

Democrat. You do not, then, believe that the respective States have the sole right to define what is citizenship within their borders?

Know-nothing. I only look to the fact that the five-year term of naturalization was fixed in a law of Congress.

Democrat. But you overlook the other fact, that in a number of the States foreigners are allowed to vote after they have been in the country a much less period, and also that our leading statesmen have come to the conclusion that the whole subject is within State jurisdiction.

Know-nothing. It matters little to me how the object is accomplished, whether by national or State legislation.

Democrat. But if by the latter, it supersedes a national organization entirely, so far as the amendment of the naturalization laws is concerned, and that is about all that is left of your creed. I will, however, answer your question frankly, and say that it will attempt to limit the term of naturalization would only be a fetter upon future emigration, and would operate to the disadvantage of the best interests of the country. I am, therefore, unhesitatingly opposed to such modification.

Know-nothing. I wish you to understand me that I am not opposed to emigration, nor do I understand the American party as being opposed to it.

Democrat. But this seems to me to be a new piece of inconsistency. You say you are in favor of emigration, and yet are for throwing obstacles in the way of emigration, and yet you will not say to me that the amendment of the naturalization laws will have any effect to reduce emigration.

Democrat. I say so most unequivocally. I not only allege that it will do so, but that it has done so; that the measure of amending the naturalization laws, of shortening the term of probation, added to the scandalous mummery and violence on the part of the know-nothing order, have excited distrust on the part of the people, and exaltation on the part of the monarchs of Europe. Some of the leading newspapers in Germany have liberally discussed the know-nothing movement in the United States, and have admonished the German people against trusting themselves to the German people against trusting themselves to the German people against trusting themselves to the German people.

Know-nothing. Well, it must come sooner or later, for it cannot be denied that thousands and tens of thousands of those who land upon our shores, even after they have been naturalized, are incapable of appreciating our institutions and of becoming in heart citizens, upon whom the glorious right of suffrage is conferred.

Democrat. Your ideal of a citizen and a voter is that a man should be native-born. Well, we have had some exhibitions of the fitness of such Americans as you are anxious should rule America within the last few weeks; not to speak of Louisville or Cincinnati, let us refer to what has just taken place in New Orleans and in Maryland. Here we find the men you set up as patrons of intelligence and of decency illustrating their devotion to American institutions by going armed to the ballot-boxes, by driving off those who are opposed to them in politics, by knocking down like beasts the adopted citizens, by overthrowing the ballot-boxes, beating the officers of election, and by openly threatening to deluge the streets with blood, rather than allow those to vote whose rights are guaranteed by our constitution and our laws. These are the men whom you hold up to me as emigrants permitted to vote.

Know-nothing. But you must not condemn the whole American order because of the violence of a few of its hot-headed members. Democrat. Alas! I am not now referring to the exceptions, but to the rule. I am not now referring to rare, but to common occurrences. There is not a city or a town in the Union in which your order boasts any considerable numbers of men in which more or less of violence and fraud are not resorted to. In some places you secure all the officers of the election, and compel them to disregard their own solemn oaths to act according to the laws of the State in which they serve, and to obey only the mandates of your secret order; in others you pack juries, so as to rescue the guilty from punishment; and in more than one instance you have been known by sheer force of numbers to intimidate the judges upon the bench. It is this example, I repeat, that you hold up before the American youth and before the people of the Old World as a sublime specimen of pure Americanism. I will conclude this picture of know-nothing misrule in the United States by giving you a description of a far-distant country, away off on the eastern shore of Asia, in which know-nothing doctrines have been practically illustrated for seven hundred years. The Louisville Courier says: "No foreign soil may tread that soil, no foreign eye profane its lights. Foreigner and devil are synonymous terms in the language spoken in that happy realm. There are no emigrants there—no naturalization laws, no foreign vote—the one great fundamental principle of government is, that none but Japanese shall rule Japan. They hate the Pope, they mob the missionaries, they trample under foot the cross, they keep out a foreign ship, whether it comes in famine or distress. When the stranger begs for bread they give him a stone—sometimes a dozen or two at once. No foreigner votes there. There is no Bible there, no Catholic Orphan Asylums, no Catholic Sisters of Charity, no honesty, no integrity in the judiciary, no safety for the stranger, no respect for God, no ships arrive there laden with foreign mechanics, and their laboring hands are replaced by agriculture, by the products of the wind and Japanese nobility, and the consequence is that mines of coal and iron lie worthless in the ground."

How do you like the picture? Know-nothing. It is an ingenious comment, I admit; but still you must indulge me in the honest belief that I am for Americans ruling America.

