

WASHINGTON.
"Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable."
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1853.

THE WARS OF THE ROSES.

Our readers are aware of the dimensions which have sprung up in the ranks of the Democratic party of the State of New York since the Federal offices in that State had been distributed by the new Administration, and of the consequent disaffection of one of the wings, which alleged a disregard of their own claims to preference, and the conferring of an undue portion of the spoils upon their adversaries.

We certainly do not regard this party quarrel as a public misfortune, and shall not affect a regret which we do not feel. On the contrary, we are convinced that the country and its true interests will gain just in proportion as the strength and influence of the New York factionists suffer decline, from whatever cause. The quarrel, moreover, which has now broken out can command neither respect nor sympathy out of their own pale, as it is evidently a mercenary one; for it is very certain that there had been no offices to bestow there would have been no falling out among the allies. The quarrel is the more disreputable inasmuch as the treaty of peace formed at Baltimore professed to have in view only "principle." The sequel proves that it was principle, but only that sordid kind spoken of by the South Carolinian, the "cohesive principle of public plunder." We know of nothing as disreputable in the history of party quarrels, unless we might cite the squabble which arose and raged in Virginia in the month of March between party leaders in different sections of the State, accusing each other of having obtained for their respective sections (in Virginia the party is a unit) an undue proportion of the crumbs of office.

All the factions of Democracy, from Maine to Texas, came up to the Baltimore Convention, and, laying their arms on its altar, swore to each other "eternal friendship;" that is, a friendship long enough to defeat the Whigs and get possession of the Government. By a united effort they elected a gentleman to the Presidency more honorable than those who put him up; for they wanted a tool, and he, though he may be the President of a faction, refuses to be the President of a faction; and now that neither one nor the other can monopolize the spoils, those who claim all, denounce their allies, fly to the arms which they so lately laid on the sacred Baltimore platform, and threaten open rebellion. This is party principle and the morality of faction. Let us may be accused of speaking too lightly of the honesty of Democratic coalitions, we quote the following passage from a late speech of Governor Dickinson, descriptive of the party negotiation of 1849, as we presume that what can with truth be said of its character in 1849 may be applied to it four years later:

"In 1849 these same men [Van Buren Barnburners] professed themselves anxious for what they called the 'union' of the Democratic party. A great many good men, a considerable number of bad men, and certainly many weak men, seconded their efforts to bring it about. I never called it a 'union.' I always denominated it as a coalition of the leaders for the sake of the spoils. It certainly was not a union of the masses. It was so far removed, indeed, that the coalition might have had the smallpox without infecting the masses. It was an unholy bargain, commenced in corruption, and I forebore that it would end in evil. It was not what I did not desire harmony. I was strongly in favor of a healthy union upon great and sound principles; but when I saw an attempt made to obliterate the Democratic party, I knew that with the price money in that attempt there could be no peace. It was not that I was personally hostile to any man or to any set of men; no true Democrat can be personally hostile to any individual who has differed with him on certain points when he comes back and repents; but I saw that their professions were insincere, and I declined to trust them. The Spanish have a proverb, 'be wary of a reconciled enemy;' and it is a good one in politics as in private life. The coalition was formed; and I saw that it was made up of party leaders who had agreed upon union only as a means by which they could secure an equal share of the offices. I recommended to my Democratic friends to have nothing to do with the bargain, but if they wished to enter into such an arrangement, to get — and [two Whigs] to run the party by contract, and to give them half the offices. And now what has been the result of the coalition? From that time to the present Baltimore resolutions have had to be written so as to read both ways, lest they should tread on any individual's toes. And thus it ever be when two parties endeavor to act together when they cannot agree in principles. It is basely dishonest—shamefully hypocritical."

The late truce and this renewed feud in the New York party resembles the reconciliation of the Scotch laird on his death-bed with his ancient enemy: he shook hands and forgave him, but added, "remember, if I get well this is to go for nothing."

It was not our intention, however, to write a homily on New York politics or party divisions, but simply to introduce the subjoined articles, with a view to keep our readers advised of the progress and varying phases of the New York party war. It may be proper to state that the gentlemen whose letters are given below belong to the party of the Union Compromise Democrats, called formerly Hunkers, now Hard-Shells, or Terriered; their adversaries, whom they allege to have been too much favored by the President, are the Free-soil Van Buren Democrats, formerly called Barnburners, now Soft Shells, and Unterrified. We believe this to be a correct classification; but New York party nomenclature, ever changing as it is, requires some study to keep pace with it, and we are not sure about our accuracy. It is but fair to give the Administration the benefit of the remarks of the Union in reply to Messrs. O'Connor and Bronson.

