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

The New Orleans Bee.

RATES OF ADVERTISING
One Dollar for every TEN lines, in each insertion, for the first insertion, and HALF that price for each subsequent one.
Advertisements on the first page One Dollar per square each insertion.
☞ Advertisements inserted at intervals will be charged One Dollar for every TEN lines of Nonpareil language, for each insertion.
The privilege of Annual Advertising is limited to advertisements strictly within the business of the firm, name, and to extent of one square each, per day.
No subscription taken for less than one year. No subscription to advertising to be received, unless arrangements are paid, unless at the option of the proprietors.

OFFICE, 83 CHARTRES ST. NEW ORLEANS, WEDNESDAY MORNING, SEPTEMBER 29, 1858. VOL. XVII—NEW SERIES. VOL. XXXII—WHOLE No. 10,77[illegible]

THE DAILY BEE.

WEDNESDAY MORNING, SEPT. 29.

COALITIONS.

Coalitions are always more or less offensive to good taste, sound judgment and honest purpose. A coalition based upon private and party or selfish aims is a stain upon the political character, and its success is an almost irremediable evil.

Time says that able and temperate journal, the Boston *Courier*, commenting upon the unsuccessful attempt of the Republicans and Americans in New York to form a coalition. Never, and to right little had can deny the truth of the proposition. It may be conceded that the union between parties entertaining diverse opinions, but not separated by irreconcilable antagonism, may occasionally be formed for patriotic purposes. The tyranny of a local city might become insupportable, and at the same time its power might be such as to defy ordinary law, or resist all ordinary modes of suppression. It might bring partial ruin upon the country, impair commerce, destroy manufacturing industry, demoralize public morality, and render the nation disreputable and contemptible abroad. In such extreme a case a fraternization of all the honest elements for the purpose of overthrowing an intolerable and malignant despotism might be justifiable, though even then the benefit to be accomplished would be probably limited to the single object of averting from power those who had abused it. It is evident enough that the reasons warranting such combinations must be of rare occurrence. In our political experience we know of but one example of the kind, viz: the memorable Presidential campaign of 1840. Mr. VAN BUREN had a record the unity of which was scarcely; its unstatesmanlike interests suffered no severer from its vicious systems of finance; so much of public profligacy had been developed in the astounding defalcations of disbursing agents, as general a monetary crash had followed as the administration and continued the right of its term, that both of all parties were of course, and elected his opponent. And yet the subsequent events demonstrated the impossibility of maintaining such coalitions. The President died, the Vice-President, with all political views had been long considered, was put out who had been selected for the purpose of the Southern States, because of our President, and in a very short time by his lapses from the dogmas of the party to which he had been nominally attached, completed its disruption, and reinstated its opponents into power.

The projected combinations of the present day must prove disastrous failures, since they are founded not upon principle, but on an inordinate lust for dominion and place. The various factions which seek a union have no affinities in common. There is no identity of interests between those calling themselves Americans and those known as Republicans. The former profess to be a national party, while the latter are exclusively sectional. These repudiate *in toto* the very extension of the period of naturalization made upon foreigners, any proscription between the native and naturalized citizen, those denounce and abhor anti-slavery fanaticism, have ever refused to commit themselves to freesoil doctrines, and claim as a distinctive and commendable feature in their organization a respect and regard for all sections of the Union. If both are honest constituents in their professions, are disinterest, selfish and grasping; and if the proposed junction of forces fails to take place, the result is to be imputed to mutual distrust and jealousies. Either is willing to abate a portion of its creed, and substitute a share of the tenets of the other. Black Republicanism has no intention to be partially Americanized, and Americanism does not refuse to become slightly sectionalized. But when the contest come to be laid down, and the amount of advantages to accrue to each faction calculated, to ask more than the other will concede, and as selfishness is either the combination, selfishness prevails, and there is nothing consummated.

In our remarks we speak of the North. Coalitions in the South are needless. There is scarcely a visible opposition extant, and what there are of it is in genuine. Neither have sharper Southern Americans with their recreancy to the South, which have been disregarded and contemned abroad. In no extreme case a fraternization of all the honest elements for the purpose of overthrowing an intolerable and malignant despotism might be justifiable, though even then the benefit to be accomplished would be probably limited to the single object of averting from power those who had abused it. It is evident enough that the reasons warranting such combinations must be of rare occurrence. In our political experience we know of but one example of the kind, viz: the memorable Presidential campaign of 1840. Mr. VAN BUREN had a record the unity so