

Business Notices.

Constant writing for six months is done cheaper with Gold Pens than with Steel Pens; therefore, it is economy to use Gold Pens.

EVANS' EXTENSIVE CLOTHING WAREHOUSE.

The immense stock of two of the largest wholesale houses in the city.

WINTER CLOTHING--The cheapest, the best assortment, new stock, best styles, &c., &c.

KNOX IS STILL AHEAD OF COMPETITION. Always assembling novel and cheap for the public.

IMMENSE REDUCTION!

LADIES' GOLD HUNTING WATCHES.

BLISTERED FEET, after a long march, are soothed and quickly healed by HOLLOWAY'S PAIN EXPELLER.

HUMPHREY'S HOMEOPATHIC SPECIFIC No. 28.

LADIES' BALNEATING GAITERS BY CANTRELL'S.

HOLLOWAY'S OINTMENT AND PILLS will cure any gonorrhea or lacyard wound.

New-York Daily Tribune

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Wm. Curtis, the burglar, who stabbed Policeman Martin of Brooklyn to the heart, in August last, while he was undertaking to arrest him, was convicted yesterday in the Kings County Oyer and Terminer of murder in the second degree, the penalty for which is life-long imprisonment.

Gen. Dix has received dispatches advising him that the Rebels in Accomac and Northampton Counties of Virginia are thoroughly disorganized.

It is reported that the rebels burned Warsaw, Mo., on Wednesday night, to prevent it from being used as Winter quarters.

The letter of our Turin correspondent, printed on another page, gives a clear idea of the disturbed state of Europe, and the causes which produce the political perturbations now engaging the attention of statesmen.

Four years ago, the Republicans of this city, in order to defeat Fernando Wood, supported a Tammany man for Mayor, and through their aid he was elected.

Everybody admits that George Opdyke has eminent fitness for the office of Mayor. His qualifications fully meet the requirements of the old Jeffersonian standard--honesty, capability, and fidelity to the Constitution.

termination of the Wood reign must support Opdyke, for he alone stands any chance of defeating the Mozart auto-crut.

RIGHT OF NEARER GREAT BRITAIN--MASON AND SIDDELL.

The Atlantic will drop its disguise in its eagerness to help Jeff. Davis & Co. by getting the Union into a war with Great Britain. Here is a specimen of its persistent falsehoods:

"The cowardly Abolition journals are making appeals to the [England's] mercy, deprecating her wrath, 'in a benighted man's boy, with heated breath and whistling humbles' while with fear and trembling they call on our Government and the popular press not to expatriate the toothless old lion of England, lest he may strike the nation dead with his powerful paw."

"Not a single American journal has appealed to Britain's 'mercy,' deprecating her 'wrath,' nor anything of the sort. We are anxious to know whether she will or will not reclaim Sidell and Mason, but cannot decide whether we should prefer that she would or would not do it. If she does it, she puts herself flagrantly in the wrong throughout a generation, and confesses that our fathers' resistance to her impudent, right of search, &c., was emphatically and eminently right. We confess to a pretty strong desire to see her on record as a champion of a liberal interpretation of Maritime Law and Neutral Rights. We do not know nor ask whether President Lincoln would in any case surrender Messrs. Sidell and Mason on her demand; but if he should, he will have won an immense triumph for the cause which is traditionally and naturally our country's, by having compelled her to take ground which will afford us a valuable precedent hereafter.

On the whole, it is our impression that she will not make the demand; but it is our National interest that she should do it. What response the President will make, is quite another matter; but he can hardly so manage that our country shall not derive great and enduring advantages from the capture of the rebel Plenipotentiaries. No doubt he will do whatever is for the best.

It is not worth while to expose further the unwearied efforts of *The Herald* to extricate the rebels from their dilemma by plunging the country into a war with Great Britain. Here is a specimen of its habitual language:

"We ask no favors from England. We simply demand justice; and if she will not yield that we will fight her, as we did before. The true way to avert her hostility is to show a bold front, and be fully prepared for her worst."

The meaning of this is simply--"Hold out a little longer, dear Jeff! and we will have the Union involved in a war with Great Britain that will enable you to dictate your own terms of peace." And this is the end for which *The Herald* has labored since the day that it was compelled to haul down its Secession flag and run up the Stars and Stripes.

—A timorous correspondent sends us the following:

To the Editor of *The N. Y. Tribune*. Sir: Your article of to-day under the caption of "Treaties with England" again reiterates the misstatement that Henry Laurens, Ambassador from the United States to Holland, was captured on board a Dutch ship on his passage to Amsterdam.