Democrat. The sentiment of Americans ruling America suits me exactly. I have always been in favor of that; but I will thank you to tell me what kind of Americans you mean shall rule America. Do you mean such an American as Santa Anna, who began his career by driving all the foreigners out of his country, Americans and Spaniards, by taking by the hand the negroes of Mexico, and ended it by proclaiming himself Emperor? or do you mean Souleuvre, now called Faustin the First, who began his career by driving all the foreigners out of the country, and by instituting a monarchy, in which the negroes controlled everything, and finally made him Emperor? Are these the Americans that you would have rule America? Or, to come down to our own times, will you have such Americans as Lewis C. Levin, as Ned. Baustine, as Joseph Hiss, as David Wilcox, as Daniel McPhail, to rule America, in place of such other Americans as Franklin Pierce, as Lewis Cass, as James Buchanan, as Rufus Choate, as Roger B. Taney, as Beverly Johnson, &c., &c. Like Santa Anna and like Souleuvre, you are for driving the foreigners out of the country, and for elevating the negro to a political equality, whether, like them, you are to end your career in establishing an abolition oligarchy on this continent, I leave the future to show.

Know-nothing. On the subject of abolition I beg to say that I am as sound as you are. I am opposed to all attempts to interfere with the constitutional rights of the South, and would not for a moment belong to any party that did not respect those rights.

Democrat. Why is it, then, that you adhere to the know-nothings? Have you not had sufficient testimony to convince you that your order is now controlled, so far as the southern States are concerned, by abolitionists?

The whigs, abolitionists, and republicans profess to be anxious to bring the question to a direct vote before the people, and boldly declare that it can no longer be dodged or evaded, and they are ready for it. Under these circumstances, what is the duty of the democratic party? Why, plainly to meet the issue as presented. The result of the late election shows that there are 200,000 people who will not go on the black side, nor will they go with the know-nothings nor the democrats so long as they stand in their present equivocal position. Where will they go?

Democrat. And it is upon these results you base the prediction of your order as a national party? You will not

deny that the know-nothings of New York were repudiated by all the known national men in that State, (whigs and democrats) that they denounced the Nebraska bill; and that their leader, Brooks, who was re-elected to the senate on account of his assault on Archbishop Hughes, was one of the prominent men in the last legislature of the State in offering resolutions filled with ultra abolition sentiments. Nor can you deny that this very man Gardner, whom you have re-elected governor of Massachusetts, signed a series of the worst resolutions against the fugitive-slave law that could have been adopted by the know-nothing legislature of that State, and retired from the Philadelphia convention because it adopted the very platform of which you boast. As if to complete the catalogue of abolitionism on the part of this Gardner, he was elected, along with other know-nothings, to an abolition national convention, held at Cincinnati on the 19th of November, called by those members of the Philadelphia convention who seceded on account of the very national platform which you support! The action of that convention is now before the country. Gov. Gardner and his "national" followers have formally joined hands with Gov. Johnston, of Pennsylvania, and other abolitionists, in demanding that the Missouri Compromise shall be restored, and that no more slave States shall be admitted into the Union!

Know-nothing. But there is no doubt, notwithstanding these evidences, that in 1856 the American order will present to the country a national candidate for the presidency, and will support him zealously. Democrat. I have no doubt that the members of the southern branch of your order will insist upon a nomination suitable to themselves; but it is as clear to me as the sun at noonday that, if they succeed in inducing any portion of the northern men who belong to your order to unite with them, the only effect of such a nomination will be to assist the abolitionists in the North. There is not a single free State, excepting Massachusetts and New York, (and I have just shown you how they stand affected,) in which know-nothingism and abolitionism are not synonymous terms; so that a southern nomination of your order will be made only for the purpose of defeating the democratic party in the South, and of thereby assisting Mr. Seward in his game of being elected to the presidency by uniting the factions of the North upon himself.

Know-nothing. Let me understand you; do you mean to say that a national man will not be supported by the American order in the free States? Democrat. I mean to say that any candidate whom you may nominate to please the southern know-nothings, who will, therefore, be compelled to stand upon some kind of a national platform, will not be supported by your brethren in the North to any considerable extent, but will be pushed aside in the free States by a fusion candidate like Seward, who will do as he has done in the last elections in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, &c., &c.—combine all the elements of the opposition united upon abolition candidates. The only effect of running such a candidate in the South will be, to weaken the democratic party in that quarter, and to give Mr. Seward the majority, and, if possible, the presidency. And this, I believe, is the real design of your leaders, North and South.

From the N. Y. Day Book. THE GREAT "STAY-AT-HOME" PARTY.