FROM THE WASHINGTON UNION OF SEPTEMBER 27.

We publish below the letters of Messrs. BRONSON and O'CONNOR, written in reply to invitations from the Committee of Arrangements to attend and address the ratification meeting held by the Democrats at Tammany Hall, in New York, on Friday evening last. These gentlemen have furnished copies of their letters to the New York Herald, from which paper we extract them. The fact that both of these gentlemen occupy highly responsible positions under the present Administration, as well as the fact that they enjoy deservedly high reputations for talents and devotion to Democratic principles, will attract to their letters more than ordinary attention. It will be seen that they take explicit and decided positions against the ticket nominated by the Union Democrats, and in favor of that put forth by the Hards. In their reasons for preferring the latter to the former ticket we see nothing different from the general grounds on which their friends at Syracuse declined to co-operate with their former political associates. The only difference that we discover is that there is a clearness and straightforward-

ness in stating their positions which gives to their letters an appearance of candor that does not characterize all the proceedings of their friends. These gentlemen cannot reconcile it to their consciences to continue longer the political connexion which has heretofore existed between them and the leaders of the Union Democrats.

They are unwilling, by co-operating with them, to concede that they are honest and sincere in abandoning their former erroneous positions and adopting the true political creed. It strikes us that there is a severity in this judgment which leaves no room for repentance or reformation. But neither of these gentlemen explain the reasons why they have selected this particular time for dissolving a connexion from which they are now enjoying high official honors and benefits. It is not shown that it would be a disadvantage to them to continue to hold the position of one of the wings, which alleged a disregard of their own claims to preference, and the conferring of an undue portion of the spoils upon their adversaries.

We certainly do not regard this party quarrel as a public misfortune, and shall not affect a regret which we do not feel. On the contrary, we are convinced that the country and its true interests will gain just in proportion as the strength and influence of the New York factionists suffer decline, from whatever cause. The quarrel, moreover, which has now broken out can command neither respect nor sympathy out of their own pale, as it is evidently a mercenary one; for it is very certain that there had been no offices to bestow there would have been no falling out among the allies. The quarrel is the more disreputable inasmuch as the treaty of peace formed at Baltimore professed to have in view only "principle." The sequel proves that it was principle, but only that sordid kind spoken of by the South Carolinian, the "cohesive principle of public plunder." We know of nothing as disreputable in the history of party quarrels, unless we might cite the squabble which arose and raged in Virginia in the month of March between party leaders in different sections of the State, accusing each other of having obtained for their respective sections (in Virginia the party is a unit) an undue proportion of the crumbs of office.

All the factions of Democracy, from Maine to Texas, came up to the Baltimore Convention, and, laying their arms on its altar, swore to each other "eternal friendship;" that is, a friendship long enough to defeat the Whigs and get possession of the Government. By a united effort they elected a gentleman to the Presidency more honorable than those who put him up; for they wanted a tool, and he, though he may be the President of a faction, refuses to be the President of a faction; and now that neither one nor the other can monopolize the spoils, those who claim all, denounce their allies, fly to the arms which they so lately laid on the sacred Baltimore platform, and threaten open rebellion. This is party principle and the morality of faction. Let us may be accused of speaking too lightly of the honesty of Democratic coalitions, we quote the following passage from a late speech of Governor Dickinson, descriptive of the party negotiation of 1849, as we presume that what can with truth be said of its character in 1849 may be applied to it four years later:

"In 1849 these same men [Van Buren Barnburners] professed themselves anxious for what they called the 'union' of the Democratic party. A great many good men, a considerable number of bad men, and certainly many weak men, seconded their efforts to bring it about. I never called it a 'union.' I always denominated it as a coalition of the leaders for the sake of the spoils. It certainly was not a union of the masses. It was so far removed, indeed, that the coalition might have had the smallpox without infecting the masses. It was an unholy bargain, commenced in corruption, and I forebore that it would end in evil. It was not what I did not desire harmony. I was strongly in favor of a healthy union upon great and sound principles; but when I saw an attempt made to obliterate the Democratic party, I knew that with the price money in that attempt there could be no peace. It was not that I was personally hostile to any man or to any set of men; no true Democrat can be personally hostile to any individual who has differed with him on certain points when he comes back and repents; but I saw that their professions were insincere, and I declined to trust them. The Spanish have a proverb, 'be wary of a reconciled enemy;' and it is a good one in politics as in private life. The coalition was formed; and I saw that it was made up of party leaders who had agreed upon union only as a means by which they could secure an equal share of the offices. I recommended to my Democratic friends to have nothing to do with the bargain, but if they wished to enter into such an arrangement, to get — and [two Whigs] to run the party by contract, and to give them half the offices. And now what has been the result of the coalition? From that time to the present Baltimore resolutions have had to be written so as to read both ways, lest they should tread on any individual's toes. And thus it ever be when two parties endeavor to act together when they cannot agree in principles. It is basely dishonest—shamefully hypocritical."

The late truce and this renewed feud in the New York party resembles the reconciliation of the Scotch laird on his death-bed with his ancient enemy: he shook hands and forgave him, but added, "remember, if I get well this is to go for nothing."

It was not our intention, however, to write a homily on New York politics or party divisions, but simply to introduce the subjoined articles, with a view to keep our readers advised of the progress and varying phases of the New York party war. It may be proper to state that the gentlemen whose letters are given below belong to the party of the Union Compromise Democrats, called formerly Hunkers, now Hard-Shells, or Terriered; their adversaries, whom they allege to have been too much favored by the President, are the Free-soil Van Buren Democrats, formerly called Barnburners, now Soft Shells, and Unterrified. We believe this to be a correct classification; but New York party nomenclature, ever changing as it is, requires some study to keep pace with it, and we are not sure about our accuracy. It is but fair to give the Administration the benefit of the remarks of the Union in reply to Messrs. O'Connor and Bronson.

FROM THE WASHINGTON UNION OF SEPTEMBER 27.

We publish below the letters of Messrs. BRONSON and O'CONNOR, written in reply to invitations from the Committee of Arrangements to attend and address the ratification meeting held by the Democrats at Tammany Hall, in New York, on Friday evening last. These gentlemen have furnished copies of their letters to the New York Herald, from which paper we extract them. The fact that both of these gentlemen occupy highly responsible positions under the present Administration, as well as the fact that they enjoy deservedly high reputations for talents and devotion to Democratic principles, will attract to their letters more than ordinary attention. It will be seen that they take explicit and decided positions against the ticket nominated by the Union Democrats, and in favor of that put forth by the Hards. In their reasons for preferring the latter to the former ticket we see nothing different from the general grounds on which their friends at Syracuse declined to co-operate with their former political associates. The only difference that we discover is that there is a clearness and straightforward-

ness in stating their positions which gives to their letters an appearance of candor that does not characterize all the proceedings of their friends. These gentlemen cannot reconcile it to their consciences to continue longer the political connexion which has heretofore existed between them and the leaders of the Union Democrats.

They are unwilling, by co-operating with them, to concede that they are honest and sincere in abandoning their former erroneous positions and adopting the true political creed. It strikes us that there is a severity in this judgment which leaves no room for repentance or reformation. But neither of these gentlemen explain the reasons why they have selected this particular time for dissolving a connexion from which they are now enjoying high official honors and benefits. It is not shown that it would be a disadvantage to them to continue to hold the position of one of the wings, which alleged a disregard of their own claims to preference, and the conferring of an undue portion of the spoils upon their adversaries.

We certainly do not regard this party quarrel as a public misfortune, and shall not affect a regret which we do not feel. On the contrary, we are convinced that the country and its true interests will gain just in proportion as the strength and influence of the New York factionists suffer decline, from whatever cause. The quarrel, moreover, which has now broken out can command neither respect nor sympathy out of their own pale, as it is evidently a mercenary one; for it is very certain that there had been no offices to bestow there would have been no falling out among the allies. The quarrel is the more disreputable inasmuch as the treaty of peace formed at Baltimore professed to have in view only "principle." The sequel proves that it was principle, but only that sordid kind spoken of by the South Carolinian, the "cohesive principle of public plunder." We know of nothing as disreputable in the history of party quarrels, unless we might cite the squabble which arose and raged in Virginia in the month of March between party leaders in different sections of the State, accusing each other of having obtained for their respective sections (in Virginia the party is a unit) an undue proportion of the crumbs of office.

