

Business Notices.

DECEMBER. Again December brings us back... How much of joy, how much of pain... The Herald adds, that the pretended poll of 215 votes at Kickapoo is bogus.

CLOTHING. No. 33 and 35. Corner of John and Nassau st. Our coats, jackets, suits, pants and vests of all kinds, making at prices below the cost of manufacturing.

BEST RED-ASH STOVE AND EGG COAL at \$5 50 per ton, now discharging and delivered free of cartage. FURNITURE. No. 14 Wall, 7th story and 215 East 11th st., New York, and P. O. South 7th and North 11th st., Williamsburg.

CROCK, RHEUMATISM, SORE THROATS, COUGHS, &c. are immediately cured by Dr. TORRIS'S wonderful... GAS FIXTURE MANUFACTORY. CHATELAIN, 110 N. 5th St. N. Y.

PROF. ALEX. C. BARRY'S TRICHOPHOROUS. The best and cheapest remedy for Dandruff, Itching, Scalding, Curdling, Falling-out, and Restoring the Hair. Ladies, try it! For sale by all Druggists and Perfumers throughout the world.

New-York Daily Tribune.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1857.

TO CORRESPONDENTS. Subscribers, in sending us communications, frequently omit to mention the name of the Post-Office, to which they are sent.

The Serdy Hook line was in working order last night, but at the hour of closing there was no sign of the Baltic. The weather was quite thick and rainy outside.

The Cantarases got through with four Wards on Saturday, making nine in all, viz.: the First, Second, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Ninth, Tenth, Eleventh and Thirteenth. The result in all these for Mayor varies from the returns published in THE TRIBUNE of Wednesday only 75 votes. There need be no fear of a final result; Mr. Timson will have about 2,300 majority. With regard to the lights in the office where the returns are kept, we are glad to state that the people quite misunderstand the matter; the lights are for security, and Mr. Valentine kept two of his most trustworthy clerks as watchmen over the returns every night. There is not the least chance for any trickery, and all run more that this or that district is to be thrown out or if errors discovered which will reverse the people's decision should not be listened to, at least until some tangible proof is advanced.

The caucus held at Washington on Saturday evening by the Democratic members of the House for officers of that body, resulted in the choice of Mr. Orr for Speaker, Mr. Allen for Clerk, Mr. Cluskey for Postmaster, Mr. Hackney for Door-keeper, and Mr. Glosbrenner for Sergeant-at-Arms. The nomination for Printer was postponed until Monday.

Judge Wallace of Indianapolis gave his decision on Saturday in the slave case pending before him. The Judge said that he could not traverse the decision of the Commissioner, and remanded the negro to the custody of the Marshal for delivery to his master. Great excitement prevailed, but no attempt at rescue was made. The suit against Dr. Velandigham was dismissed.

The St. Paul Times of the 24th ult. has off set returns of the vote for Governor in 32 Counties of MINNESOTA, which show aggregates of 16,674 votes for Ramsey (Repub.), and 16,141 for Sibley (Dem.).—Ramsey ahead, 533. Ten more Counties unofficially heard from give Ramsey 1,880, Sibley 1,494—increasing Ramsey's majority to 416. But there are bogus reports from Pembina and eight other Counties, which give Sibley 1,176 majority, which of course elects him. The manufacturers of these returns are warned that they can only submit them for the canvass at their peril.

The Times says that there is a return of 35 votes for Sibley at Kandahoi preclude, Davis County, when there is proof ready that only nine persons pretended to vote there, and none of these were legal voters. One of them was a boy 16 years old. It is by such votes—or rather, by such returns—that Mr. Sibley is to govern Minnesota for the next two years. His ill will be "the Honorable Henry H. Sibley."

From WISCONSIN, we have what seem to be conclusive returns. Fifty Counties officially returned give Randall (Repub.) for Governor 44,473, to 41,026 for Cross, (Dem.). Three other Counties give Randall 18,189, and the remaining County (Burnett) held no election. Votes not returned from Jefferson and other Counties—Randall 409, Cross 654. Randall's net majority, 221. No thanks to the Fifteen Thousand Republicans who did not vote.

Our letters from Kansas are unaccountably delayed on the way. That given in our last was three weeks in reaching us by express. That given herewith came by Mail in a little less time. It will be seen that the meeting at Lawrence, though deeply indignant at the bogus usurpation, did not consent to extreme measures. An appeal was made to Gov. Walker to call the new Territorial Legislature in anticipation of its regular meeting, in order that it might countercheck the bogus usurpation. The people of Lawrence were not aware that Gov. Walker had already started for Washington.

We have The Herald of Freedom of the 21st. It is known as the Free-State organ of Gov. Walker. It announces the Governor's departure, and says his influence will be exerted at Washington in favor of the People of Kansas and against the

bigua Constitution. It adds that the People, though aroused and indignant are awaiting cordially a call of the new Legislature by Gov. W. Sec. Stanton, in season to head off the Border Ruffian Regency. The Editor says, "We have no doubt that the Legislators will be convened."