There were, on the day of election, over two hundred thousand voters in this State who did not feel interest enough in the success of either of the four parties to leave their business and their homes long enough to deposit their ballots in the ballot-boxes. One of these stay-at-homes gave us the following reasons for neglecting the privilege and duty of voting for State officers: "I am, first, a national Peace democrat, and cannot consistently with my feelings and principles vote for any but national democrats for office. I belong to what you call 'soft-shells,' and should have voted that ticket but for the statement of John Van Buren that all but two of the candidates were Van Buren men in 1848, and were prouder to-day of having been so than ever. It was the fact—and I had no reason to doubt it—I could not vote for any man sooner than for Mann and King. The 'hard-shells,' though right in their declaration of principles, opposed and denounced our democratic administration. Their opposition was factious, and nothing else, and I would not vote with them nor for them. The know-nothings, inasmuch as they had no principles and expressed none, I might have gone for on the ground that they were nobodies as well as know-nothings; and I could express my indifference just about as well in voting that ticket as by staying at home. But it was a little less trouble to stay at home; and I did so."

Now, then, we are to expect that in every ten of those who did not vote as well as fall one-third of those who voted the know-nothing ticket, thought and felt just as this man thought and felt. The democratic party, by its free-soil corner-stone resolution, and the quasi endorsement of John Van Buren's speeches, completely stifled itself, and we wonder how it made out to poll as many votes as it did. We should think that every man who believed what John Van Buren said or thought, or as he pretended to think, would most surely have voted the republican ticket, and every one who did not think as he did, nor believe what he said, would have been ashamed of being seen voting with a party so utterly inconsistent in all its professions as was the democratic party. The republicans were consistent, and polled their entire vote. The know-nothings, of course, polled their full vote, and got fifty thousand silver-gray whigs and neutrals for, for the want of something tangible to go for, voted for the know-nothings. They found that they could not say they knew nothing in the whole range of parties that expressed their principles and sentiments by voting the know-nothing ticket, and they did so.

It is evident from all this—and we defy any rational, intelligent man to say that our deductions from the facts are not fair and correct—that had the democratic party come boldly out with a manly set of principles, totally different from the republicans, it would have swept the State by a hundred thousand majority. Ever since the defeat of Van Buren in 1840 both the whig and democratic parties have been dodging and fooling around this interminable nigger question. At first both were shy of it, (or rather the whigs were shy, the democrats sneered it); then the whigs began to talk about it to introduce resolutions, throw out feelers, and, finally, to take it up and bug it to their bosoms. These leaders became possessed with the idea that anti-slavery was immensely popular with the people, and so firm were they in the opinion that they offered in 1840 the question of suffrage to the blacks to the whites to vote upon. The result was a tremendous majority against it. Still they were not satisfied; they said, "Oh, of course, laboring white men are opposed to political equality, but they are in favor of freedom." Nevertheless, they have never dared to let even the naked question of freedom or slavery for the negro be submitted to the people. The instincts of white laborers are too strong even for that.

In 1848, to revenge himself for an imagined wrong, Martin Van Buren introduced this negro question into the democratic ranks, and taking up the whig cry of "freedom for the negro, freedom in the Territories, opposition to slavery extension," &c., &c., succeeded in breaking up the party and detaching the democratic candidate for President. Since then the whole country has been agitated with the question—nigger, nigger, nigger, has been the theme year in and year out, not only in the halls of Congress, but in the State legislature, in the towns, in the district schools, and in the churches, until the people are fairly sick and tired of it; and two hundred and ninety thousand of them in this State are waiting and watching for an opportunity to express their decided opposition to any further talk or legislation on the subject.

The whigs, abolitionists, and republicans profess to be anxious to bring the question to a direct vote before the people, and boldly declare that it can no longer be dodged or evaded, and they are ready for it. Under these circumstances, what is the duty of the democratic party? Why, plainly to meet the issue as presented. The result of the late election shows that there are 200,000 people who will not go on the black side, nor will they go with the know-nothings nor the democrats so long as they stand in their present equivocal position. Where will they go?

Democrat. And it is upon these results you base the prediction of your order as a national party? You will not

deny that the know-nothings of New York were repudiated by all the known national men in that State, (whigs and democrats) that they denounced the Nebraska bill; and that their leader, Brooks, who was re-elected to the senate on account of his assault on Archbishop Hughes, was one of the prominent men in the last legislature of the State in offering resolutions filled with ultra abolition sentiments. Nor can you deny that this very man Gardner, whom you have re-elected governor of Massachusetts, signed a series of the worst resolutions against the fugitive-slave law that could have been adopted by the know-nothing legislature of that State, and retired from the Philadelphia convention because it adopted the very platform of which you boast. As if to complete the catalogue of abolitionism on the part of this Gardner, he was elected, along with other know-nothings, to an abolition national convention, held at Cincinnati on the 19th of November, called by those members of the Philadelphia convention who seceded on account of the very national platform which you support! The action of that convention is now before the country. Gov. Gardner and his "national" followers have formally joined hands with Gov. Johnston, of Pennsylvania, and other abolitionists, in demanding that the Missouri Compromise shall be restored, and that no more slave States shall be admitted into the Union!

