

The Standard.

RALEIGH, SATURDAY, DEC. 5, 1857.

HOLDEN & WILSON, STATE PRINTERS.

AUTHORIZED PUBLISHERS OF THE LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES.

Special Notice.

The Standard is conducted strictly upon the cash system. All papers are discontinued at the expiration of the time for which they have been paid.

As a party those with whom we have acted, and now act, are powerless. We are not in the field even.

Who has clothed the Register with the power to pronounce the fifty thousand American Whigs who have never faltered and who voted for John A. Gilmer for Governor as "powerless"?

DEMOCRATIC STATE CONVENTION.

The members of the Democratic State Committee are respectfully requested to meet in the City of Raleigh, on Friday, the 8th day of January, 1858, to determine on the time and place for holding the next Democratic State Convention.

The members of the Committee, in the order named by the President of the last State Convention, are as follows: Wm. W. Holden, of Wake; James Fulton, of New Hanover; James H. White, of Gaston; Jesse A. Waugh, of Forsyth; Robert S. French, of Robeson; William A. Jenkins, of Warren; Wm. K. Lane, of Wayne; David Coleman, of Yancey; R. P. Waring, of Mecklenburg; and Joseph Allison, of Orange.

W. W. HOLDEN, Chairman. The Democratic papers of the State will please copy or notice.

Mr. McRae's Letter.

We copy to day, from the Tarborough Southern, a letter from Duncan K. McRae, Esq., late United States Consul at Paris, addressed to W. F. Dancy, Esq., of Edgecombe, on the subject of State Debt and Distribution.

Mr. Dancy, it appears, did not retain a copy of the letter he addressed to Mr. McRae, and therefore has not published it; but we are left to infer, from the character of Mr. McRae's reply, that he was interrogated upon two questions, to wit, State Debt and Distribution. Other gentlemen, we learn, have also been interrogated by Mr. Dancy, and other further questions have been put to them.

Mr. McRae, it will be seen, takes ground for distribution, and declares that "at this moment" it is "a far more important" question "than that of slavery, and a much more practical one."

These are the main features of his letter, so far as federal politics are concerned. We publish his letter as a matter of courtesy, and because we are willing that he should be heard; but we disagree with him thoroughly and radically on the subject of distribution and in relation to the usages of the party.

We shall examine his letter somewhat at length hereafter. Mr. McRae's course will be hailed with satisfaction and delight by most of the Know Nothing presses of the State. They will see in it some gleam of hope that the Democratic party may be disorganized, and that the result will inure to their benefit.

These are our opinions, freely and plainly given. We expect to maintain them now and hereafter. We have been contending for them through the columns of this journal for more than fourteen years, and we will never surrender them.

SOUTH-CAROLINA UNITED STATES SENATOR.—Ex-Governor James H. Hammond was, on Monday, on the third ballot, elected U. S. Senator by the Legislature of South Carolina. The following is the vote: Hammond, 85; Pickens, 59; Dargan, 8; Barnwell, 2; Messinger, 1; Allison, 2; D. E. Twilley, 1; Chesnut, 1; Blank, 4. Hammond's majority over Pickens, 26; over all, 13.

The Columbia Times says that Gov. Hammond is "a man of very considerable political ability, and is understood to be a 'States Rights' Democrat of the strictest sort. He has successively filled the positions of State legislator, member of Congress, and Governor of the State, in all of which he has given evidence of distinguished talent. His letters in reply to the anti-slavery views of Clarkson, the noted English Abolitionist, contain some of the strongest arguments upon the pro-slavery side of the much debated slavery question. His election, in the face of his positive declination, is a most remarkable compliment." The Times learns that a dispatch has been received by a friend of Gen. Hammond, announcing his willingness to accept the position to which he has been elected.

Hon. L. O'B. BRANCH.—Our excellent and able Representative, Mr. Branch, left this City on Thursday evening for Washington City. Mr. Branch is in fine health and spirits. The ensuing session will be an exciting and important one; and we feel sure that Mr. Branch will acquit himself in a highly creditable manner, and to the entire satisfaction of his constituents.

George Howard, Esq., Editor of the Southern, has been appointed Postmaster at Tarborough, in place of David Pender, resigned. An excellent appointment.

The Cloven Foot of Disorganization. Mr. McRae says "this is the second and the best time" for urging the question of distribution before the people. "There is no organized opposition," he continues, "to the Democratic party—indeed, there is but one party at the South. No harm can come of a discussion of this question. If a candidate were to place himself before the people for Governor on this issue, in the old-fashioned way, before caucuses were invented, what matters it? A Democrat would be elected any way. For my own part, I wish some practical farmer, a Democrat, would take this issue in hand and appeal to the people upon it."