The Democratic Congressional Caucus on Saturday night, after harmoniously nominating Speaker, Clerk, Sergeant-at-Arms, Doorkeeper and Postmaster, balked and broke up in a row on the nomination of Printer. There is a chance that the machinery may have been re-oiled and got in working order during the thirty six intervening hours, but we cherish a joyful hope that it will be found this morning to have broken down irreparably, and that no Printer to the House can be elected under the system hitherto in vogue. In that case, we urge all friends of honesty and economy in public affairs to strike at once, and determinedly for the restoration of the policy of advertising for bids, and awarding the Printing of Congress in classes to the lowest bidder who proffer ample security for the prompt and faithful execution of the work.

This plan combines simplicity with conformity to usage in other well administered departments of the public service. Everybody can understand it; no one can dispute its fairness. There can be no cheating nor extortion under it except through the connivance and complicity of those public functionaries who are appointed and paid expressly to guard against such robbery of the Nation; and not a great deal, we presume, even with such complicity. Any competent printer, with the contracts and the orders of the two Houses before him, backed by the certificate of the proper functionary that the documents ordered have actually been printed and delivered, can readily determine to a fraction just how much the printer is entitled to receive from the Treasury. It might be advisable to appoint all the practical printers in both Houses a Joint Committee to scrutinize the accounts of the several Congressional Printers and see that they obtain all their due and not one farthing more. If these should ever run short—as we trust they would not—the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House might be required to designate three practical printers from the cities of New-York, Philadelphia and Baltimore respectively to scrutinize the accounts of the several Printers of Congress and report the exact amount payable to each. Under this system—which is substantially that under which the Government supplies itself with Pork, Flour, Powder, &c., for its Army and Navy, and about everything else but Official Service and Printing—there is little doubt that \$100,000 per annum might be saved to the Treasury. Why any one who wishes to save the Public Money should object to it, we cannot imagine.

One of our contemporaries proposes a lien of this National Printing Office, in which all the Public Printing shall be executed by public stipendiaries on types and presses owned by the Government. It is hardly necessary to say that the author of this notable project, though an owner of types, never made a month's livelihood by handling them. Such a National Printing Office would inevitably become a great National Hospital for all the broken down party hacks who ever dabbled in ink. Every Member of Congress would have two or three of these incurable invalids who must be provided for; and the inevitable result would be an army of Foremen, Proof Readers, Superintendents of this, that and the other department of the business, most of whom will have sought and obtained their places as a reward for party services and a salve for personal dissipation, with a clear understanding, at least on their own part, that they are to do little or nothing and receive generous stipends. The Printer-in-Chief who could make places for the largest number of this class would be eminently popular with Congress, and might expect to retain his situation till the defeat of his party, when one of like facility would naturally be chosen by the opposite party, and a new and hungry swarm would replace the old one. We appeal to every practical printer—nay, to every man familiar with the manner of working for Government and for individuals respectively—in support of our argument that every evil now experienced would be aggravated by the establishment of a National Printing Office. The expense would be far greater than that now incurred, heavy as it is; for the naked fact that the Government has a large army of printing stipendiaries to pay through the year, whether they have work or not, will be urged as a reason why jobs of printing should be given out by Congress to keep them busy throughout the recess.

We beg the Members not familiar with Printing to be assured that there is no difficulty—no shadow of difficulty—in so preparing specifications and contracts as absolutely to insure the prompt and faithful execution of the Public Printing at the lowest cash prices. Let ample security be exacted, to be deposited in the Sub Treasury at Washington, and the Superintendent of Printing authorized to reject all work badly or not seasonably executed, have the same work well done elsewhere, and draw on the contractor's deposit for payment. If it is proper that the Government should supply its need of Beef or Brandy in this way, it cannot be wrong to pursue the same course with regard to Printing. And if it is to resort to the opposite policy, and establish a National Printing Office, we see not why it should stop here. Why not have a National Paper-Mill, and a National Slaughter-House—we mean no allusion to the quadrennial Democratic National Convention, but a grand establishment for packing and pickling the meats required for the Army and Navy? If there be any need of the Government which it is advisable to supply by contracting with the lowest bidder, we hold that of Printing to belong to this category.

