THE DAILY BEE PUBLISHED BY C. F. HILLYER & CO. Editors and Proprietors. C. HILLYER. S. BOSTIC.

DAILY PAPER, (one year in advance,) $12 00
COUNTRY PAPER, semi-weekly, (one year in advance,) 6 00
All communications or advertisements given to the office in writing, before 8 o'clock, A. M., will be inserted the same day.

The New Orleans Bee.

RATES OF ADVERTISING.

Each square (one inch in length) of this size, in each language, will be charged one dollar per day for each insertion.

Advertisements handed in without any specification as to the number of insertions desired, will be published until forbidden, and charged accordingly.

The proprietors will not be responsible for any debts contracted in their name, unless on their own written order.

NEW ORLEANS, MONDAY MORNING, SEPTEMBER 5, 1853.

THE DAILY BEE.

Monday Morning, Sept. 5, 1853.

For Congress
(SECOND DISTRICT.)
T. G. HUNT.

For State Treasurer,
HARRY T. HAYS, of Orleans.

For Auditor Public Accounts,
JOHN E. KING, of St Landry.

For Superintendent of Public Education,
A. B. LAMON, of W Baton Rouge.

The North Star came through yesterday with the latest dates.

THE EPIDEMIC.

The full list of interments for the past week, from the 29th August to the 3d september, in the cemeteries in our city, presents a total of 955 deaths. Of this number 814 were of yellow fever, including as fever cases the small proportion daily registered under the head of congestion, and which are chiefly confined to the cemetery. As compared with the record of the previous week, we find the diminution in the whole number of deaths to be 673; and of deaths by Yellow Fever, 640. The details for the week are as follows:

	Y. Fever.	Oth. diseases	Total
Aug. 28	142	26	168
29	128	15	143
30	125	14	139
31	110	27	137
Sept. 1	103	16	119
2	110	23	133
3	96	20	116
	814	141	955

A glance at the above tabular statement will serve to convince the observer that the epidemic is gradually and steadily abating. From August 28th to September 1st the decrease in the mortality was quite regular. On the evening of the 1st and throughout the 2nd, a great change in the weather was experienced, the wind flowing from the North, accompanied by a marked fall in the temperature, which continued all day. In consequence of this change, so unfavorable to health, the mortuary statistics of the second exhibited a slight increase. The next day the weather became warm and seasonable, and the returns show a further decrease in the number of deaths.

It is no doubt now exists of the approaching termination of the epidemic. Unless some new and unexpected source of disease arises in our midst, we may reasonably look for a progressive decline during the present week, and probably by the end of the month, the almost total disappearance of the scourge. Many intelligent persons entertain the belief that the fever is only yielding from exhaustion of the material, and that its extinction cannot be expected with any degree of confidence, until we have a frost, or cold weather of sufficient severity to be incompatible with the prolonged existence of the pestilential storm. While a rational and judicious caution would lead us so far to respect this view, as to warn our unacclimated citizens now absent of the danger of a premature return, it is but justice to another and enlightened class of sufferers to state that their views are different. Several of our physicians have declared to us personally that the epidemic is wearing off, that it is characteristic of all epidemic to run a certain course, and then die away—that Yellow Fever is no exception to this law, and that the fever having lingered amongst us for some eight or ten weeks, is now slowly giving way, and must eventually disappear, before the advent of a frost. We simply give this theory, without seeking to defend it, and without subscribing to it—for whether true, or fallacious, the result is still the same, and the advice to be offered to absentees cannot be modified. We are thus morally convinced of the truth of this doctrine, we should still pause long, ere we ventured to assume the fearful responsibility of inviting back amongst us those who have fled from the terrors of the season.

The cry, sadly re-echoed elsewhere by the dreadful ravages of disease in our city continues to receive merit by timely and munificent contributions. As we have from day to day kept a record of the sums collected in behalf of the sufferers, it is unnecessary to do more than refer to the number and large and liberal character of the donations, which, as they are rarely commensurate with the necessity that calls them forth, fall far within the range of the benevolent sympathies of our friends have been cut out to the distress which they are intended to relieve in almost boundless. Not alone are we required to tend the sick, and bury the dead, but we must also provide sustenance and shelter for the bereaved widow, and destitute orphan. Under such afflicting circumstances, no pecuniary aid can exceed the exigencies of the occasion, or create the slightest fear of misapplication or waste. All that has been received is needed—and more.