This is entirely wrong; he was captured on board an American packet-ship, as the following will show:

From *The New York Mercury*, Oct. 12, 1780. Yesterday, the ship *Rally*, Capt. Mearns, from Glasgow, and which left seven weeks ago, reports that the (Congress) packet bound from Philadelphia, on which which was passengered by Mr. Henry Laurens, the President of Congress, was captured by the British frigate *Vestal*, Capt. Keppel, on the 23rd of September, on the Newfoundland station; the prize was carried into St. John's, and the vessel being found of such consequence as to warrant its being dispatched to Sir M. Baskin in person, under convoy, to England, &c.

Had she been a Dutch ship, how could an English frigate have captured her, Holland being then, and for months afterward, at peace with England? But she was built and owned in Philadelphia, and we will surely have "Treaties with England." G. W.

—We assure G. W. that there will be no serious trouble with England, for Mason and Sidell are not worth it. If Great Britain can show good reason for claiming them, they will be given up; but we do not believe she can.

INTERVENTION IN MEXICO.

The particular bearing which the proposed French, Spanish, and English Expedition against Mexico has on what is called the Monroe doctrine, can scarcely be determined until the nature and object of that expedition are more fully developed than is at present the case. The Monroe doctrine, as stated by President Monroe in his Annual Message, December 2, 1823, was this: That the United States did not propose to interfere in any manner with the existing colonies or dependencies of European powers in this hemisphere.

"But with the Governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration, and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by an European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."

The significance and the pertinency of this declaration depended in a great measure on the peculiar circumstances of the period at which it was put forth. The despotic powers of Europe in 1823 were leagued in "holly alliance" for the suppression of Liberalism not only in their own dominions, but among their neighbors, and there was reason to apprehend that their system of intervention and repression might be extended to this continent, to the Spanish American republics which had just asserted their independence of Spain. That power, it will be remembered, did not till long subsequently acknowledge the independence of its revolted colonies, and in fact several years later than 1823 endeavored by force of arms to recover its lost dominion, over Mexico. The new republics were yet weak and unstable, and would doubtless have been easily subdued if Spain had been supported by the direct intervention of the fleets and armies of the Great Powers.

The circumstances of these Republics are now totally different. However feeble and distracted may be their condition, their independence is no longer in question. Spain has long ago renounced all claims to their allegiance; and the present movement of that Power and her allies against Mexico is simply a joint expedition to obtain redress for injuries. By a convention signed at London Oct. 31, the three Powers, France, Spain, and Great Britain, agree to employ their forces to persuade, or if need be, compel, the Government of Mexico to pay certain debts, and to make due reparation for insults and injuries which it has in past times inflicted on French, Spanish, and British subjects. To effect this, it is proposed to occupy Vera Cruz, and such other parts on the coast as may be deemed expedient, and to collect duties, of which a certain amount will be paid to the Mexican Government for its current expenses, and the remainder retained by the Allies until their respective claims are satisfied. But it is expressly stipulated in the convention that neither of the three Powers shall seek any territorial or special advantages for themselves, and that they shall not interfere with the internal Government of Mexico in any manner whatever. The convention also contains a provision for an invitation to the Government of the United States to participate in the intervention, for the purpose of obtaining payment of the claims of our own citizens against Mexico.

On the face of it, this expedition is a legitimate measure, such as any nation has a right to use against another for the redress of grievances, and in no way conflicts with or infringes upon the Monroe doctrine. There can be no question that the subjects of France, Spain and Great Britain have been grossly outraged and persistently wronged by Mexico, and it is only reasonable that their Governments should interpose for their protection and redress. There is nothing equivocal, so far as yet appears, in the intervention, except the fact that it is entered upon at a time when the Government of the United States is embarrassed with a great civil war. The fact that it is a joint intervention of three great powers, so far from affording any ground of apprehension or distrust to the United States, may be rather regarded as a favorable circumstance. Their mutual jealousies and conflicting interests can be confidently relied on to keep the enterprise within bounds, and to insure moderation and forbearance in its conduct.

SKETCH OF FERNANDO WOOD ACCEPTS.

The sketch which we print this morning of the little speech made by Fernando Wood to his followers yesterday when they went through the form of tendering him the renomination for the Mayoralty, is decidedly one of the choicest bits of unblushing effrontery, which we have ever read. The position, he said, was one of great importance, and so honorable as to be worthy of a struggle to attain it; but he was satisfied it could confer no additional honor upon him.