There is no better test of the morality of a people than their treatment of their public creditors. That a man who owes an honest debt and will not pay it simply because he knows his creditor cannot compel him, is a scoundrel, we all understand; but the moral responsibility resting on every citizen to insist on and secure the payment of every obligation of the State or municipality of which he is a citizen, is not so generally felt as it should be. The plea of necessity, of inability, is often interposed to justify or palliate the swindling of public creditors, though

the State in whose behalf this plea is set up swindles thousands of citizens of whom any hundred are worth more than the whole debt, and when the vices of its people cost them enough to pay the debt twice over every ten years. Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Texas have generally disgraced themselves by defrauding their public creditors. The failure to pay promptly, whether principal or interest, is a wrong which can never be repaired. The State may resume at some future day; but meantime hundreds of timid or ignorant or necessitous persons have sold out at a sacrifice and their loss is never made up to them—a loss inflicted on them solely by the State's dishonest insolvency.

The State of Arkansas is preeminent among these culprits. Very soon after her organization, her ruling politicians induced her Legislature to borrow Three Millions of Dollars and invest it in two State Banks. The politicians thereupon borrowed the money out of the Banks and invested it in real estate or more perishable fancies; hard times came on; the borrowers failed, the Banks failed, and the State failed, leaving her creditors to whistle for their money. That was twenty years ago, and they are whistling yet. It is urged on the part of Arkansas that the Banking system is a very bad thing. We do not see how this plea can be made available. Arkansas, through her chosen rulers, saw fit to borrow Three Millions of Dollars, and her creditors want their pay. The plea that she made a bad use of the money, set up in bar of a demand for payment, would be tolerated by no Court in Christendom. Her misapplication, if such it was, of their money, was nowise the fault of her creditors. But again it is urged that she has collected from the assets of the exploded Banks and paid over to her creditors a part of their dues. That is a good plea so far as it goes. All that has thus been paid over is of course so much of her debt liquidated. But this by no means excuses her from paying the residue. She contracted with her creditors not to repay them so much of their loans as the debtors of her Banks might see fit or be compelled to refund, but the full amount of their loans with interest. If he owes anything, she owes this amount, and her paying part of it is a confession of judgment on the whole. Again, it is urged that the loans were unauthorized and unwarranted. But no word of this was whispered at the time they were made. Then universal acquiescence and satisfaction prevailed. It was not till the money had been obtained, distributed and spent, that the power to borrow it was seriously questioned. But Arkansas not only empowered and accredited the men who borrowed the money in her behalf; she has since ratified and sanctioned their acts by retaining and advancing them in power. The Democratic dynasty which borrowed the Three Millions and lent it in the State's behalf to Banks, is still continued in power. Many of the heaviest and least trustworthy borrowers from those Banks have since been and still are her chosen Governors, Senators, Members of Congress, &c., &c. She still chooses to be ruled by those who, if the plea we are considering has any force, swindled the lenders by borrowing in her name without authority. Any Court of Justice must adjudge her to have assumed the responsibility of their acts if she did not originally authorize them. The upshot of the whole matter is, that Arkansas must pay her creditors in full—and pay them promptly—or rest under a cloud of dishonor and insolvency. True policy coincides with honesty in urging her to resume payment at once.

It is exceedingly desirable, that the great questions of the day should be so presented that every party's position may be fairly understood by each other party. In this conviction, we ask The Express to reconsider and restate its assertions with respect to the Kansas difficulty.

The Express is unchanged. It stands upon the very principle now it took at the start—the principle taken on the New-York Municipal Rights issue, and ever taken in Kansas—the right of self-government—the right of the people of Kansas to make their own Constitution and their own laws. The Nebraska Kansas bill, objectionable enough because it violated the Missouri Compromise without doing any good to the South, to propitiate which it was violated, nevertheless stipulated and pledged itself for this principle of self-government, and contended that the people, in their own way, should make their own Constitution, not only as to Slavery, but in all other things. The Republican party set itself against this principle—but The Express never did, and The Express now, as at the start, insists upon the Administration carrying out the leading cardinal principle, not only of the Kansas bill, but of our form of government—that in all things, not in conflict with the Federal Constitution, the people of Kansas should have their own way. It is with great pleasure that we see the Republican journals coming up to our standard now, and abandoning the wrong plea, that Congress should make Constitutions for Territories of the United States.

Whoever sets down the 40,000 vote cast for Fernando Wood as the true strength of the Democratic party makes a serious blunder. That he could by any possibility get more votes under the circumstances of the late canvass than he had in the sweep of the Presidential contest, cannot be conceded. That he meant, under any circumstances, to be elected, is certain. His complacent confidence even after the closing of the polls, and his astonishment when the truth was known, prove conclusively that he had made a very careful computation and had prepared to overcome Mr. Tiemann in a poll of 75,000 votes. Indeed, it is generally believed that he had made up his figures (on this basis, and relied upon his trusty shoulder-knitters who gathered at Pythagoras Hall to five the half of 75,000, so far as to give him five thousand majority. This they did; and, in doing it, they swelled his legitimate vote by many thousands. Had he imagined the possibility of more than 35,000 votes for Mr. Tiemann, his desperate backers would just as certainly have beaten 43,000 as they did 35,000; but, most fortunately for the cause of good government, a large number of men who seldom or never voted before were aroused from their habitual neglect and came up en masse against him.