AN ABOLITIONIST UNMASKED.

The New York *Evening Post* ought to be an available prize in the premises, to what concerns its anti-slavery character. That journal, as most of our readers know, is one of the very ablest, but most fanatical Democratic organs in the country. Its Democracy and Abolition go hand in hand, and its boast is, that it is Abolition because Democratic and that Democracy strictly interpreted, must lead to abolition. Well, the *Evening Post* has recently made the formal announcement that the Washington *Union* is an abolition paper, and not only does the *Post* say so, but it quotes the Albany *Argus*, and Rochester *Advertiser*—both of which are Hunker Democratic organs, to prove that it is not alone in this opinion. Hear the *Post*:

"*It is, not of to-day or two or three years ago*, as we have repeated two or three times, that Washington Union *is an abolition journal*. The Albany *Argus* has had a glimpse at this truth for a week past, and now the Rochester *Daily Advertiser*, a journal of the same class as the other two, flouts it as plain that it can be seen with the naked eye. Hear what that enlightened print says of it:

"The abolitionists not only determined to establish a paper in the district of Columbia, and the *National Era* soon made its appearance there, which has since been maintained and sustained by the capital of the nation, mostly of with the most extraordinary success, and rivalling in its circulation all the papers of that city. Even now, it is said, it ranks as the 2d or 3d established paper in the District. Accounts from the *Washington Union*—formerly a journal of much standing and influence—is now following in the wake of the *National Era*, and is fast assimilating with it as a genuine abolition paper.

The course and tone of the *Union* for some months past, and the obvious sympathies which control its columns, clearly indicate its affinities with abolitionism. The time has been when the conductors of that journal would have spurned such associations, and would have scorned to be the abettors and confederates of free soilism and freesoil leaders. But times change, and so does the tastes of men."

So the thing is out, at last. It is impossible to play the part of the hypocrite so successfully as to escape all danger of detection in a course of years. The Washington *Union* went on unknowingly at first. It received its readers in the quarters of the republic into the belief that it was the friend of slavery, but here comes the Albany *Argus* and lifts a corner of the mask, and the *Daily Advertiser* with a rough hand puts it away altogether, and leaves the abolitionism exposed in full view.

Many will no doubt be astonished at this, but we are not astonished: we foresaw it from the first, and if the *Argus* and *Advertiser* had hesitated to it, they would have broken off all association with the Washington *Union* long since. It is not time to consider the *Union* as an offending member, and to cut it off from the Democratic party at once?"

We beg the reader to understand that the title of this article is taken from the *Post*. We desire by any means charge the Washington Union with being an abolition sheet, in the sense in which the term would be applicable to the *Post*. We only transcribe the judgment passed upon the *Union*, by three of its Democratic contemporaries—two of which are decided anti-abolition and slavery opinions. The *Union* has noticed the charge, and answered it with a vast amount of indignation. It puts in a general denial, accompanied with an editorial of scathing denunciation. The *Post* having vented its wrath, and backed by two *Administration* papers, is bound to make it good, or submit to the calumny. For our part, we think it would be highly difficult to prove the charge as instructed with that ferocious fanaticism which inspires the *Post*, while it would be decidedly easy to demonstrate that the Administration organ, by its rash and fatal denunciation of the freesoil appointments of President Pierce, is giving aid and comfort to the abolitionists, and sowing the seeds of future trouble for the South.

CITIZENS' BANK.—We take occasion to remind the public, that the books of subscription for $1,000,000 of the Cash Stock of the Citizens' Bank, will be opened this day, at the office of the Bank, corner of Custom House and Royal streets, and will remain open till the 9th October. Capitalists have now a fine opportunity for a profitable investment.

CROPS IN CADDO.—The South Western says the cotton in this parish is doing extremely well—with one to some portions of it rain is needed. We are informed that the crops on the river plantations are not so promising as they were at this time last year. Accounts from eastern Texas represent that the cotton never has appeared so fine as at this time.