All the factions of Democracy, from Maine to Texas, came up to the Baltimore Convention, and, laying their arms on its altar, swore to each other "eternal friendship;" that is, a friendship long enough to defeat the Whigs and get possession of the Government. By a united effort they elected a gentleman to the Presidency more honorable than those who put him up; for they wanted a tool, and he, though he may be the President of a faction, refuses to be the President of a faction; and now that neither one nor the other can monopolize the spoils, those who claim all, denounce their allies, fly to the arms which they so lately laid on the sacred Baltimore platform, and threaten open rebellion. This is party principle and the morality of faction. Let us may be accused of speaking too lightly of the honesty of Democratic coalitions, we quote the following passage from a late speech of Governor Dickinson, descriptive of the party negotiation of 1849, as we presume that what can with truth be said of its character in 1849 may be applied to it four years later:

"In 1849 these same men [Van Buren Barnburners] professed themselves anxious for what they called the 'union' of the Democratic party. A great many good men, a considerable number of bad men, and certainly many weak men, seconded their efforts to bring it about. I never called it a 'union.' I always denominated it as a coalition of the leaders for the sake of the spoils. It certainly was not a union of the masses. It was so far removed, indeed, that the coalition might have had the smallpox without infecting the masses. It was an unholy bargain, commenced in corruption, and I forebore that it would end in evil. It was not what I did not desire harmony. I was strongly in favor of a healthy union upon great and sound principles; but when I saw an attempt made to obliterate the Democratic party, I knew that with the price money in that attempt there could be no peace. It was not that I was personally hostile to any man or to any set of men; no true Democrat can be personally hostile to any individual who has differed with him on certain points when he comes back and repents; but I saw that their professions were insincere, and I declined to trust them. The Spanish have a proverb, 'be wary of a reconciled enemy;' and it is a good one in politics as in private life. The coalition was formed; and I saw that it was made up of party leaders who had agreed upon union only as a means by which they could secure an equal share of the offices. I recommended to my Democratic friends to have nothing to do with the bargain, but if they wished to enter into such an arrangement, to get — and [two Whigs] to run the party by contract, and to give them half the offices. And now what has been the result of the coalition? From that time to the present Baltimore resolutions have had to be written so as to read both ways, lest they should tread on any individual's toes. And thus it ever be when two parties endeavor to act together when they cannot agree in principles. It is basely dishonest—shamefully hypocritical."

The late truce and this renewed feud in the New York party resembles the reconciliation of the Scotch laird on his death-bed with his ancient enemy: he shook hands and forgave him, but added, "remember, if I get well this is to go for nothing."

It was not our intention, however, to write a homily on New York politics or party divisions, but simply to introduce the subjoined articles, with a view to keep our readers advised of the progress and varying phases of the New York party war. It may be proper to state that the gentlemen whose letters are given below belong to the party of the Union Compromise Democrats, called formerly Hunkers, now Hard-Shells, or Terriered; their adversaries, whom they allege to have been too much favored by the President, are the Free-soil Van Buren Democrats, formerly called Barnburners, now Soft Shells, and Unterrified. We believe this to be a correct classification; but New York party nomenclature, ever changing as it is, requires some study to keep pace with it, and we are not sure about our accuracy. It is but fair to give the Administration the benefit of the remarks of the Union in reply to Messrs. O'Connor and Bronson.

FROM THE WASHINGTON UNION OF SEPTEMBER 27.

We publish below the letters of Messrs. BRONSON and O'CONNOR, written in reply to invitations from the Committee of Arrangements to attend and address the ratification meeting held by the Democrats at Tammany Hall, in New York, on Friday evening last. These gentlemen have furnished copies of their letters to the New York Herald, from which paper we extract them. The fact that both of these gentlemen occupy highly responsible positions under the present Administration, as well as the fact that they enjoy deservedly high reputations for talents and devotion to Democratic principles, will attract to their letters more than ordinary attention. It will be seen that they take explicit and decided positions against the ticket nominated by the Union Democrats, and in favor of that put forth by the Hards. In their reasons for preferring the latter to the former ticket we see nothing different from the general grounds on which their friends at Syracuse declined to co-operate with their former political associates. The only difference that we discover is that there is a clearness and straightforward-

ness in stating their positions which gives to their letters an appearance of candor that does not characterize all the proceedings of their friends. These gentlemen cannot reconcile it to their consciences to continue longer the political connexion which has heretofore existed between them and the leaders of the Union Democrats.