Another class of voters must also be considered. Many hundreds of so strongly-marked political bias, and certainly not partisans of Tammany Hall, were swayed by a strong sentiment of opposition to Albany legislation—not of opposition to this or that law of the last Legislature, but a general conviction that the people of the city were imposed upon; that the various commissions and special bills so loudly complained of were equivalent to the denial of the right of self-government, and at war with all republican principle. A great many such voters, while they approved of the result of these laws and cordially confessed their belief that Wood was unfit for any honorable position, cast their ballots directly for him solely to rebuke the Legislature. None rejoice more sincerely over his defeat than these very men, yet they believed that personal independence and municipal rights would be best sustained by voting for him; and were well repaid with more prompt and unmistakable indignation than these men attempt to represent them as Democratic partisans.

Bringing Mr. Wood's 40,000 votes then, to a careful analysis, we find it necessary to take off about one-third for these two classes—the non-po-

litical voters who strained at the gnat and swallowed the camel, and the figures piled up by the double and treble voters who swore an oath in Pythagoras Hall to elect Wood in spite of a larger poll than ever before cast who undertook to bring his total return up to 40,000 and did it. This leaves him 27,000, which will certainly take in his utmost legitimate strength in the Democratic party. How many of these would vote for him to-morrow? A great many swallowed the pill "by order" from their official masters; thousands more voted for Wood because they were convinced that he would succeed; while the illegal rumellers, policy vendors, gamblers, and all who live by unlawful and immoral practices, supported him as a matter of course. Of the honest, intelligent voters of the Democratic party, Mr. Tiemann undoubtedly had a large share. The "champions of municipal rights," who sustained Wood to rebuke Albany, are not Democratic strength; the office-holders whose will was weaker than their inclination never worship a setting sun; these attracted, how many and of what character are the balance of the 40,000 votes of which he boasts? Only about 20,000 to 25,000 of the most ignorant naturalized citizens, 2,000 of whom were made expressly for this election, and perhaps 5,000 natives who generally vote the Democratic ticket. It is notorious that the Democratic party is exceedingly anxious to get rid of this scheming, unprincipled demagogue, and nowhere has his defeat caused more genuine satisfaction than in the very city itself.

Let us be sure we understand, and refer not to misrepresent each other. Mr. John Van Buren favored The Herald on Saturday with the following spicy correspondence: NEW-YORK, Dec. 4, 1857. Will you do me the favor to publish the enclosed correspondence? I have purposely delayed its publication till after election.

The Mayor's Note. MAYOR'S OFFICE, NEW-YORK, Nov. 17, 1857. MY DEAR SIR: I hope, as an especial favor to myself, you will consent to address the following meeting on Monday evening at Tammany Hall. Will you do me the favor to refer to your recent message, and that contains sentiments and recommendations which I greatly esteem. So I should do you more honor than by a stony silence. Yours truly, J. VAN BUREN.

It strikes us that Mr. Van Buren has made a mistake in printing this correspondence subsequent to Wood's defeat. Ill-natured people will ask whether he would have pursued the same course in case Wood had triumphed, and talk of the want of generosity involved in striking a man (only) after he is down. Mr. Wood may perhaps complain of the violation of confidence involved in blazoning to the world the fact that he personally impromptu distinguished speakers to attend and address the meetings held to secure his election—for no one will presume that Mr. Van Buren was alone compelled by one of these beseeching characters. But our criticism is of quite another character. Mr. Van Buren is a recognized counselor and magnate of the Democratic party. As such, he was personally invited to attend and address one of the general meetings of his party. Mr. Wood was the nominee of that party for a most responsible public office. He had recently promulgated, in his official capacity, doctrines which were directly and palpably calculated to shake the pillars of the social edifice—to fill the minds of the freedy and despairing with hatred of the prosperous, as crafty robbers and oppressors. If Wood in his four-and-twenty Message was right, then the property now standing in the names of the landlords, mortgagees, bankers and merchants of our City, honestly belonging in the main to "those who produce everything, yet receive nothing" What more natural or just than that they, in their urgent need, should reclaim what is justly their own? Mr. Van Buren, it now appears, regards and regards those doctrines as did the great mass of our intelligent and considerate citizens. If he had spoken at Tammany Hall on the 23d ult., he must have frankly said so. Well, then, why did he not speak? Was it not his clear duty to do so? Was not his stubborn silence calculated to involve his party, through Wood's election, in the indorsement of those pestilent and perilous doctrines? Why was it not incumbent on him, as a freeman and a Democrat, to attend the meeting as invited, and there avow his convictions on the issues made up by Wood's nomination? Did he fear that his brother Democrats would not tolerate "free speech"? Can any one imagine an excuse for Mr. Van Buren's silence that is creditable at once to his integrity and his courage?