The *Evening Post*, noticing the disproportionate mortality among children in New York city remarks:

"The largest number of deaths is from cholera infantum: the majority of such cases is, without doubt, owing to the rank poisons of the Paris, and wholly unnecessary. The mortality of the innocents in a civilized community, is positively frightful. They are stalled, and destroyed, and ravaged beyond all reason; and when the legitimate result of such wrongdoing comes on, it is charged—as it seems fitly—but to a special interposition of Providence."

IF The following correspondence is not without interest. The question involved, however, cannot be better disposed of than is already done by Mr. Everett's celebrated Tripartite letter. Let our Government adhere strictly and firmly to the position taken by Mr. Everett, as Secretary of State, and it will avoid all entanglement and difficulty.

Lord John Russell to Mr. Crampton.

FOREIGN OFFICE, Feb. 16, 1853.

SIR—Lord Malmesbury received, just before leaving office, the note addressed to you by Mr. Everett, and left it for the consideration of his successor.

The absence from London of the ambassador of France has hitherto prevented that communication between the two governments which the circumstances of the proposal made jointly required.

I have now to inform you of the view which her majesty's government take of Mr. Everett's reply to our overture.

It is doubtless perfectly within the competence of the American government to reject the proposal that was made to Lord Malmesbury and Mr Turgot, in reference to Cuba. Each government will then remain as free as it was to believe to take that course which its sense of duty and a regard for the interests of its people may prescribe.

I should have satisfied my obligations as Secretary of State by this obvious remark, had not Mr. Everett entered at large into arguments which the simple nature of the question before him hardly seemed to require.

The governments of Great Britain and France, when they made this proposal to that of the United States, were fully aware of the growth and power and extension of territory which have marked the progress of the United States since the period of their independence. The absorption or annexation of Louisiana in 1803, of Florida in 1819, of Texas in 1845, and of California in 1848, had not escaped them; still less did they require to be reminded of the event of the seven years' war, or of the American wars.

It occurs to Her Majesty's Government, therefore, to ask for what purpose are these arguments introduced with so much preparation, and urged with so much ability?

It would appear that the purpose, not fully avowed, but hardly concealed, is to procure the admission of a doctrine that the United States have an interest in Cuba, to which Great Britain and France cannot pretend. In order to meet this pretension, it is necessary to set forth the character of the waters of the Gulf. Mr. Everett declares, in the outset of his despatch, that 'the United States would not see with indifference a change in the present state of possession of any other European government than Spain,' &c.

The two powers most likely to possess themselves of Cuba, and most formidable to the U. States, are Great Britain and France.

Great Britain is in possession, by treaty, of the island of Trinidad, which, in the last century was a colony of Spain: France was in possession, at the commencement of this century, of Louisiana, by voluntary cession from Spain. These two powers, by their naval resources, are in fact the only powers who could be rivals with the United States for the possession of Cuba. Well, these two powers are ready voluntarily to "declare, severally and collectively, that they will not obtain, or maintain for themselves, or for any one of themselves, any exclusive control over the said island (of Cuba,) nor assume nor exercise any dominion over the same."

Thus, if the object of the United States were to bar the acquisition of Cuba by any European State, this declaration would secure that object.

But if it is intended, on the part of the United States, to maintain that Great Britain and France have no interest in the maintenance of the present *status quo* in Cuba, and that the United States have alone a right to a voice in the question, her Majesty's Government cannot admit that matter, her Majesty's Government do not admit the claim. Her Majesty's possessions in the West Indies alone, without insisting on the importance to Mexico and other friendly States of the present distribution of power, give her Majesty an interest in the question which she cannot forego.

The maintenance of France in the American seas gives a similar interest to France, which no doubt will be put forward by her government. Nor is the question materially altered by the retirement of Mr. Everett, that Cuba is to the United States as an island at the mouth of the Thames or the Seine would be to England or France.

The distance of Cuba from the nearest parts of the territory of the United States, viz., from Florida, is 110 miles.

An island at an equal distance from the mouth of the Thames would be placed about ten miles north of Ostend, in Belgium; while an island at the same distance from Jamaica would be placed at Manzanilla, a town in Cuba.