Know-nothing. But there is no doubt, notwithstanding these evidences, that in 1856 the American order will present to the country a national candidate for the presidency, and will support him zealously. Democrat. I have no doubt that the members of the southern branch of your order will insist upon a nomination suitable to themselves; but it is as clear to me as the sun at noonday that, if they succeed in inducing any portion of the northern men who belong to your order to unite with them, the only effect of such a nomination will be to assist the abolitionists in the North. There is not a single free State, excepting Massachusetts and New York, (and I have just shown you how they stand affected,) in which know-nothingism and abolitionism are not synonymous terms; so that a southern nomination of your order will be made only for the purpose of defeating the democratic party in the South, and of thereby assisting Mr. Seward in his game of being elected to the presidency by uniting the factions of the North upon himself.

Know-nothing. Let me understand you; do you mean to say that a national man will not be supported by the American order in the free States? Democrat. I mean to say that any candidate whom you may nominate to please the southern know-nothings, who will, therefore, be compelled to stand upon some kind of a national platform, will not be supported by your brethren in the North to any considerable extent, but will be pushed aside in the free States by a fusion candidate like Seward, who will do as he has done in the last elections in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, &c., &c.—combine all the elements of the opposition united upon abolition candidates. The only effect of running such a candidate in the South will be, to weaken the democratic party in that quarter, and to give Mr. Seward the majority, and, if possible, the presidency. And this, I believe, is the real design of your leaders, North and South.

From the N. Y. Day Book. THE GREAT "STAY-AT-HOME" PARTY.

There were, on the day of election, over two hundred thousand voters in this State who did not feel interest enough in the success of either of the four parties to leave their business and their homes long enough to deposit their ballots in the ballot-boxes. One of these stay-at-homes gave us the following reasons for neglecting the privilege and duty of voting for State officers: "I am, first, a national Peace democrat, and cannot consistently with my feelings and principles vote for any but national democrats for office. I belong to what you call 'soft-shells,' and should have voted that ticket but for the statement of John Van Buren that all but two of the candidates were Van Buren men in 1848, and were prouder to-day of having been so than ever. It was the fact—and I had no reason to doubt it—I could not vote for any man sooner than for Mann and King. The 'hard-shells,' though right in their declaration of principles, opposed and denounced our democratic administration. Their opposition was factious, and nothing else, and I would not vote with them nor for them. The know-nothings, inasmuch as they had no principles and expressed none, I might have gone for on the ground that they were nobodies as well as know-nothings; and I could express my indifference just about as well in voting that ticket as by staying at home. But it was a little less trouble to stay at home; and I did so."

Now, then, we are to expect that in every ten of those who did not vote as well as fall one-third of those who voted the know-nothing ticket, thought and felt just as this man thought and felt. The democratic party, by its free-soil corner-stone resolution, and the quasi endorsement of John Van Buren's speeches, completely stifled itself, and we wonder how it made out to poll as many votes as it did. We should think that every man who believed what John Van Buren said or thought, or as he pretended to think, would most surely have voted the republican ticket, and every one who did not think as he did, nor believe what he said, would have been ashamed of being seen voting with a party so utterly inconsistent in all its professions as was the democratic party. The republicans were consistent, and polled their entire vote. The know-nothings, of course, polled their full vote, and got fifty thousand silver-gray whigs and neutrals for, for the want of something tangible to go for, voted for the know-nothings. They found that they could not say they knew nothing in the whole range of parties that expressed their principles and sentiments by voting the know-nothing ticket, and they did so.

It is evident from all this—and we defy any rational, intelligent man to say that our deductions from the facts are not fair and correct—that had the democratic party come boldly out with a manly set of principles, totally different from the republicans, it would have swept the State by a hundred thousand majority. Ever since the defeat of Van Buren in 1840 both the whig and democratic parties have been dodging and fooling around this interminable nigger question. At first both were shy of it, (or rather the whigs were shy, the democrats sneered it); then the whigs began to talk about it to introduce resolutions, throw out feelers, and, finally, to take it up and bug it to their bosoms. These leaders became possessed with the idea that anti-slavery was immensely popular with the people, and so firm were they in the opinion that they offered in 1840 the question of suffrage to the blacks to the whites to vote upon. The result was a tremendous majority against it. Still they were not satisfied; they said, "Oh, of course, laboring white men are opposed to political equality, but they are in favor of freedom." Nevertheless, they have never dared to let even the naked question of freedom or slavery for the negro be submitted to the people. The instincts of white laborers are too strong even for that.