Whoever sets down the 40,000 vote cast for Fernando Wood as the true strength of the Democratic party makes a serious blunder. That he could by any possibility get more votes under the circumstances of the late canvass than he had in the sweep of the Presidential contest, cannot be conceded. That he meant, under any circumstances, to be elected, is certain. His complacent confidence even after the closing of the polls, and his astonishment when the truth was known, prove conclusively that he had made a very careful computation and had prepared to overcome Mr. Tiemann in a poll of 75,000 votes. Indeed, it is generally believed that he had made up his figures (on this basis, and relied upon his trusty shoulder-knitters who gathered at Pythagoras Hall to five the half of 75,000, so far as to give him five thousand majority. This they did; and, in doing it, they swelled his legitimate vote by many thousands. Had he imagined the possibility of more than 35,000 votes for Mr. Tiemann, his desperate backers would just as certainly have beaten 43,000 as they did 35,000; but, most fortunately for the cause of good government, a large number of men who seldom or never voted before were aroused from their habitual neglect and came up en masse against him.

gency by the State of New-York. Does The Express now uphold or condemn it? Yes or No? IV. The Republicans maintain that, under the principles recently avowed by the Democratic party, through Congress, the President and the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case, "the People of Kansas," or any other Territory, do not "have their own way" with regard to Slavery. They are compelled, so long as they retain the Territorial condition, to endure and uphold it. Ten thousand citizens of a Territory may be entirely and unchangeably averse to Slavery, yet any one slaveholder may thrust it upon them, and they are without redress so long as their Territory continues a Territory. This is "National Democracy," as now defined and enforced. But is it "Popular Sovereignty"? Is it the doctrine of The Express? Yes or No?

V. Congress does "make Constitutions for Territories of the United States"—always did, and— from the nature of the case—always must. States make their own Constitutions; Territories do not. So that State Constitutions are truly and thoroughly Republican, therefore in consonance with the paramount law, we disclaim any right on the part of Congress to interfere with them, except to see that they have been fairly made and ratified. This we hold to be the Republican ground. Does The Express dissent from it?

Let us be sure we understand, and refer not to misrepresent each other. Mr. John Van Buren favored The Herald on Saturday with the following spicy correspondence: NEW-YORK, Dec. 4, 1857. Will you do me the favor to publish the enclosed correspondence? I have purposely delayed its publication till after election.

The Mayor's Note. MAYOR'S OFFICE, NEW-YORK, Nov. 17, 1857. MY DEAR SIR: I hope, as an especial favor to myself, you will consent to address the following meeting on Monday evening at Tammany Hall. Will you do me the favor to refer to your recent message, and that contains sentiments and recommendations which I greatly esteem. So I should do you more honor than by a stony silence. Yours truly, J. VAN BUREN.

It strikes us that Mr. Van Buren has made a mistake in printing this correspondence subsequent to Wood's defeat. Ill-natured people will ask whether he would have pursued the same course in case Wood had triumphed, and talk of the want of generosity involved in striking a man (only) after he is down. Mr. Wood may perhaps complain of the violation of confidence involved in blazoning to the world the fact that he personally impromptu distinguished speakers to attend and address the meetings held to secure his election—for no one will presume that Mr. Van Buren was alone compelled by one of these beseeching characters. But our criticism is of quite another character. Mr. Van Buren is a recognized counselor and magnate of the Democratic party. As such, he was personally invited to attend and address one of the general meetings of his party. Mr. Wood was the nominee of that party for a most responsible public office. He had recently promulgated, in his official capacity, doctrines which were directly and palpably calculated to shake the pillars of the social edifice—to fill the minds of the freedy and despairing with hatred of the prosperous, as crafty robbers and oppressors. If Wood in his four-and-twenty Message was right, then the property now standing in the names of the landlords, mortgagees, bankers and merchants of our City, honestly belonging in the main to "those who produce everything, yet receive nothing" What more natural or just than that they, in their urgent need, should reclaim what is justly their own? Mr. Van Buren, it now appears, regards and regards those doctrines as did the great mass of our intelligent and considerate citizens. If he had spoken at Tammany Hall on the 23d ult., he must have frankly said so. Well, then, why did he not speak? Was it not his clear duty to do so? Was not his stubborn silence calculated to involve his party, through Wood's election, in the indorsement of those pestilent and perilous doctrines? Why was it not incumbent on him, as a freeman and a Democrat, to attend the meeting as invited, and there avow his convictions on the issues made up by Wood's nomination? Did he fear that his brother Democrats would not tolerate "free speech"? Can any one imagine an excuse for Mr. Van Buren's silence that is creditable at once to his integrity and his courage?