Observe the caution, the adroitness with which Mr. McRae approaches the main point, that of placing a disorganizer in the field, for Governor. "There is no organized opposition," he says, to the Democratic party of the State. How does he know that? Depend upon it there is an opposition, whether organized or not. Twelve months ago we know it was organized, and not only organized but sworn to oppose Democracy in every shape and form.—Does Mr. McRae expect to convince the people that the Know Nothings of this State, who polled last year nearly fifty thousand votes, have abandoned their principles, given up their organization, or joined the Democrats?

"No harm," he says, "can come of a discussion of this question." What good can come of it? Has not the State repeatedly voted against it? Did not Mr. McRae himself take strong ground against it in 1852, when as President of the Democratic State Convention he declared that "in federal politics we hold fast to and stand upon the ancient and time-honored landmarks of Democracy?" Why vex the public ear and disturb the people with an issue which has long been settled? Who has called for this "discussion?" The people? No. Mr. McRae has called for it. The people have not moved at all in the matter.

But let us get a little nearer to the main point. "If a candidate were to place himself before the people for Governor on this issue, in the old-fashioned way, before caucuses were invented, what matters it?" There it is. These Conventions of the Democracy—"caucuses" Mr. McRae calls them—have been dangerous bodies, at least ever since he presided over one in 1852. The "old-fashioned"—the independent one is the best. So says Mr. Syme, and so says "Sam." Mr. Syme, in the Register of the 7th November, very kindly warns the next Democratic State Convention against inserting "that abominable anti-distribution plank in their platform," and emphatically tells them that if they do so "some patriotic Democrat, whose feelings are right about this, and who has pluck enough to say what he feels, in defiance of party madness and tyranny, will speak out, and put himself in the field in opposition." How pleasant it is to see brethren dwelling together in unity! Of course Mr. Syme has become a Democrat!—he has come over to Mr. McRae and produced this "unity"—this concord of "old-fashioned" anti-caucus, distribution sounds. Mr. McRae cannot certainly have gone over to him, for he still claims to be a good Democrat—"in the old-fashioned way, before caucuses were invented." And what does "Sam" say? "Sam" turns over to his culvert, knocks the ashes from his dark lantern, and says "good!" The only objection, however, which "Sam" has to caucuses is, that the members are not sworn, as they are when they meet under his auspices.

Mr. McRae wants some "practical farmer" to take the field "for Governor on this issue in the old-fashioned way." That is just what "Sam" told us when Mr. Shepard ran for Congress against Mr. Branch, and Mr. Reid ran against Mr. Winslow. But the people thought and voted otherwise. "Independent" candidates and "independent" newspapers, so-called, are of all candidates and all newspapers the most dependent. Boasting of their independence of party, they are compelled to rely for support upon every faction and ism which promises temporary strength or ultimate success.—Pledged to all parties and to all isms, no party can depend upon them; and the people, whom they essay to cajole for their votes, are forgotten as soon as the election passes by. Parties are indispensable in all free governments. Every public man who is useful, is a member of some one party; and as soon as he sets up for himself and becomes "independent," he ceases to be useful. No public man can serve two parties. He must either be a Democrat or a co-operator with the opposition, no matter by what name the opposition may be known. If he makes war upon the principles or upon the organization of his party, he at once ceases to be of that party. We state facts obvious to every one. Like beggars like, like assimilates to like. No man can be a Democrat and at the same time publicly and openly advocate a federal issue and endeavor to undermine and overturn the usages and the organization of the party. Distribution is as much a federal issue as Bank or Tariff, or internal improvements by the general government. It is a link in the chain of Mr. Clay's "American system" doctrine,—it is a proposition in disguise to assume the debts of the States and render them dependents on federal bounty.

It appears to be generally understood that President Buchanan and Gov. Walker differ widely in relation to affairs in Kansas. The President will recommend to Congress the admission of the new State with the Constitution framed at Leocompton, and to be ratified by the people on the 21st instant; and Gov. Walker opposes this, and contends that a new Convention should be called, &c. Congress will assemble on Monday next, and we shall therefore soon have the views of the President in full on the subject.

It is not true that Senator Douglas has taken ground with Gov. Walker and against the President. His reputed organ, the Chicago Times, has done so; but that will not affect his course. Senator Douglas is understood to hold that the submission of the slavery clause of the Constitution vindicates the popular sovereignty doctrine of the Kansas-Nebraska act.