He had filed the office three terms, and during that time it had degenerated to a mere clerkship. With power to reform abuses he would serve again, and build up such a monument for himself as he might well be proud to bequeath to posterity. But otherwise he could not accept the position. The claims of his family, his personal inclinations, the fact that under present circumstances he could render no good to the public nor help his friends, all conspired to make him decline; but the truth was New-York was the hub of the American universe, her influence would be potent in the settlement of the grav. questions now agitating the country, and he clung to the Union, and hoped to assist in its restoration. The people of New-York made him what he is, and they had a right to claim his services. So, all things considered, in spite of his family claims, personal inclinations, want of power, and all the rest, he would accept, to avert the disaster which would follow the calamity of a sectional party again having possession of New-York. In conclusion he hoped the Legislature would restore to the office the power which it requires to make it efficient.

conduct on one occasion was so flagrant, that in order to prevent a repetition of it, the voting places were split up into over 200 little districts, entailing an annual cost upon the city of nearly \$100,000 for holding elections alone. By the aid of his trained bands he at length brought the affairs of the city into such a state that legislative interference became imperative, to save us from absolute anarchy. The Metropolitan Police Commission was established and the Mayor deprived of a controlling influence in its management. We all know how violently he resisted it, even to riot and bloodshed, till the city seemed on the verge of revolution. Stripped of his power for evil in that direction, he has turned his attention to Hackley contracts, the disposal of Street Commissionerships and City Chamberlaincies in such a manner as to disgrace his office, and lay himself open to impeachment.

Judging him by the past, what might we expect if he could succeed in recovering the power of which he has been deprived, and for which he longs so ardently? Suppose the police had been his plant tools as formerly, who believes that he would have contented himself with the message which he sent to the Common Council in January last, advocating the secession of New-York City from the State, wherein he says: "If the Confederacy is broken up, the Government is dissolved, it behooves every distinct community, as well as every individual, to take care of themselves." What was that but an invitation to all the ruffians of the Five Points to emerge from their dens, and despoil Fifth Avenue? He continues: "When 'Disunion has become a certain and fixed fact, why may not New-York disrupt the bands which bind her to a venal and corrupt master, to a people that have plundered her revenues, attempted to ruin her commerce, taken away the power of self-government, and destroyed the Confederacy of which she was the proud Empire City?"

And then he goes on to advise that New-York set up for a Free City. Who doubts, if he had the power, that Fernando Wood would have raised the standard of rebellion here in the midst of us. His correspondence with Senator Toombs, of Georgia, on the 25th of the same month, shows what he would have done had he been able:

To His Honor Mayor Wood: In reply to your dispatch, I regret to say that, intended for and consigned to the State of Georgia, have been seized by the police of this State, but that the City of New-York should in no way be made responsible for the outrage.

NEW LORDS, NEW LAWS.

Gen. Fremont's Missouri Proclamation having been "modified," and the General himself suppressed, Gen. Hunter is sent to Kansas, and Gen. Halleck, just from California, succeeds to the chief command at St. Louis. Hereupon the telegraph informs us that:

General Halleck has issued orders that, in consequence of important information respecting the number and condition of fugitives being conveyed to the enemy by fugitive slaves, such persons shall be hereafter permitted to enter the lines of any camp, nor any forces on the march, and any one within such lines to be immediately excluded therefrom.

We call that good—decidedly. Fugitive slaves—that is, fugitives from rebel masters—are likely to run back into Slavery, carrying important information respecting our forces, so Gen. Halleck—has them all safely watched and guarded!—not he! He is so afraid that they will escape from our lines and give information to the enemy, that he turns them all out and compels them to go somewhere! The Hibernian mob that, out of hatred to a banker, seized all his notes they could find in the shops of Dublin, and burnt them on the spot, are outside in perspicacity and the adaptation of means to ends by Gen. Halleck.

It would be sheer affectation to pretend not to see that this order is a concession to Slavery, and that its true object is dismembered and would fain be concealed. Nobody on earth will believe that one fugitive slave has carried information to the Rebels where ten have brought the like to our camps. But suppose the contrary were the fact, what then? The obvious remedy for the asserted evil is not to repel all fugitives coming from the enemy to us, but to take good care that none shall escape from our camps to him. White deserters are often spies for the service they have left, but

no general ever thought of repelling the approach of deserters. On the contrary, they are always welcomed, with a perfect knowledge that they may be spies, every general taking the chances of getting more information out of them that they can glean in his camp and get away with. He questions them sharply, believes so much as he chooses of their replies, treats them civilly, unless he detects them in treachery, and takes good care that they do not desert back again. He would like to have the enemy send over half his force as sham deserters, and would gladly take the risk of their deceiving and outwitting him.