Whoever sets down the 40,000 vote cast for Fernando Wood as the true strength of the Democratic party makes a serious blunder. That he could by any possibility get more votes under the circumstances of the late canvass than he had in the sweep of the Presidential contest, cannot be conceded. That he meant, under any circumstances, to be elected, is certain. His complacent confidence even after the closing of the polls, and his astonishment when the truth was known, prove conclusively that he had made a very careful computation and had prepared to overcome Mr. Tiemann in a poll of 75,000 votes. Indeed, it is generally believed that he had made up his figures (on this basis, and relied upon his trusty shoulder-knitters who gathered at Pythagoras Hall to five the half of 75,000, so far as to give him five thousand majority. This they did; and, in doing it, they swelled his legitimate vote by many thousands. Had he imagined the possibility of more than 35,000 votes for Mr. Tiemann, his desperate backers would just as certainly have beaten 43,000 as they did 35,000; but, most fortunately for the cause of good government, a large number of men who seldom or never voted before were aroused from their habitual neglect and came up en masse against him.

Another class of voters must also be considered. Many hundreds of so strongly-marked political bias, and certainly not partisans of Tammany Hall, were swayed by a strong sentiment of opposition to Albany legislation—not of opposition to this or that law of the last Legislature, but a general conviction that the people of the city were imposed upon; that the various commissions and special bills so loudly complained of were equivalent to the denial of the right of self-government, and at war with all republican principle. A great many such voters, while they approved of the result of these laws and cordially confessed their belief that Wood was unfit for any honorable position, cast their ballots directly for him solely to rebuke the Legislature. None rejoice more sincerely over his defeat than these very men, yet they believed that personal independence and municipal rights would be best sustained by voting for him; and were well repaid with more prompt and unmistakable indignation than these men attempt to represent them as Democratic partisans.

Bringing Mr. Wood's 40,000 votes then, to a careful analysis, we find it necessary to take off about one-third for these two classes—the non-po-

litical voters who strained at the gnat and swallowed the camel, and the figures piled up by the double and treble voters who swore an oath in Pythagoras Hall to elect Wood in spite of a larger poll than ever before cast who undertook to bring his total return up to 40,000 and did it. This leaves him 27,000, which will certainly take in his utmost legitimate strength in the Democratic party. How many of these would vote for him to-morrow? A great many swallowed the pill "by order" from their official masters; thousands more voted for Wood because they were convinced that he would succeed; while the illegal rumellers, policy vendors, gamblers, and all who live by unlawful and immoral practices, supported him as a matter of course. Of the honest, intelligent voters of the Democratic party, Mr. Tiemann undoubtedly had a large share. The "champions of municipal rights," who sustained Wood to rebuke Albany, are not Democratic strength; the office-holders whose will was weaker than their inclination never worship a setting sun; these attracted, how many and of what character are the balance of the 40,000 votes of which he boasts? Only about 20,000 to 25,000 of the most ignorant naturalized citizens, 2,000 of whom were made expressly for this election, and perhaps 5,000 natives who generally vote the Democratic ticket. It is notorious that the Democratic party is exceedingly anxious to get rid of this scheming, unprincipled demagogue, and nowhere has his defeat caused more genuine satisfaction than in the very city itself.

litical voters who strained at the gnat and swallowed the camel, and the figures piled up by the double and treble voters who swore an oath in Pythagoras Hall to elect Wood in spite of a larger poll than ever before cast who undertook to bring his total return up to 40,000 and did it. This leaves him 27,000, which will certainly take in his utmost legitimate strength in the Democratic party. How many of these would vote for him to-morrow? A great many swallowed the pill "by order" from their official masters; thousands more voted for Wood because they were convinced that he would succeed; while the illegal rumellers, policy vendors, gamblers, and all who live by unlawful and immoral practices, supported him as a matter of course. Of the honest, intelligent voters of the Democratic party, Mr. Tiemann undoubtedly had a large share. The "champions of municipal rights," who sustained Wood to rebuke Albany, are not Democratic strength; the office-holders whose will was weaker than their inclination never worship a setting sun; these attracted, how many and of what character are the balance of the 40,000 votes of which he boasts? Only about 20,000 to 25,000 of the most ignorant naturalized citizens, 2,000 of whom were made expressly for this election, and perhaps 5,000 natives who generally vote the Democratic ticket. It is notorious that the Democratic party is exceedingly anxious to get rid of this scheming, unprincipled demagogue, and nowhere has his defeat caused more genuine satisfaction than in the very city itself.

Let us be sure we understand, and refer not to misrepresent each other. Mr. John Van Buren favored The Herald on Saturday with the following spicy correspondence: NEW-YORK, Dec. 4, 1857. Will you do me the favor to publish the enclosed correspondence? I have purposely delayed its publication till after election.