They are unwilling, by co-operating with them, to concede that they are honest and sincere in abandoning their former erroneous positions and adopting the true political creed. It strikes us that there is a severity in this judgment which leaves no room for repentance or reformation. But neither of these gentlemen explain the reasons why they have selected this particular time for dissolving a connexion from which they are now enjoying high official honors and benefits. It is not shown that it would be a disadvantage to them to continue to hold the position of one of the wings, which alleged a disregard of their own claims to preference, and the conferring of an undue portion of the spoils upon their adversaries.

We certainly do not regard this party quarrel as a public misfortune, and shall not affect a regret which we do not feel. On the contrary, we are convinced that the country and its true interests will gain just in proportion as the strength and influence of the New York factionists suffer decline, from whatever cause. The quarrel, moreover, which has now broken out can command neither respect nor sympathy out of their own pale, as it is evidently a mercenary one; for it is very certain that there had been no offices to bestow there would have been no falling out among the allies. The quarrel is the more disreputable inasmuch as the treaty of peace formed at Baltimore professed to have in view only "principle." The sequel proves that it was principle, but only that sordid kind spoken of by the South Carolinian, the "cohesive principle of public plunder." We know of nothing as disreputable in the history of party quarrels, unless we might cite the squabble which arose and raged in Virginia in the month of March between party leaders in different sections of the State, accusing each other of having obtained for their respective sections (in Virginia the party is a unit) an undue proportion of the crumbs of office.

THE EUROPEAN QUESTION.

On scanning our letters and newspapers received by the last steamer, and comparing the information they bring with what had been already given to our readers, we find nothing contradictory of the view of the Russo-Turkish quarrel which the Intelligence has presented editorially and in its Parisian correspondence. They were in hourly expectation in the French capital, at the moment of our last letter, of learning what reception had been given by the Czar to the modification which the Porte ventured to make to the note of settlement that issued from the Conference of Vienna; but the response of the Emperor had not reached Paris when the steamer left Liverpool.

As the *Moniteur* had officially declared that the amendments of the Sultan to that note were "without importance," none of the French journals were bold enough to maintain the contrary. Some of them were silent; but most of them, and especially the Government ones, with the facility of Polonius, swear that the modifications of the Sultan are "like a camel," or are "backed like a weasel," or "very like a whale," according as we may please the *Moniteur* to assert. As we have published the official Turkish note on the subject, our readers will have seen that in Constantinople and the Council of the Porte the modifications are deemed serious and of prime importance; and we should think that any intelligent unbiased person who felt interest enough in the matter to examine the modifications, would perceive that they are so. We are not surprised, therefore, at the confidence so generally expressed abroad that the Czar, who said that the note of Vienna would be satisfactory to him if accepted "without change" by the Sultan, will now declare the amendments important. Such a declaration, and at the same time a withdrawal of his troops from the Danubian Principalities, as though the object of the occupation were attained, would indicate an infirmity of purpose on the part of the Russian potentate of which he has not hitherto evinced any disposition, and to which no display of force that has yet been made would seem sufficient to compel him.

That the amendments are not really as unimportant as is professed by the four mediating Powers seems to be countenanced by the extent of their anger against the Sultan, whose dignity and sovereignty were summarily disposed of without his concurrence in the Vienna note, for undertaking to exercise the independence of demanding modifications. If independent, he had a right to make them. If really unimportant and merely verbal, why such displeasure at them?

It strikes us that this exercise of independence by the Sultan has placed the protecting Powers—two of them at least—in an embarrassing position. They are doubtless both sincerely disinclined to a flagrant war in the East at the present moment; but they would both go to war rather than permit the breaking up of the Ottoman Empire and the occupation of Constantinople by Russia. They apprehended on the outset that the designs of the Czar had even that extent, and they made in concert the admonitory or minatory naval demonstration and the offer of protection to the Porte to prevent the realization of those designs. Satisfied as they now probably are that the Emperor of Russia does not, at present at least, meditate the territorial absorption or "annexation" of European Turkey, they are willing, rather than incur the evils and the expense of war, to allow the Czar to carry his ultimatum, although he will thus acquire really important and dangerous, though not decisive and final, advantages. They therefore agreed upon the note of Vienna, which bears about the same relation to the ultimatum of the Czar that two score does to forty; and they advised the Sultan to accept that note. But the Sultan, regarding the terms of the note in its original form as a grave infringement of his sovereignty, refuses to sign it; and knowing, as he must know, his inability to contend single-handed for his religion and his empire against Russia, he ventures to dare the power of the Czar, and provoke even his advance upon Constantinople in open hostility, relying upon this, that, in spite of their disinclination to war, England and France will, for their own interests' sake, come up to his support, rather than see Russia crush the Porte and monopolize Turkey. The Sultan counts that thus, by the arms of his allies, his independence and the integrity of his Empire will be both maintained. This is perhaps a sagacious and safe calculation on the part of the Sultan, and this view appears to us to furnish a clue to the motives and probabilities of the Russo-Turkish question.