In 1848, to revenge himself for an imagined wrong, Martin Van Buren introduced this negro question into the democratic ranks, and taking up the whig cry of "freedom for the negro, freedom in the Territories, opposition to slavery extension," &c., &c., succeeded in breaking up the party and detaching the democratic candidate for President. Since then the whole country has been agitated with the question—nigger, nigger, nigger, has been the theme year in and year out, not only in the halls of Congress, but in the State legislature, in the towns, in the district schools, and in the churches, until the people are fairly sick and tired of it; and two hundred and ninety thousand of them in this State are waiting and watching for an opportunity to express their decided opposition to any further talk or legislation on the subject.

The whigs, abolitionists, and republicans profess to be anxious to bring the question to a direct vote before the people, and boldly declare that it can no longer be dodged or evaded, and they are ready for it. Under these circumstances, what is the duty of the democratic party? Why, plainly to meet the issue as presented. The result of the late election shows that there are 200,000 people who will not go on the black side, nor will they go with the know-nothings nor the democrats so long as they stand in their present equivocal position. Where will they go?

Democrat. And it is upon these results you base the prediction of your order as a national party? You will not

deny that the know-nothings of New York were repudiated by all the known national men in that State, (whigs and democrats) that they denounced the Nebraska bill; and that their leader, Brooks, who was re-elected to the senate on account of his assault on Archbishop Hughes, was one of the prominent men in the last legislature of the State in offering resolutions filled with ultra abolition sentiments. Nor can you deny that this very man Gardner, whom you have re-elected governor of Massachusetts, signed a series of the worst resolutions against the fugitive-slave law that could have been adopted by the know-nothing legislature of that State, and retired from the Philadelphia convention because it adopted the very platform of which you boast. As if to complete the catalogue of abolitionism on the part of this Gardner, he was elected, along with other know-nothings, to an abolition national convention, held at Cincinnati on the 19th of November, called by those members of the Philadelphia convention who seceded on account of the very national platform which you support! The action of that convention is now before the country. Gov. Gardner and his "national" followers have formally joined hands with Gov. Johnston, of Pennsylvania, and other abolitionists, in demanding that the Missouri Compromise shall be restored, and that no more slave States shall be admitted into the Union!

Know-nothing. But there is no doubt, notwithstanding these evidences, that in 1856 the American order will present to the country a national candidate for the presidency, and will support him zealously. Democrat. I have no doubt that the members of the southern branch of your order will insist upon a nomination suitable to themselves; but it is as clear to me as the sun at noonday that, if they succeed in inducing any portion of the northern men who belong to your order to unite with them, the only effect of such a nomination will be to assist the abolitionists in the North. There is not a single free State, excepting Massachusetts and New York, (and I have just shown you how they stand affected,) in which know-nothingism and abolitionism are not synonymous terms; so that a southern nomination of your order will be made only for the purpose of defeating the democratic party in the South, and of thereby assisting Mr. Seward in his game of being elected to the presidency by uniting the factions of the North upon himself.

Know-nothing. Let me understand you; do you mean to say that a national man will not be supported by the American order in the free States? Democrat. I mean to say that any candidate whom you may nominate to please the southern know-nothings, who will, therefore, be compelled to stand upon some kind of a national platform, will not be supported by your brethren in the North to any considerable extent, but will be pushed aside in the free States by a fusion candidate like Seward, who will do as he has done in the last elections in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, &c., &c.—combine all the elements of the opposition united upon abolition candidates. The only effect of running such a candidate in the South will be, to weaken the democratic party in that quarter, and to give Mr. Seward the majority, and, if possible, the presidency. And this, I believe, is the real design of your leaders, North and South.

From the N. Y. Day Book. THE GREAT "STAY-AT-HOME" PARTY.

There were, on the day of election, over two hundred thousand voters in this State who did not feel interest enough in the success of either of the four parties to leave their business and their homes long enough to deposit their ballots in the ballot-boxes. One of these stay-at-homes gave us the following reasons for neglecting the privilege and duty of voting for State officers: "I am, first, a national Peace democrat, and cannot consistently with my feelings and principles vote for any but national democrats for office. I belong to what you call 'soft-shells,' and should have voted that ticket but for the statement of John Van Buren that all but two of the candidates were Van Buren men in 1848, and were prouder to-day of having been so than ever. It was the fact—and I had no reason to doubt it—I could not vote for any man sooner than for Mann and King. The 'hard-shells,' though right in their declaration of principles, opposed and denounced our democratic administration. Their opposition was factious, and nothing else, and I would not vote with them nor for them. The know-nothings, inasmuch as they had no principles and expressed none, I might have gone for on the ground that they were nobodies as well as know-nothings; and I could express my indifference just about as well in voting that ticket as by staying at home. But it was a little less trouble to stay at home; and I did so."