The Mayor's Note. MAYOR'S OFFICE, NEW-YORK, Nov. 17, 1857. MY DEAR SIR: I hope, as an especial favor to myself, you will consent to address the following meeting on Monday evening at Tammany Hall. Will you do me the favor to refer to your recent message, and that contains sentiments and recommendations which I greatly esteem. So I should do you more honor than by a stony silence. Yours truly, J. VAN BUREN.

It strikes us that Mr. Van Buren has made a mistake in printing this correspondence subsequent to Wood's defeat. Ill-natured people will ask whether he would have pursued the same course in case Wood had triumphed, and talk of the want of generosity involved in striking a man (only) after he is down. Mr. Wood may perhaps complain of the violation of confidence involved in blazoning to the world the fact that he personally impromptu distinguished speakers to attend and address the meetings held to secure his election—for no one will presume that Mr. Van Buren was alone compelled by one of these beseeching characters. But our criticism is of quite another character. Mr. Van Buren is a recognized counselor and magnate of the Democratic party. As such, he was personally invited to attend and address one of the general meetings of his party. Mr. Wood was the nominee of that party for a most responsible public office. He had recently promulgated, in his official capacity, doctrines which were directly and palpably calculated to shake the pillars of the social edifice—to fill the minds of the freedy and despairing with hatred of the prosperous, as crafty robbers and oppressors. If Wood in his four-and-twenty Message was right, then the property now standing in the names of the landlords, mortgagees, bankers and merchants of our City, honestly belonging in the main to "those who produce everything, yet receive nothing" What more natural or just than that they, in their urgent need, should reclaim what is justly their own? Mr. Van Buren, it now appears, regards and regards those doctrines as did the great mass of our intelligent and considerate citizens. If he had spoken at Tammany Hall on the 23d ult., he must have frankly said so. Well, then, why did he not speak? Was it not his clear duty to do so? Was not his stubborn silence calculated to involve his party, through Wood's election, in the indorsement of those pestilent and perilous doctrines? Why was it not incumbent on him, as a freeman and a Democrat, to attend the meeting as invited, and there avow his convictions on the issues made up by Wood's nomination? Did he fear that his brother Democrats would not tolerate "free speech"? Can any one imagine an excuse for Mr. Van Buren's silence that is creditable at once to his integrity and his courage?

Whoever sets down the 40,000 vote cast for Fernando Wood as the true strength of the Democratic party makes a serious blunder. That he could by any possibility get more votes under the circumstances of the late canvass than he had in the sweep of the Presidential contest, cannot be conceded. That he meant, under any circumstances, to be elected, is certain. His complacent confidence even after the closing of the polls, and his astonishment when the truth was known, prove conclusively that he had made a very careful computation and had prepared to overcome Mr. Tiemann in a poll of 75,000 votes. Indeed, it is generally believed that he had made up his figures (on this basis, and relied upon his trusty shoulder-knitters who gathered at Pythagoras Hall to five the half of 75,000, so far as to give him five thousand majority. This they did; and, in doing it, they swelled his legitimate vote by many thousands. Had he imagined the possibility of more than 35,000 votes for Mr. Tiemann, his desperate backers would just as certainly have beaten 43,000 as they did 35,000; but, most fortunately for the cause of good government, a large number of men who seldom or never voted before were aroused from their habitual neglect and came up en masse against him.

Another class of voters must also be considered. Many hundreds of so strongly-marked political bias, and certainly not partisans of Tammany Hall, were swayed by a strong sentiment of opposition to Albany legislation—not of opposition to this or that law of the last Legislature, but a general conviction that the people of the city were imposed upon; that the various commissions and special bills so loudly complained of were equivalent to the denial of the right of self-government, and at war with all republican principle. A great many such voters, while they approved of the result of these laws and cordially confessed their belief that Wood was unfit for any honorable position, cast their ballots directly for him solely to rebuke the Legislature. None rejoice more sincerely over his defeat than these very men, yet they believed that personal independence and municipal rights would be best sustained by voting for him; and were well repaid with more prompt and unmistakable indignation than these men attempt to represent them as Democratic partisans.

Bringing Mr. Wood's 40,000 votes then, to a careful analysis, we find it necessary to take off about one-third for these two classes—the non-po-

litical voters who strained at the gnat and swallowed the camel, and the figures piled up by the double and treble voters who swore an oath in Pythagoras Hall to elect Wood in spite of a larger poll than ever before cast who undertook to bring his total return up to 40,000 and did it. This leaves him 27,000, which will certainly take in his utmost legitimate strength in the Democratic party. How many of these would vote for him to-morrow? A great many swallowed the pill "by order" from their official masters; thousands more voted for Wood because they were convinced that he would succeed; while the illegal rumellers, policy vendors, gamblers, and all who live by unlawful and immoral practices, supported him as a matter of course. Of the honest, intelligent voters of the Democratic party, Mr. Tiemann undoubtedly had a large share. The "champions of municipal rights," who sustained Wood to rebuke Albany, are not Democratic strength; the office-holders whose will was weaker than their inclination never worship a setting sun; these attracted, how many and of what character are the balance of the 40,000 votes of which he boasts? Only about 20,000 to 25,000 of the most ignorant naturalized citizens, 2,000 of whom were made expressly for this election, and perhaps 5,000 natives who generally vote the Democratic ticket. It is notorious that the Democratic party is exceedingly anxious to get rid of this scheming, unprincipled demagogue, and nowhere has his defeat caused more genuine satisfaction than in the very city itself.

