THE DAILY BEE.

E. WALKER, W. PATTON, W. PATTERSON, E. KARST, W. PATTERSON.

Daily paper, (one year in advance) ... $12
Tri-Weekly paper, (one year in advance) ... $6
The Bee will be published every day in the week, Sundays excepted. Subscribers desiring the paper discontinued will have to give notice in writing before they can be allowed to discontinue. Subscribers receiving the paper, whether they have ordered it or otherwise, will be considered as subscribers, and charged to pay, unless they notify the Publisher of their intention to reject the paper.

The New Orleans Bee.

Terms of Advertising: Daily paper, $1 for every 100 lines, for each insertion, and the same for every 100 lines for each subsequent insertion. Tri-Weekly paper, $1 per square of 10 lines, for each insertion. Weekly paper, $1 per square of 10 lines, for each insertion. Advertisements published at intervals will be charged One Dollar, for every 100 lines for each insertion. Contracts for Advertising will be made on the following terms: The privilege of Annual Advertisements is limited to advertisements strictly within the line of their business and to extend to and square every other day. No subscription taken for less than one year. No subscription to advertising will be stopped until all arrearages are paid, unless it be at the option of the proprietors.

OFFICE, 83 CHARTRES ST. NEW ORLEANS, MONDAY MORNING, APRIL 11, 1859. VOL. XVII—NEW SERIES. VOL. XXXII—WHOLE NO. 11,022.

THE DAILY BEE.

MONDAY MORNING, APRIL 11.

A WARNING.

Even in Democracy there is an element of conservation and honesty which will occasionally manifest its existence. The vessel principles and corrupt practices of the dominant party have shained many of its adherents into a frank acknowledgement of its unworthiness. Men are not unfrequently jarred by political excitement into acts which in their cooler moments they heartily regret; but few who are not inherently destitute of all honesty will continue to affiliate with a party when they discover that it is utterly profligate and base. The purer and nobler segment of the party strives in such cases to disengage itself from further intimate connection with the fouler and sinkier one, and the struggle which the process of separation produces terminates in a schism or a split. We have recently seen this condition of things exemplified in our own city; for, after due allowance made for the influence of personal antipathies and disappointed ambition, little doubt remains that the major part of those Democrats who have sundered their association with the Old-Hunkers, and assumed an independent position, are animated by a sincere, and earnest desire to effect reform, and drive from public confidence the unscrupulous leaders who have prostituted Democratic principles and labelled the entire party with most revolting attributes.

Whether this effort to purify Democracy will succeed is somewhat problematical. We are fearful that the masses are either too indifferent, or are too completely under the control of crafty and reckless leaders, to justify the hope of immediate reform. But at all events the experiment itself is an auspicious one. It shows that the people are not irretrievably plunged into the abyss of corruption—that there is yet some hope in Gilead—that there are still some intrepid and manly spirits who will and love the law to the Bank of corruption. Indeed, if the funny which pollutes every branch of the Federal government were to remain unrebuked, if the shameless frauds and peculations the waste of the public moneys on politics jobbs and panders, the unwaged extravagance, turpitude and inherently which stamp the conduct of our rulers were to meet with neither remonstrance nor resistance, we should look upon the country as "hopelessly a better plight" than the wretched aborigines of Mexico and South America. Fortunately it is otherwise. And the more degenerate cases of the future can be rousing from the apathy of the Democrats themselves protesting against infamy and bribery.

It gives us pleasure to state that New Orleans is not alone in her indignant accusation. We perceive that even in New York—the very focus and fountain head of political fraud and chicanery—a body of Democrats, upon the call of Mr. Cassidy, was have held a meeting for the laudable object of reform, and to purify the representation of the Democratic party. In explanation of the object of the meeting, Mr. Cassidy, as we learn from the New York correspondent of the *National Intelligencer*, confessed his deep affliction at what he "conceived to be the corruptness of their own party. He felt constrained to confess that he was a tendency to ruin, and had therefore been induced to invite them this evening. He said "they met as party men, it was true, but at the same time as good citizens in consultation as to the best means of aiding to free themselves and the Democratic party of the ties from a longer association with allies, with men whose official conduct and acts, while they shame the party to which they lay claim as members, are a reproaching the good denominations of the whole community." He portrayed the corruptions of the city government. And stated that it was enough to know that the Democratic party have added to the number of those public pensioners by placing into places of trust men who are wholly destitute of character and moral principle." A preamble and resolutions were submitted which proposed a course of action which he hoped would be adopted. The resolutions were adopted by a vote of 300 to 200. Mr. Cassidy, in his address, urged the party to purify itself, and to be united in their action. The people would be a unanimous in the contest of the ensuing election, if the matter of the time of course. It was a special in the case, and so evident. The chairman of state the occasion was made to Mr. Cassidy, and when he was called upon he said he was a Democrat of 1844 in the winter of 1845, in the spring of 1845. The power of Mr. Polk was also the direction. In spite of difficulties, he was a Democrat, there was a difference of opinion. He confessed he was not satisfied with the point of identity. The speaker was not opposed to the principles of the Democratic party, and he was greatly with immense applause, which was supposed to be the power of the opening remarks of the Union editor.

Daniel was carried on the shoulders of his friends through the streets, and a large crowd followed the Democratic party to their rooms. The Abolitionists of course paid a public condemnation.

James Guthrie.

There is a quiet but lasting movement in progress, designed to make James Guthrie, of Louisville, Kentucky, the next Democratic candidate for President, and as an intimate friend of him than the author of these lines will be called to be given their support, yet propose to contribute our mite towards their enlightenment.

Mr. Guthrie was a strong Democrat, and is so to this season. He is more than sixty years old, but has been little in public life, owing to the independent and political views to those which prevailed in his neighborhood. Lucky during the better portion of his career he has fully proven, when he was not nominally so, that he is honest, an union man, and in unison with Mr. Clay in the Union-defending struggle. He has always and the subject of the old people of Kentucky, engendered by the creation of a state court in opposition to the laws of a session of general assembly, whence the terms of "Old Court" and "Old Court" parties. Mr. Clay was an "Old Court" Mr. Guthrie a "New Court" man, and the antagonism thus engendered continued to the death of the former. Hence Mr. Guthrie became a Jackson man, and in that time was dubbed a "Democrat," which, as his is about the most detested nickname in Kentucky, was of about the same importance as a Nullifier in South Carolina, or a Democrat in any direction in Louisiana. He was the nicest Union man. The Bill against Nullifiers, tendered in favor of a Nullifier, was the same that he was in favor of the Compromise in any direction