

(Tel.)

NEW YORK, May 19, 1859.

PETER COOPER to J. C. COGSWELL.

Your letter of 10th instant received. I do not wonder that you have been provoked. I earnestly urge you, however, to draw a proper distinction between the just rights of the public and the demands of private individuals. Your letter will be submitted to the directors and answered by mail.

PETER COOPER.

(Letter.)

HALIFAX, April 30, 1859.

W. H. WISWELL to JOHN HUNTER.

Sir,—In answer to your last letter of the 29th inst., as also to several preceding ones I am directed to reply as follows :

Your communication of the 8th instant (being in extension of that of the 1st, which simply requested information as to our being open to an offer) was duly laid before the executive committee. They were perfectly prepared before receiving it to meet you in a candid and business like spirit, making, of course, the best terms they could, without being too exacting. In fact, they would undoubtedly have consented to the very same arrangements as they consider had previously existed between them and the New York Associated Press, but which the latter to a certain extent, disputed. In consequence of the dispute the committee terminated the contract. Your letter of the 8th inst., with enclosures, however, is couched in such terms that the committee would hardly consent to entertain it for an instant. It was threatening and dictatorial and its tone would have been bad enough at the close of a hostile correspondence instead of being the commencement of a professedly friendly one.

We were told that should your offer be rejected "no news whatever should pass over our wires to the American press," that Mr. Stuart's Liverpool business should cease, and that arrangements to dispense with transmission over our wires being already completed any expectation to make up for the loss of the Associated Press payments, &c., would certainly prove fallacious, and a hint was then thrown out that, did we not submit to your terms, we must be intending to share in the "spoils of speculators." From a correspondence opening in such a spirit on your side the committee did not anticipate much. As gentlemen and men of ordinary spirit they could not consent to deal with parties holding such language.

The telegraphic messages from Mr. Craig which were laid before the committee were also so harsh and inimical that it was felt to be impossible to hope for any satisfactory arrangement with him, and, therefore, the subject was put out of sight. All these messages set us at defiance, speak with taunt and contempt of our opposition, and hardly condescend to treat us as men of ordinary feeling.

Mr. Craig's letter of the 18th, which you only laid before the committee on the 29th, is very differently worded—courteous in its tone and unexceptionable in its requirements. Had all the proceedings been conducted in that style the result would probably have been very different.