of their Southern brethren as a faithless set, upon whom no reliance can be placed? Already there begins to be plainly visible a sectional crack in the party. As to poor Mr. Buchanan, he is in evident danger, in his efforts to close this creek, of being swallowed up by it. The Leocompton school, which it is now pretty well understood is named from Washington, outrageously as it sets aside the doctrine of popular sovereignty, has yet very little to recommend it to the friends of Slavery. Indeed, it can hardly be regarded in any other light than as a poor expedient to gratify the members of the Leocompton Convention at the expense of everybody else.

The Herald seems more than ever to be in the dotage. It gravely asks: "When does the assembly elected Mayor take his seat? On the 1st of January, 1858, or 1859? and proceeds to show, or rather attempts to show, that Mayor Wood's term has not been cut short by law, and that he may therefore legally hold over. A glance at the City Charter will make short work of this bogey, and might have saved The Herald an unnecessary exhibition of its genius for nonsense.

Section 51 provides for the election held last Tuesday, and says that the terms of all officers elected under former laws shall continue until the officers chosen under the new Charter shall take office, "and no longer," except the Controller and others who are to serve to the close of their elected terms, and the Commissioners of Repairs and Streets and Lamps, whose offices were abolished last May. This section especially legalizes the election just held. The Herald finds this election of a Mayor all right, but cannot find when he is to be inaugurated. We read in section 53 that the regular annual charter election is permanently fixed on the first Tuesday of December, and that "the officers elected at the first election, as hereinbefore provided [the election held last Tuesday], and in each year thereafter, shall take office on the first Monday of January next succeeding." However much The Herald may desire to rebel against the laws of the land and the lately expressed will of the people, we presume Mr. Wood has had enough of forcible resistance, and enough of the Court of Appeals. He has no thought of holding over, and but for the extreme sensitiveness of the people upon the matter, we should not deem it worth while to expose the silly blunders of a garrulous old journal which knows little and cares less what it is talking about.

The Nebraska News is considering the policy of organizing the Democratic party in that Territory. It is heartily in favor of doing so, but is not quite ready yet, because "No party can succeed with the people of Nebraska with such leaders as the corrupt C., the drunken Tom C., and the scoundrelly R. I would be an army of lions with a ring for a leader—another complication of the ancient fables. Not such those corruptors, drunkards, expelled Know-Nothing, dishonest gamblers, miscreants, vagabonds, rascals, thieves as filled off, shall we favor the organization in this Territory of our glorious old party." The names we have reduced to initials are given in full in The News's plain-spoken leader. Provided the facts are as it indicates, we consider its reasoning cogent and its position a strong one.

This afternoon the Common Council of 1857 will commence their last monthly session—a session that will need close watching. There are several schemes in progress which bode no good to the people, while some beneficial measures, originated early in the year, will be quietly smothered. Fort Gansevoort's spectral walls will loom up in the Councilman, having already passed the other Board. The speculative mind of Ald. Steers, who has a shippard to dispose of, will urge forward the unjust attempt to remove the steamboat landings. Grants of land to sectarian institutions will probably lie over, under the influence of the recent injunction; and, besides, there are no votes to bid for just now. The job of reorganizing the Departments is still incomplete; and if any more places can be made for party favorites, the mill will turn a little further. Then the new avenue west of Broadway, and the widening of several streets, must be attended to. Another important measure is the purchase of the remainder of the land on Ward's Island, a very suspicious scheme, not at all palatable to those who remember the blackening testimony in regard to the purchase of the portion already belonging to the city. Let the people keep a sharp eye on the Common Council.

THE SHOE AND LEATHER BANK AND THE CITY DEPOSITS.

A statement having appeared in The Evening Post of this day (whose editor has evidently been imposed upon) to the effect that the Shoe and Leather Bank had contributed \$10,000 toward Mr. Wood's election to the Mayoralty, and had offered the same sum indirectly to the Tiemann Committee, on condition of the continuance with the Bank of the City's deposits, I desire to say in the most unqualified manner that both these allegations are totally without foundation, both in respect to the Bank and to myself as an individual. The Bank has never paid, or offered to pay, or authorized any one to offer to pay, either directly or indirectly, any sum whatever for any candidate for any office, and for Mr. Wood quite as little as for Mr. Tiemann. I must also ask for Mr. Wood the justice to say that he has never asked for a dollar.