Now, then, we are to expect that in every ten of those who did not vote as well as fall one-third of those who voted the know-nothing ticket, thought and felt just as this man thought and felt. The democratic party, by its free-soil corner-stone resolution, and the quasi endorsement of John Van Buren's speeches, completely stifled itself, and we wonder how it made out to poll as many votes as it did. We should think that every man who believed what John Van Buren said or thought, or as he pretended to think, would most surely have voted the republican ticket, and every one who did not think as he did, nor believe what he said, would have been ashamed of being seen voting with a party so utterly inconsistent in all its professions as was the democratic party. The republicans were consistent, and polled their entire vote. The know-nothings, of course, polled their full vote, and got fifty thousand silver-gray whigs and neutrals for, for the want of something tangible to go for, voted for the know-nothings. They found that they could not say they knew nothing in the whole range of parties that expressed their principles and sentiments by voting the know-nothing ticket, and they did so.

It is evident from all this—and we defy any rational, intelligent man to say that our deductions from the facts are not fair and correct—that had the democratic party come boldly out with a manly set of principles, totally different from the republicans, it would have swept the State by a hundred thousand majority. Ever since the defeat of Van Buren in 1840 both the whig and democratic parties have been dodging and fooling around this interminable nigger question. At first both were shy of it, (or rather the whigs were shy, the democrats sneered it); then the whigs began to talk about it to introduce resolutions, throw out feelers, and, finally, to take it up and bug it to their bosoms. These leaders became possessed with the idea that anti-slavery was immensely popular with the people, and so firm were they in the opinion that they offered in 1840 the question of suffrage to the blacks to the whites to vote upon. The result was a tremendous majority against it. Still they were not satisfied; they said, "Oh, of course, laboring white men are opposed to political equality, but they are in favor of freedom." Nevertheless, they have never dared to let even the naked question of freedom or slavery for the negro be submitted to the people. The instincts of white laborers are too strong even for that.

In 1848, to revenge himself for an imagined wrong, Martin Van Buren introduced this negro question into the democratic ranks, and taking up the whig cry of "freedom for the negro, freedom in the Territories, opposition to slavery extension," &c., &c., succeeded in breaking up the party and detaching the democratic candidate for President. Since then the whole country has been agitated with the question—nigger, nigger, nigger, has been the theme year in and year out, not only in the halls of Congress, but in the State legislature, in the towns, in the district schools, and in the churches, until the people are fairly sick and tired of it; and two hundred and ninety thousand of them in this State are waiting and watching for an opportunity to express their decided opposition to any further talk or legislation on the subject.

The whigs, abolitionists, and republicans profess to be anxious to bring the question to a direct vote before the people, and boldly declare that it can no longer be dodged or evaded, and they are ready for it. Under these circumstances, what is the duty of the democratic party? Why, plainly to meet the issue as presented. The result of the late election shows that there are 200,000 people who will not go on the black side, nor will they go with the know-nothings nor the democrats so long as they stand in their present equivocal position. Where will they go?

Democrat. And it is upon these results you base the prediction of your order as a national party? You will not

deny that the know-nothings of New York were repudiated by all the known national men in that State, (whigs and democrats) that they denounced the Nebraska bill; and that their leader, Brooks, who was re-elected to the senate on account of his assault on Archbishop Hughes, was one of the prominent men in the last legislature of the State in offering resolutions filled with ultra abolition sentiments. Nor can you deny that this very man Gardner, whom you have re-elected governor of Massachusetts, signed a series of the worst resolutions against the fugitive-slave law that could have been adopted by the know-nothing legislature of that State, and retired from the Philadelphia convention because it adopted the very platform of which you boast. As if to complete the catalogue of abolitionism on the part of this Gardner, he was elected, along with other know-nothings, to an abolition national convention, held at Cincinnati on the 19th of November, called by those members of the Philadelphia convention who seceded on account of the very national platform which you support! The action of that convention is now before the country. Gov. Gardner and his "national" followers have formally joined hands with Gov. Johnston, of Pennsylvania, and other abolitionists, in demanding that the Missouri Compromise shall be restored, and that no more slave States shall be admitted into the Union!