Gen. Halleck has invented a very different method. He is so afraid some negro will outwit him and return laden with information to Dixie that he drives every one out of his lines and forbids any more to come in! To such innocence, a resolve never to bathe for fear you might get wet, is the very acme of shrewdness.

Gen. Halleck is of course fishing for the good opinion of the rebel slaveholders. Whenever he gets an encouraging nibble, we trust he will let us know it.

THE GREAT PROBLEM.

As we will not admit, not even in argument, that success can await this Southern rebellion, or that any other result can follow the struggle than the complete exposure and defeat of its infamous purpose, so we hold that the destruction of Slavery, sooner or later, must be its inevitable consequence. In their insane ambition, and under the pressure of the natural laws of political economy, against which they struggle in vain, these Southern madmen have pulled the house down over their own heads. It may not, indeed, all come down with a single crash; but whether it shall fall into instantaneous ruin, or shall crumble away piecemeal, now one section and now another, that it is shaken to its very foundations and cannot, even with the most skillful props, be sustained much longer, can hardly admit of a doubt. Some persons, who have data for their conclusions, estimate that in Missouri alone, within the last eight or nine months, the slave population of about 90,000 is diminished by 50,000; of these, 25,000 have left their masters, and disposed of themselves according to their own will and pleasure, and the other 25,000 have been hurried off to the South from a market where, it is presumed, they will presently be an utter loss. As it is in Missouri, so it is in all the border States to a greater or less extent. In all of them a tenure of the masters upon the slaves has been broken in thousands of cases, and in many thousands more the masters have rid themselves of property whose value, they fear, will soon cease altogether. The system, in a whole tier of States from Missouri to Delaware, though not yet plucked up by the roots and cast away, is loosened and broken so that its leaves and branches are withering and shriveling, and it must presently die. The same causes that have produced these results in the border States are about to be introduced, we trust, into those south of them, and will have like consequences. Whether the Federal Government resorts to emancipation or not, as a military necessity, events are proclaiming that a death-blow has been struck at Slavery, whether we like it or not. It may not fall this month or next, this year or next year, in the whole South, but a system so pernicious, politically, morally, and economically, cannot long survive the inroads of destruction when once commenced.

To raise four millions of people from Slavery to civilization, whether in one or in ten years, is a problem which it is best not to leave to the solution of chance. Left to the slow influence of natural law, it would work itself out, undoubtedly, to a happy result; but wisdom, guided by experience, may forestall the delays and disasters of a transition period, and by aiding and directing the blind forces of nature produce in five years the harmony and prosperity which nature unassisted would take a quarter of a century to create. Great Britain, in decreeing emancipation in the West Indies, remembered only that every human being is entitled to freedom, but forgot that centuries of slavery was a poor preparation for the new dispensation. She gave liberty to the slave, but failed to recognize the fact that the slave is a mere child in intellectual and moral development, and that intelligence is the chief condition of perfect freedom. It was wise to relieve him from the degradation of slavery, even though a generation should perish before the negro learned those habits of self-control and self-government which become the freeman. But it would have been wiser to take into consideration his actual ignorance and imbecility, and by a guardianship of law and of circumstance to have fitted him at once for the duties and responsibilities of free citizenship. The negro of the West Indies had, it is true, worked out the problem for himself almost unassisted, but it has taken him twenty years to do so. Let us profit by her mistakes as well as by her example, and when we decree liberty to the American slave make it a boon that shall not be merely a heritage for the future, but a blessing to him and to us to-day, one which we may never repeat, even for a moment, of having given.

One step, perhaps the first we can take, is to make labor honorable by example, and desirable because of the rich fruits it may be made to yield to the laborer himself. The South must be opened to free labor. It is idle to say that white men cannot bear the exposure of that climate, for the fact is that they always have borne it, as laborers, and are doing so more and more every year. Mr. Russell mentions in one of his earlier letters, in a description of the Houmas plantation, that there are twenty miles of deep ditching upon it, exclusive of canal, the work of Irish navvies. He naively adds, that "the work is so severe for African thews, and experience has shown it a bad economy to overtask the slave."