We learn that much difficulty is to be apprehended in the effort to carry out the act of the late Congress enjoining on the Executive to open negotiations with the Indians west of the Missouri, with a view to an organization of a United States Territory there. The premature agitation of the subject by the whites on the frontier is said to have produced a very unfavorable feeling in the Indian mind, which may have the tendency to delay indefinitely the desirable measure of an organization of Nebraska.

The Whig State Convention of Massachusetts met at Fitchburg yesterday and nominated Judge WASHINGTON as the Whig candidate for Governor of Massachusetts, and THOMAS C. PLUNKETT for Lieutenant Governor.

By way of Halifax we have accounts from Bermuda to the 18th instant. The yellow fever was very fatal at St. George's. Lieut. Gov. WOODFORD and fifteen officers of the fifty-sixth regiment had died. Of two hundred convicts fifty had died, and only twenty-five had escaped the fever. Two-thirds of the sappers and miners were in the hospital. JOHN M. HOWARD, the American Consul, had died.

A Government Survey of the Northern Lakes is now in progress under the direction of Capt. JOHN MACOMB, assisted by Capt. SEAMON and Lieut. REYNOLDS, Mendell, and Rose. Already the bureau at Washington has published three maps of the results of their labors, one of which embraces the whole of Lake Erie, another the west end of the same Lake, and a third the harbors about the Bass Island group. These maps are very valuable, and a great demand for them already exists, so that the bureau has distributed gratuitously one thousand copies. The publication will be continued as data for them reaches Washington. The surveys have been very minutely made, and a vast amount of information has been obtained respecting the navigation of the Lakes. Capt. Macomb and his party are now engaged upon the strait of Mackinac, which he hopes to be able to finish by the end of the current season.—North American.

MURDER WILL OUT.—The Northampton Courier says that Mary Ann, a milliner, was arrested in that town on Saturday for murdering her wife in Spencer, Worcester county, two years ago. He had been living there for nearly two years and a half, under the name of George Brown. He confessed the murder. A reward of two hundred dollars had been offered for his arrest by the Selectmen of the town. He has been committed to Worcester jail.

FOREIGN MAILS.

The following Table of Comparison, prepared at the Post Office Department, is interesting as showing that for the correspondence between Germany and the British North American Provinces, the British West Indies, Cuba, and Mexico, the United States and Prussian closed mail arrangement offers cheaper rates of communication than those charged on such correspondence when sent in the British mail.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT of the rates of postage on letters between the German-Austrian Postal Union and the following-named countries, first, when transmitted via the United States in the United States and Prussian closed mail in either direction, and, secondly, via England in the British mail:

| NAMES OF COUNTRIES. | In the United States and Prussian closed mail via the U. S. to be prepaid in full by the sender, whether the letter is sent from or received in that country. | | In the British mail, via England, optional, compulsory. | |
|---|---|------------|---|------------|
| | Cents. | Shillings. | Cents. | Shillings. |
| Canada, do, via Halifax, when desired. | 25 | | 45 | |
| Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, via the United States, when desired. | 30 | | 45 | |
| Do, via Halifax, when desired. | 20 | | 41 | |
| Newfoundland, do, via Halifax, when desired. | 24 | | 41 | |
| British Colonies and Foreign Possessions in the West Indies, &c. | | | | |
| Antigua, do, via Halifax, when desired. | 35 | | 41 | |
| Bahamas, do, via Halifax, when desired. | 25 | | 41 | |
| Barbadoes, do, via Halifax, when desired. | 25 | | 41 | |
| Caribbean, do, via Halifax, when desired. | 25 | | 41 | |
| Dominica, do, via Halifax, when desired. | 25 | | 41 | |
| Essequibo, do, via Halifax, when desired. | 25 | | 41 | |
| Grenada, do, via Halifax, when desired. | 25 | | 41 | |
| Montserrat, do, via Halifax, when desired. | 25 | | 41 | |
| Nevis, do, via Halifax, when desired. | 25 | | 41 | |
| St. Kitt's, do, via Halifax, when desired. | 25 | | 41 | |
| St. Lucia, do, via Halifax, when desired. | 25 | | 41 | |
| St. Vincent, do, via Halifax, when desired. | 25 | | 41 | |
| Tobago, do, via Halifax, when desired. | 25 | | 41 | |
| Trinidad, do, via Halifax, when desired. | 25 | | 41 | |
| Belice, do, via Halifax, when desired. | 25 | | 41 | |
| Bermuda, do, via Halifax, when desired. | 25 | | 41 | |
| Barbadoes, do, via Halifax, when desired. | 25 | | 45 | |
| Jamaica, do, via Halifax, when desired. | 25 | | 45 | |
| Kingston, do, via Halifax, when desired. | 25 | | 45 | |
| West Indies, do, (not British) via: | | | | |
| Guadaloupe, do, via St. Pierre, when desired. | 50 | | 47 | |
| Martinique, do, via St. Pierre, when desired. | 50 | | 47 | |
| Hayti, (St. Domingo), do, via St. Pierre, when desired. | 50 | | 47 | |
| Porto Rico, do, via St. Pierre, when desired. | 50 | | 47 | |
| St. Bartholomew, do, via St. Pierre, when desired. | 50 | | 47 | |
| St. Martin, do, via St. Pierre, when desired. | 50 | | 47 | |
| St. Croix, do, via St. Pierre, when desired. | 50 | | 47 | |
| St. John, do, via St. Pierre, when desired. | 50 | | 47 | |
| St. Thomas, do, via St. Pierre, when desired. | 50 | | 47 | |
| Cuba, via United States, when desired. | 35 | | 46 | |
| Do, direct, do, via St. Pierre, when desired. | — | | 43 | |
| Mexico, do, via St. Pierre, when desired. | 45 | | 67 | |
| Central America, (Costa Rica, Guatemala, Mosquito Coast), do, via St. Pierre, when desired. | 50 | | 67 | |
| Bogota, do, via St. Pierre, when desired. | 50 | | 67 | |
| Buenaventura, do, via St. Pierre, when desired. | 50 | | 67 | |
| Chagres, do, via St. Pierre, when desired. | 45 | | 67 | |
| Panama, do, via St. Pierre, when desired. | 45 | | 67 | |
| Bolivia, do, via St. Pierre, when desired. | 72 | | 65 | |
| Chili, do, via St. Pierre, when desired. | 72 | | 65 | |
| Peru, do, via St. Pierre, when desired. | 72 | | 65 | |
| Venezuela, do, via St. Pierre, when desired. | 50 | | 61 | |
| Sandwich Islands, do, via St. Pierre, when desired. | 30 | | 33 | |

On newspapers sent to or from any of the above-named countries in the Prussian closed mail, the postage, which must in all cases be collected in Germany, is as follows, viz: To or from the British North American Provinces and the Sandwich Islands, 6 cents each; to or from the British West Indies, Cuba, Mexico, Chagres, and Panama, 8 cents; to or from the West Indies, &c. (not British) and Central America, 12 cents; and to or from the West coast of South America, 14 cents. Of the rates on newspapers by the British mail we are not advised.

OUR CHARGE AT ROME.—Among the passengers who left New York on Saturday in the steamer for Europe we observe the name of the Hon. LEWIS CASS, JR., who has been on a short and melancholy visit home, and now, we are glad to see, returns to a post which he has filled with so much honor to himself and advantage to his country and countrymen on several occasions which required character judgment, and firmness.