Know-nothing. But there is no doubt, notwithstanding these evidences, that in 1856 the American order will present to the country a national candidate for the presidency, and will support him zealously. Democrat. I have no doubt that the members of the southern branch of your order will insist upon a nomination suitable to themselves; but it is as clear to me as the sun at noonday that, if they succeed in inducing any portion of the northern men who belong to your order to unite with them, the only effect of such a nomination will be to assist the abolitionists in the North. There is not a single free State, excepting Massachusetts and New York, (and I have just shown you how they stand affected,) in which know-nothingism and abolitionism are not synonymous terms; so that a southern nomination of your order will be made only for the purpose of defeating the democratic party in the South, and of thereby assisting Mr. Seward in his game of being elected to the presidency by uniting the factions of the North upon himself.

Know-nothing. Let me understand you; do you mean to say that a national man will not be supported by the American order in the free States? Democrat. I mean to say that any candidate whom you may nominate to please the southern know-nothings, who will, therefore, be compelled to stand upon some kind of a national platform, will not be supported by your brethren in the North to any considerable extent, but will be pushed aside in the free States by a fusion candidate like Seward, who will do as he has done in the last elections in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, &c., &c.—combine all the elements of the opposition united upon abolition candidates. The only effect of running such a candidate in the South will be, to weaken the democratic party in that quarter, and to give Mr. Seward the majority, and, if possible, the presidency. And this, I believe, is the real design of your leaders, North and South.

From the N. Y. Day Book. THE GREAT "STAY-AT-HOME" PARTY.

There were, on the day of election, over two hundred thousand voters in this State who did not feel interest enough in the success of either of the four parties to leave their business and their homes long enough to deposit their ballots in the ballot-boxes. One of these stay-at-homes gave us the following reasons for neglecting the privilege and duty of voting for State officers: "I am, first, a national Peace democrat, and cannot consistently with my feelings and principles vote for any but national democrats for office. I belong to what you call 'soft-shells,' and should have voted that ticket but for the statement of John Van Buren that all but two of the candidates were Van Buren men in 1848, and were prouder to-day of having been so than ever. It was the fact—and I had no reason to doubt it—I could not vote for any man sooner than for Mann and King. The 'hard-shells,' though right in their declaration of principles, opposed and denounced our democratic administration. Their opposition was factious, and nothing else, and I would not vote with them nor for them. The know-nothings, inasmuch as they had no principles and expressed none, I might have gone for on the ground that they were nobodies as well as know-nothings; and I could express my indifference just about as well in voting that ticket as by staying at home. But it was a little less trouble to stay at home; and I did so."

Now, then, we are to expect that in every ten of those who did not vote as well as fall one-third of those who voted the know-nothing ticket, thought and felt just as this man thought and felt. The democratic party, by its free-soil corner-stone resolution, and the quasi endorsement of John Van Buren's speeches, completely stifled itself, and we wonder how it made out to poll as many votes as it did. We should think that every man who believed what John Van Buren said or thought, or as he pretended to think, would most surely have voted the republican ticket, and every one who did not think as he did, nor believe what he said, would have been ashamed of being seen voting with a party so utterly inconsistent in all its professions as was the democratic party. The republicans were consistent, and polled their entire vote. The know-nothings, of course, polled their full vote, and got fifty thousand silver-gray whigs and neutrals for, for the want of something tangible to go for, voted for the know-nothings. They found that they could not say they knew nothing in the whole range of parties that expressed their principles and sentiments by voting the know-nothing ticket, and they did so.

It is evident from all this—and we defy any rational, intelligent man to say that our deductions from the facts are not fair and correct—that had the democratic party come boldly out with a manly set of principles, totally different from the republicans, it would have swept the State by a hundred thousand majority. Ever since the defeat of Van Buren in 1840 both the whig and democratic parties have been dodging and fooling around this interminable nigger question. At first both were shy of it, (or rather the whigs were shy, the democrats sneered it); then the whigs began to talk about it to introduce resolutions, throw out feelers, and, finally, to take it up and bug it to their bosoms. These leaders became possessed with the idea that anti-slavery was immensely popular with the people, and so firm were they in the opinion that they offered in 1840 the question of suffrage to the blacks to the whites to vote upon. The result was a tremendous majority against it. Still they were not satisfied; they said, "Oh, of course, laboring white men are opposed to political equality, but they are in favor of freedom." Nevertheless, they have never dared to let even the naked question of freedom or slavery for the negro be submitted to the people. The instincts of white laborers are too strong even for that.

