as a national matter. It is rumored that Mr. Mason has demanded an apology, which the Times says will not be couched.

The affair has given rise to much newspaper discussion, and the belief is generally entertained that it will cause a serious difficulty between the American and French governments.

There are no tidings of the missing passengers of the steamer Arctic.

THE LATEST.

LIVERPOOL, Wednesday.—This morning's mail brings nothing more definite from the seat of war, than the above.

The Czar's two sons had arrived in the Crimea. From the Baltic there is nothing new.

The Russian descent on Dobruja seems to be a mere manoeuvre, to draw the Turks from the river Pruth.

Prussia, on the 23d, sent a note to the Czar urging his acceptance of the four points in the Austrian note.

The reported defeat of the Russians at Garuzi, in Asia, is confirmed.

The Queen mother of Bavaria is dead.

COTTON.—Market steady, without improvement. Broadcloth.—Wheat had declined 1s. 6d. a 2s. and four 6d. per quarter.

Provisions.—Beef and pork unchanged; bacon in moderate request.

Money market.—No change in Consols.

HON. THOMAS H. BAIRD.—Among the eminent citizens of Pennsylvania we do not know one who, by education, abilities, judicial knowledge, and sound principles, is better fitted for a seat in the Senate of the United States than the gentleman whom we name above. It is with pleasure, therefore, that we have seen the annexed paragraph in a Philadelphia paper.—National Intelligencer.

HON. THOMAS H. BAIRD.—This talented gentleman, who was the American nominee for supreme judge at the late election, is named in some papers for the United States senatorship which will be vacated on the 4th of March next by the expiration of Mr. Cooper's term. So far as legal ability, profound learning, and superior intellectual acquirement are concerned, Mr. Baird's superior for this position is not to be found in the State. We hold up both hands for his appointment to the highest honor our country can bestow upon its ablest men—a seat in the body of sages immortalized by Clay, Calhoun, Hayne, and Webster.—Banner.

SHIPMENTS OF GOLD.—The shipments of gold from California thus far this year and last, are thus stated:

Table with 2 columns: Date, Amount.

Georgetown Markets—Monday, 11 P. M. The steamer's news will probably unsettle the market for breadstuffs generally. Since harvest the supply of family flour has been very limited, consequently the price of that grade of flour has ruled high. Sales are now made at from \$10 00 to \$11 25, the latter price for Welch's premium.

Extra superfine—69. Superfine—67 to 68. What—white 7 to 9 cents; red \$1 51. Corn—white 75 to 80 cents; yellow 75 to 78. Prices nominal.

Corn meal—85 cents to \$1 00. Oats from vessel—46 to 48 cents, struck measure. Shipments—7 to 9 cents. Brown stuff—36 to 39 cents. Ship stuff—40 to 62 cents.

Potatoes—A vessel has arrived with a cargo of Merona—sales at \$1 30 by the ten bushels.

J. O. F.—The Annual Session of the Grand Lodge of the District of Columbia will be held this evening, at 7 1/2 o'clock. As the election of Officers will take every precaution taken for their meeting, a full attendance of members is expected.

DRY GOODS! DRY GOODS! Great Reduction in Prices! THE subscriber, during this week, presents large inducements to families and others, in the purchase of DRY GOODS, which he offers for sale at exceedingly low rates, as on Monday next he will remove to his new, elegant, and commodious store.

CORNER OF 1 AND SEVENTH STREET, where he will open an entirely fresh assortment of Dry Goods of the best description. All accounts rendered, up to the present time, the undersigned will esteem a special favor to obtain a settlement.

PLUMBER'S DAGUERREAN ROOM, Over Todd's Hat Store, Penn. avenue. THE Pictures taken at this establishment cannot possibly be excelled, as the apparatus and chemicals used are of the best description; consequently, a bad picture is an impossibility. Visitors will find every precaution taken for their comfort, and the charges, which are low, vary in proportion to the style. The rooms are beautifully fitted up, and contain portraits of hundreds of celebrated public characters, and are always open for the examination of visitors.

FASHIONABLE BOOT AND SHOE No. 34, Opposite Centre Market. THE subscriber respectfully calls the attention of the public generally to his NEW STOCK of GOODS, just received. They comprise all kinds, from French importations to the best description of home made articles, suitable for ladies and gentlemen of the most fastidious taste.

FALL STYLES OF HATS AND CAPS. MATINGLY, Fashionable Hatter, No. 494 Washington Place, Seventh street, invites his friends and the public to examine his large assortment of Hats and Caps for gentlemen, youths, and children, before purchasing elsewhere.

BRIGGS, HALL & CO., Engineers and General Machinists, corner of Virginia avenue and Ninth street west, Washington, District of Columbia.

J. H. JOHNSON, Family Grocer, corner of Seventh and E streets, No. 459, is being constantly supplied