The New Orleans Bee.

OFFICE 83 CHARTRES ST. NEW ORLEANS, FRIDAY MORNING, MAY 23, 1856. VOL. XVII—NEW SERIES. VOL. XXIX—WHOLE NO. 10,042.

THE DAILY BEE.

FRIDAY MORNING, MAY 23, 1856.

Supplemental to our Weekly.

The contents of the full are authorized to receive subscriptions by the week, at the rate of 12 cents.

The Nicaragua Mail came through yesterday with the latest dates.

OUR REPORTERS WRITE SIMILARLY.

The report of Senator Cameron's remarks in reference to the President's message announcing the recognition and recognition of the Republic from Nicaragua, finds corroborate the tenor of the telegraphic despatch, which represented him as saying that in a week after the news reached Europe we should have a war on our hands. The reader will find what Mr. Cameron really said in another column. We thought at the time that the Kentucky Senator could not possibly have uttered the sentiment ascribed to him, and so expressed ourselves. Nevertheless his remarks would seem to involve considerable apprehension of the result of the step taken by our government, and manifest a timidity we believe altogether misplaced. Who ever heard of one nation going to war with another, because the latter thought proper, in conformity with its settled policy, to recognize a government *de facto*? Unless Great Britain were absolutely instigated by a foregone conclusion, and determined to have a fight with the United States, with or without a pretext, the action of our government in acknowledging Father Vaca could not reasonably provoke a quarrel.

It may be told, indeed, that other grave questions and difficulties arise, which, combined with the Nicaragua affair, tend to irritate and estrange the two countries, and may gradually impel them to a state of war. The premises are correct, but the conclusion is scarcely warranted by the evidence. The two sources of trouble with Great Britain are the Enlistment question and the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. With regard to the first, Lord CLARENDON's assurances, though adverse to the demands of our government, is studiously courteous and friendly, and clearly evinces the desire of the British Ministry to maintain amicable relations with us. The English government unequivocally disclaims any intention to infringe the law, or to disregard the policy or the sovereign rights of the United States." This is not the language of a bitter adversary seeking a quarrel. And again: Lord CLARENDON "expresses the hope that his explanation will prove satisfactory to the government of the United States. It being the desire of Her Majesty's government to continue unbroken the relations of friendship existing between the two countries." Is this the tone of insulting defiance? Have words like these the meaning of menaces? Would not the impartial reader rather infer from their evident intent and meaning, that while the British government is unwilling to recall Mr. CRAMPTON, believing him to be guiltless of the acts charged against him, nothing can be further from their wish than to protract an exciting controversy, or to give just cause of offence to the United States? Thus we construe the letter, or so much of it as has been received and published here.

There is nothing in the Enlistment difficulty which, to our mind, can possibly lead to war; unless political knaves, blunderers and demagogues, in their anxiety to win popular favor, seek purposely to exasperate and embitter the contest. Great Britain is undoubtedly averse to any other than a peaceful settlement of the questions at issue. She has proclaimed her sentiments through her official authorities, and their expression outweighs a thousand extemporaneous articles of the London press. Nor can the legitimate inference be drawn that the pacific disposition of Great Britain will be changed into warlike ardor, even should the Administration dismiss Mr. CRAMPTON. The right of a government to decline diplomatic intercourse with a foreign envoy, for cause, is indisputable, and has been more emphatically asserted and acquiesced in than right to refuse, when she suffered Spain to send SIR HENRY BULWER hence for litigious meddling in the politics of the kingdom. The utmost that could grow out of the dismissal of Mr. CRAMPTON would be a retaliatory act applied to Mr. DALLAS. This might occasion coolness, but could not and would not necessitate a rupture. Our Administration holds the Cabinet Ministry of complicity in an attempt to infringe the neutrality laws of the Republic. The British Ministry accept Mr. CRAMPTON's protestations of innocence, and refuse to recall him. The President consults the evidence in preference to his simple word, and recalls Lord PAGET. Would this lead Great Britain to declare war against us for the exercise of a power which it, however distasteful it might be to her, she has fully and formally acknowledged? Preposterous!