In 1848, to revenge himself for an imagined wrong, Martin Van Buren introduced this negro question into the democratic ranks, and taking up the whig cry of "freedom for the negro, freedom in the Territories, opposition to slavery extension," &c., &c., succeeded in breaking up the party and detaching the democratic candidate for President. Since then the whole country has been agitated with the question—nigger, nigger, nigger, has been the theme year in and year out, not only in the halls of Congress, but in the State legislature, in the towns, in the district schools, and in the churches, until the people are fairly sick and tired of it; and two hundred and ninety thousand of them in this State are waiting and watching for an opportunity to express their decided opposition to any further talk or legislation on the subject.

The whigs, abolitionists, and republicans profess to be anxious to bring the question to a direct vote before the people, and boldly declare that it can no longer be dodged or evaded, and they are ready for it. Under these circumstances, what is the duty of the democratic party? Why, plainly to meet the issue as presented. The result of the late election shows that there are 200,000 people who will not go on the black side, nor will they go with the know-nothings nor the democrats so long as they stand in their present equivocal position. Where will they go?

Why, of course, with the party that voted in 1852 for Franklin Pierce, the pro-slavery man, for President in preference to Winfield Scott, the anti-slavery man, and ally of anti-slavery. Let the democratic party come out boldly and distinctly on the broad ground that a negro is a negro and not a white man; let his organs and his speakers have something tangible and with a meaning to argue from; in other words, give them a good start and fair play, and not bum them in with meaningless resolutions about the "slave States being responsible for the evil," and we have not a shadow of fear that another 1852 triumph would be the result. And to this party must, sooner or later, come. It has dodged, and skulked, and played around quite as long as the people will suffer it to play.

DEPARTMENT NEWS. INTERIOR DEPARTMENT. Death in the General Land Office.—On Saturday last, at about two o'clock, Mr. Abram Hines, one of the packers in the General Land Office, while discharging his duties, was struck with paralysis, from the effects of which he has since died. Mr. H. was upwards of fifty years of age, and was an old resident of this city. He has been employed in the General Land Office since April, 1844, and has been faithful in the discharge of his duty.

NAVY DEPARTMENT. The East India Squadron.—Letters have been received by the Secretary of the Navy from the East India squadron, stating that the sloop Macedonian (flag-ship), Commodore Joel Abbott, commander-in-chief of the squadron, was at Shanghai on the 6th of September last; that the steam-frigate Powhatan, Capt. William J. McCluney, was at Hong Kong at the same date; and that the sloop Vanadis, Commander John Pope, was also at Hong Kong on the 23d of August last. Several deaths are reported, but no names are given.

COURT OF CLAIMS. Monday, November 25.—The court met at 11 o'clock. The judges were all present. The argument in the privateer Armstrong case (adjudged over from Friday) was resumed by the Solicitor, who concluded his remarks. Charles O'Connor, esq., of New York, will follow with his argument to-morrow. Charles O'Connor, esq., of New York, was sworn an attorney of this court.

The following named gentlemen (in addition to those already appointed) were appointed commissioners to take testimony in the several States named: Maine.—James L. Child, Augusta. New Hampshire.—Charles W. Woodman, Dover. Connecticut.—David J. Peck, New Haven. New York.—Malcolm S. Hamblet, John Livingston, and Frederick W. King, New York; Henry T. Walbridge, Saratoga; B. T. Trowbridge, Syracuse; and A. Conklin, Buffalo. Pennsylvania.—Arthur M. Barton and John M. Grier, Philadelphia. Ohio.—John L. Pendry, Cincinnati; and Amos Layman, Marietta.

Illinois.—William G. Bowman, Shawneetown. Indiana.—Salmon A. Buel, Indianapolis, and William R. Bowers, Michigan city. Wisconsin.—Michael McLaughlin, Dubuque. Kansas.—James H. Lane, Benjamin T. Simmons, Daniel A. N. Grover, and Allen T. Tibbitts, Lawrence city. Minnesota.—Henry J. Horn, St. Paul, and J. J. Noah, Mendota. California.—William G. Morris and William McDougall, San Francisco.

Cherokee Nation.—George Butler, Tahlequah. New Mexico.—John S. Barber, Taos. Washington Territory.—Charles H. Mason. Virginia.—John C. Moncure, Fredericksburg; G. W. Handbrough, Frontstown; and William L. Clark, Jr., Winchester. South Carolina.—Robert Cogdell Gilchrist and Thomas Frost, Charleston. Georgia.—Seymour B. Bonner and Michael N. Clarke, Columbus. Kentucky.—John O. Ballock, Louisville. Mississippi.—Terence McElwain, Rankin county. Missouri.—Eliza B. Jackson, Jackson county. Alabama.—Robert Christian, Perry county. Louisiana.—Richard P. Harrison, New Orleans. Texas.—Thomas De Cordova, Georgetown. Florida.—William P. de Saurade, and Willis L. Roberts