Thus there can be no reason for saying that the possession of Cuba by Great Britain or France would be menacing to the United States; but that its possession by the United States would not be so to Great Britain.

There is one argument of the United States Secretary of State, to which anyone, to her Majesty's government would not only astounded, but disgust, &c.

Lord Malmesbury and M. de Tarcet put forward, as a reason for entering into the proposed compact, the attacks which have lately been made on the Spanish dominions in the Bay of Mexico by filibustering expeditions from the United States, and with the avowed design of taking possession of that island. To this Mr. Everett replies in the following terms: "The President is convinced that the conclusions of such a treaty, instead of putting a stop to these lawless proceedings, would give a new and more formidable impulse to them."

The government of Great Britain acknowledges with regret to the candour of this President in observing so explicitly the lawless attempts here referred to. The character of these attempts, indeed, was such as to excite the reprobation of every civilized State. The spectacle of bands of men collected together in reckless disregard of treaties, for the purpose of taking forcible possession of the territory of a friendly power, was a reproach to the United States and to the age.

The government of Great Britain acknowledges with regret to the candour of the President in observing so explicitly the lawless attempts here referred to. The character of these attempts, indeed, was such as to excite the reprobation of every civilized State. The spectacle of bands of men collected together in reckless disregard of treaties, for the purpose of taking forcible possession of the territory of a friendly power, was a reproach to the United States and to the age.

Her Majesty's government, therefore, to ask for what purpose are these arguments introduced with so much preparation, and urged with so much ability?

It would appear that the purpose, not fully avowed, but hardly concealed, is to procure the admission of a doctrine that the United States have an interest in Cuba, to which Great Britain and France cannot pretend. In order to meet this pretension, it is necessary to set forth the character of the waters of the Gulf. Mr. Everett declares, in the outset of his despatch, that 'the United States would not see with indifference a change in the present state of possession of any other European government than Spain,' &c.

The two powers most likely to possess themselves of Cuba, and most formidable to the U. States, are Great Britain and France.

Great Britain is in possession, by treaty, of the island of Trinidad, which, in the last century was a colony of Spain: France was in possession, at the commencement of this century, of Louisiana, by voluntary cession from Spain. These two powers, by their naval resources, are in fact the only powers who could be rivals with the United States for the possession of Cuba. Well, these two powers are ready voluntarily to "declare, severally and collectively, that they will not obtain, or maintain for themselves, or for any one of themselves, any exclusive control over the said island (of Cuba,) nor assume nor exercise any dominion over the same."

Thus, if the object of the United States were to bar the acquisition of Cuba by any European State, this declaration would secure that object.

But if it is intended, on the part of the United States, to maintain that Great Britain and France have no interest in the maintenance of the present *status quo* in Cuba, and that the United States have alone a right to a voice in the question, her Majesty's government cannot admit that matter, her Majesty's government do not admit the claim. Her Majesty's possessions in the West Indies alone, without insisting on the importance to Mexico and other friendly States of the present distribution of power, give her Majesty an interest in the question which she cannot forego.

The maintenance of France in the American seas gives a similar interest to France, which no doubt will be put forward by her government. Nor is the question materially altered by the retirement of Mr. Everett, that Cuba is to the United States as an island at the mouth of the Thames or the Seine would be to England or France.

The distance of Cuba from the nearest parts of the territory of the United States, viz., from Florida, is 110 miles.

An island at an equal distance from the mouth of the Thames would be placed about ten miles north of Ostend, in Belgium; while an island at the same distance from Jamaica would be placed at Manzanilla, a town in Cuba.

Thus there can be no reason for saying that the possession of Cuba by Great Britain or France would be menacing to the United States; but that its possession by the United States would not be so to Great Britain.

There is one argument of the United States Secretary of State, to which anyone, to her Majesty's government would not only astounded, but disgust, &c.

Lord Malmesbury and M. de Tarcet put forward, as a reason for entering into the proposed compact, the attacks which have lately been made on the Spanish dominions in the Bay of Mexico by filibustering expeditions from the United States, and with the avowed design of taking possession of that island. To this Mr. Everett replies in the following terms: "The President is convinced that the conclusions of such a treaty, instead of putting a stop to these lawless proceedings, would give a new and more formidable impulse to them."