The opposite interpretations of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty constitute a more complex and more difficult subject of controversy. The most trouble-some point of difference, practical testimony to prove double-dealing and treachery on the part of the accredited minister of the British government, Yet, though in the hands of unskillful and hot-headed politicians, such controversy might be so benighted conducted as to lead to serious results, there can be no doubt that with ordinary prudence and without the sacrifice of one iota of national dignity, it may be brought to a peaceful termination. Unlike the Enlistment case, it does not call for prompt and decided action. The Gordian knot is to be set only after all efforts to untie it have proved fruitless. The usual avenues of diplomatic correspondence will be selected to lay open the views of the British government so comprehensively and clearly that no possible misunderstanding can occur, and should that government, with all the rights before it, persist in a construction sustained neither by the spirit of the treaty nor the evidence adduced, by the mouth of its ministers, to the contrary, it will then become a proper question for the United States to determine whether our interests and policy, our convictions of right, and our sense of honor do not demand a preposition for the abrogation of the compact. In such a contingency we believe Great Britain would scarcely hesitate to accede to the request. An harmonious interpretation being utterly impossible, considerations of public policy would admonish her of the expediency of annulling a treaty which could not be made binding. To persist in the misfeasance of the treaty under such circumstances, would be to invite a collision, and place Britain in every reason to think Great Britain would rather deprecate or avoid it.

War, therefore, imminent or prospective, seems to us highly improbable.

NEW BOOKS.—Our thanks are due the publishers, DEWITT & PARSIPPORT, through R. H. NORMAN, 14 Camp street, for the following new works:

Salad for the Social, by the author of "Salad for the Solitary." One of the pleasantest companions for a leisure hour we have ever met with—genial, profuse in story-telling, graceful and generous in their distribution. The writer has gleaned from every field, and has reported nothing that is not at once palatable and wholesome.

A Defense of the Americas, by Thomas R. Whitney. This is another of those volumes on Americanism which the press has recently put forth. The author is a careful observer, and a zealous advocate, but his book is subject to the serious drawback of religious prejudice.

At Boston, on the evening of the 15th, while the accommodation train from Albany was entering the city, it came in collision with a carriage, in which were William McFarland, his wife, and Miss Haught. The two ladies were instantly killed, and Mr. McFarland is dangerously if not fatally injured. He is a resident of Trenton, and was a member of the firm of White & McFarland, bakers, of Salisbury.

ROYAL LOVE-MATCH.—Prince Oscar, of Sweden, is expected shortly in England, on a tour of pleasure, to wed the hand of the Princess Mary, of Cambridge, daughter of the present Duke of Cambridge, and first cousin of Her Majesty Queen Victoria. The Princess Mary is young, and the favorite of all the females of the British Court. She is said to be still more charming than her sister, with a profusion of golden hair, and a complexion of the purest lily and rose. The Prince, who is a handsome young man, and who, we believe, is the only surviving son of the King of Sweden, and first cousin of the Princess Victoria, and for whom he is named, is said to be very fond of the Princess Mary, and to be fully worthy of her love. The fortune of the Princess is somewhere about three hundred thousand pounds, sterling, and her dowry is three thousand pounds a year.

[illegible] Mr. G. [illegible] is a middle-aged bachelor, and is large in the possession of the goods of this life. As he married his wife in 1841, something on the Cape, and this is the short time since he published the fact, the reader may be supposed that this event has taken place in order to get married again. Such has been the knowledge of his first wife, was fixed in the immediate neighborhood, and what mischief he apprehended therefrom. The second wife, however, of Mr. Prince, is from Liverpool, and the fact of her being married to a Prince of the Cape, is a matter of no little importance to the inhabitants of the Queen's Dominions