At every incident of importance connected with our foreign relations or domestic concerns a "public meeting" is held in New York, and speeches made and resolutions passed. We have never yet seen that these New York public meetings, speeches, and resolutions influence or control the opinions or actions of the people of the other States. They seem to be regarded generally as the effervescence of an easily-excited population, in many cases the contrivance of busy-bodies and politicians for their own selfish purposes. Those concerned seem to think that the huzzas of a Park meeting astonish the world. They are mistaken. They are more often the subject of ridicule than of serious consideration. The echoes amidst the streets of New York, and disturb no body out of that city.—*Alex. Gardet.*

FOR LIBERIA.—It was announced some time since that an expedition for Liberia, under the auspices of the American Colonization Society, would set sail from New York on the 15th of October. It now appears that the vessel will not sail until the fifth of November, and this delay is with a view to the accommodation of Messrs. Williams and Deputie, two intelligent colored men, who go out from Pennsylvania accompanied by between thirty and fifty others, also from that State. They take with them a steam engine and other machinery, besides a considerable amount of property of their own; and the Pennsylvania Colonization Society has loaned them \$2,000 to aid them in their outfit. Over thirty other persons from various Northern States have also applied for a passage by the same vessel.

A driver in Cincinnati has been fined twenty-five dollars for driving against a pedestrian who was crossing the street. The Judge ruled that at all regular street crossings pedestrians have the right of way, and that the law requires a driver to hold up when he sees a foot passenger crossing in front of his team.

THE HEALTH OF NATCHES.—A telegraphic despatch dated Natchez, (Miss.) September 21, says: "The fever is rapidly declining. There have been 270 deaths since the 5th of August. The population is 2,500. It is prevailing at all the most towns from Vicksburg down. Canton all Southerners not to return South until the 20th of October."

FROM PENNSYLVANIA.

WASHINGTON, (Pa.) SEPTEMBER 21, 1853. The number of deaths here and in this vicinity since the commencement of the epidemic, some six weeks since, until this time, is eighty-three, and, as far as I can judge by the statements of the physicians, there have been some five hundred patients under treatment. These eighty-three deaths are what we have counted up; it may be we have omitted some, and the cases are over five hundred rather than under it. They have the fever badly in Milton, I understand, in Pennsylvania there is now very little sickness, and here scarcely any at all, and we trust most sincerely that it is over with us, but will not feel secure until after frost. The U. S. frigate *Colombus* appeared off the harbor yesterday, nineteen days from San Juan; officers and crew all well. The pilots had orders for the Captain not to come into the harbor, or even to communicate with the shore, unless absolutely necessary. The frigate accordingly sailed immediately for New York.

SHOOTING BY A MURDERER.—During the recent cruise of the practicing ship *Proble* an acting midshipman, named PARKINS, from the Annapolis Naval School, fired a thirty-two pound shot twice in succession directly through the head of a barrel used as a target at a distance of from a half to three-quarters of a mile, shattering it to atoms. Few old veterans in the service could equal that.

MORTALITY OF NEW ORLEANS.

The New Orleans Monthly Register for September, edited by Dr. ANSON, has an article on the mortality of the past year in New Orleans, from which we learn that the whole number of deaths from September, 1852, to August, 1853, was 14,559, including 3,438 children under ten years of age and 1,381 colored persons. Of this frightful aggregate, 6,705, or not far from one-half, perished from yellow fever. In every month of the year except March and April there were fatal cases of this disease: thus in September, 1853, the deaths from fever numbered 68, in October 21, in November 165, in December 17, in January 1853, 1, in February 1, in March 1, in June 46, in July 1,387, in August 4,798. During the same period the admissions into the Charity Hospital were 16,854, discharges 13,514, deaths 3,386, births 176. Of the persons admitted, 15,027 were born in foreign countries, 1,564 were natives of the United States, and the birth-place of 129 was unknown.

LIBERIA.

Reliable accounts are coming to us of the prosperity of this African Republic, the first constitutional government which history records of that continent. The industrial emigrants are acquiring not only comfort and independence, but the means of elegant luxury. Dr. FROSTMAN, in his "Sketches of Liberia," gives this pleasant picture of Monrovia: "The town is divided into lots of one-fourth of an acre, and most of the dwelling houses have a lot attached to each of them. Most of the lots and several of the streets are adorned with various tropical fruit trees; and some of the gardens present a handsome appearance. The houses are generally one story or a story and a half high, and some are two full stories. Many of them are substantially built of stone or brick; and some of the best houses are built partly of both these materials. The State-house is a large stone building which was erected in 1843. In the rear of this building is a substantial stone prison. There are three commodious stone houses for public worship in the town—Methodist, Baptist, and Presbyterian; nearly all of the professing Christians in the place being attached to one of these religious denominations. "At the base of the hill on