In other words, a negro costs money, and when the planters have work to do that kills men, they prefer Irishmen on wages—a consideration on the part of our "Southern brethren" which our Irish fellow-citizens, who

have been inveigled by such papers as *The Herald*, *The Daily News*, and *The Journal of Commerce* into upholding Slavery, may lay aside for future use. But the evidence on the point in question is important. It was testified long before by Mr. Olmsted, who says that in one of the best cotton districts in the country, a railroad contractor, even in Midsummer, substituted Irish and German laborers for negroes, and with great advantage. He asserts that he has seen hundreds of white men at work in the cotton-fields, poor wretches indeed—the "mean whites"—mean, poor, and wretched, however, not because they labor sometimes, but because they labor so little. But more conclusive still is the testimony of figures. The census of 1850 shows that in the nine Southernmost States, where, it is asserted, there can be no cultivation of the soil except by slaves, there were 800,000 engaged in agriculture, over 1,000,000 in out-door labor, and of the 900,000 persons engaged strictly in the cultivation of cotton, 100,000 were free whites.

If, then, we take for granted, as statistics and observation both show, that white men can labor in a Southern climate, the next question is, is such labor profitable? It hardly needs an answer; for wherever the unpaid labor of slaves at a high price can be made productive enough, not only for the support of their own class, but for the support of the non-producing class of masters, the labor of those who work for themselves is sure to be profitable. So great is the return upon the culture of the great Southern staple that free labor has been, of late years, more and more applied to it, notwithstanding the presence of Slavery always makes labor of any sort degrading. One of the causes of this rebellion is the inevitable necessity, which the South could not fail to recognize, that free labor must gradually encroach upon and drive out slave labor. The profit upon raising cotton is so great that it has raised the price of slaves, thus diminishing the profit to slave-owners, who were compelled to purchase laborers at the enhanced value. At the same time the certainty of large profits has overcome the prejudice against labor, and men who work with their own hands have come in competition with those who work only with the hands of others. It becomes a necessity, therefore, with slaveholders to extend their dominion where lands are cheap, and to reopen the slave-trade that they may work these cheap lands with cheap negroes, with whom free laborers cannot compete. The result would be to diminish the price of cotton, but its culture would still be remunerative with lands and slaves at a low price, though unprofitable to free white labor. The purchase of the Territory of Louisiana gave a new lease to the system of Slavery, even without the Foreign Slave-Trade; the annexation of Texas gave it another; and its upholders knew that its perpetuation—in which their political supremacy was involved—depended upon its still further expansion South and West. They knew as well as we did that the Republican party had no intention of interfering with Slavery directly; but they also knew that the triumph of the policy of the non-extension of the system put a limit to its existence, though it might be a distant one, leaving it unprotected against the gradual encroachment of free labor, and the working of the natural laws that must inevitably undermine it when they are permitted to have full sway. The attempt at the Dissolution of the Union and the establishment of a Southern Confederacy has only been delayed until the North gave unmistakable evidence, by the success of a Free-Soil party, that the South could no longer count upon the perpetuation of Slavery by its indefinite and unlimited extension into new territory now possessed and to be acquired hereafter. The rebellion is one against the Federal Constitution. But it has brought into action new forces which must insure the overthrow of the system it was meant to protect.

What ought we to do? Manifestly not to leave the issue to chance, but to hasten a new and prosperous order of things by wise statesmanship. Free labor, and not idleness, should follow the disappearance of Slavery. We need cotton for our own manufactures, and still more as an article of export. There is no necessity, in the nature of the case, of sacrificing a staple worth \$200,000,000 because heretofore it has been raised by unpaid labor which is to be no longer at our command. On the contrary, the value of the staple ought to be increased, not only by offering the stimulus of wages to those who have heretofore worked in a shiftless way without it, but by giving to them the example, and to the production the advantage, of the application of free and intelligent labor of Northern working men. The author of a pamphlet recently published in Boston, entitled "Cheap Cotton by Free Labor," estimates the annual cost of a slave to his master to be \$240. This would give \$20 per month as the wages which a cotton planter could afford to pay the free laborer. He estimates also eight bales of 500 pounds each as the product of each hand under the slave system. Conclusions based upon the cost and the product of slave labor are hardly to be relied upon as evidence of the profit that could be made by free labor in the culture of cotton, not only because we know that its cultivation under the present system is much more profitable than these figures would make it, but because the product of enlightened free labor cannot be measured by that of slaves. The great point is, whether the climate of the Cotton States will admit of out-door work by white men, and of that there can be no doubt. We know, moreover, that free-labor cotton has been produced by Friends in North Carolina for many years, commanding a higher price than the ordinary article; that the Germans of Texas find it a profitable crop; that its cultivation is not more difficult than corn; that any Northern laborer could make not less than ten bales of cotton, and raise wheat, corn and hogs enough beside to support a family; and if with this we reckon the labor of an ordinary family, it is evident that the cultivation of cotton would draw off from the North a large emigration to the cotton-fields, should they be once opened to free labor, as far more enticing