We had some fears at one time that a considerable portion of the Northern Democratic press would take ground against the President on the subject, and insist that not only the slavery clause, but the entire Constitution should be submitted to the people of Kansas; but we are gratified to state that in our opinion, this will not be the case. The last Washington Union says:

"Attempts have been made in certain quarters to produce the impression that the northern democratic press, with few exceptions, are opposed to the action of the Kansas convention. We have upon our exchange list over one thousand papers, embracing all the leading democratic journals in the free States. We have been, and still are, in the habit of examining these journals with no slight care; and the result of our observations is quite conclusive, at least to our mind, that, so far from there being a serious and wide-spread difference of opinion among our northern contemporaries in regard to at best a non-essential question, the difference is slight, quite immaterial in extent, and we are disposed to believe, susceptible of an easy and early settlement. The position, sentiment, and language of the Democratic press of the North, at this juncture, cannot be mistaken. An honest difference of opinion as to whether the Kansas convention should have submitted to popular ratification the whole or the great essential part of the constitution framed by them may be tolerated; but the entire democratic press will hold no more neutral ground than we do in relation to the action of associations with black republicanism in any form. To sanction even for a moment the sectional objects, or to adopt even for a temporary purpose the wretched sophistries and fanatical appeals of the enemy, may be safely regarded as the preliminary steps of a formal desertion. White, Bell, and Tallmadge did not do so, and the party leaders and organization of the democratic party. Wilmot's utter apostasy was discovered amid the loudest protestations of his orthodoxy.

We have already placed before our readers a large number of extracts from northern democratic journals, in which the action of the Kansas convention was spoken of in the warm language of approval. We could fill whole pages of the Union with extracts of a similar character, and from the same source, if our limits permitted."

"The Probable Homicide" at Oxford.—We have received a communication from a highly respectable source, stating that the injury sustained by young Landis was but slight, and that it was the result of an accident, and not intentional. Our informant received his information, as we learn, from the officers sent in pursuit of young Bellamy.

"The Farmers' Guide"—Mr. E. L. Perkins, Editor of the Orlston Independent, proposes to publish an agricultural paper, under the foregoing title. The price of the paper will be \$1 per annum, payable on receipt of the first number. Mr. Perkins is an intelligent, working man, and well posted in agriculture and the improvements of the day. We wish him much success in his enterprise.

"The Tribune and the Northern Democratic Press." The Philadelphia Atlas, the Philadelphia Express, the Providence Post, and scores of sterling Democratic presses, have been gathering up manfully to the support of the action of the late Constitutional Convention of Kansas. The Argus then notices the course of the Press, Mr. Forney's paper:

"The black republicans, the conglomeration of negro advocates, traitors to the constitution and the Union, the tricksters and factious who make up the position party to the democracy, have had new life infused into their late departing and disunited forces by the 'aid and comfort' which has been extended to them by a daily morning paper published in this city, which was professedly established to advocate democratic doctrines and defend democratic principles. The abolitionist organs are thrown into spasmodic delight at finding their long-cherished ideas obtaining utterance and endorsement in a professedly democratic paper. The New York Tribune is in an ecstasy of pleasure that its own mischievous and fanatical opinions have been tacitly acknowledged to be sound and just by being promulgated through a democratic journal. The New York Courier and Enquirer find an echo to its own doctrine in the Press of Philadelphia. It is a matter that fills us with profound amazement and alarm that we have to acknowledge the painful and humiliating fact that our worst political foes at the present time are those of our own household.

We have a higher than human authority for saying that he that is not for us is against us. There exists no good living and no honorable halfway house between political truth and political error.—This test, or standard, is an inflexible one. They who are not engaged with their whole heart and soul on the democratic side, who only professedly advocate democratic opinions for a profitable consideration, who merely 'act with the party' because it affords them a good living and a responsible position, but who take no further interest in it, are not only no help to us, but in most cases are a hindrance to our prosperity, and a dead weight to our party and our cause. They exert an embarrassing and a discouraging influence; are not only not worth finding them; they are the worst of all things to all men who are engaged in a just and noble cause, and cannot be looked upon as a moment too soon."

The Pennsylvania says: "The question now is, Will the democratic party stand by the Kansas constitutional convention, and admit the State, with such a constitution as its people shall adopt on the 21st of December, or join forces with the black-republican party, and keep the issue still open to distract the nation and embarrass the national administration? This is the real and vital issue. The black-republican party are opposing the Kansas convention, and will contend against the admission of the State into the Union when the constitution is presented. Agitation upon the subject is their purpose. They have and are falsifying the whole action of the democratic party in Kansas, abusing and vilifying Mr. Buchanan, and his conservative and administrative policy upon that irritating and delicate affair, and thus preparing new difficulties for the coming Congress. They will not have a settlement of the question. With all these facts burning like plains along the pathway of the national administration, it is the duty of the democratic party to sustain the national administration, the constitutional convention, and admit Kansas when she presents herself to Congress and claims a place among her sister States. There is no excuse for a single desertion from the democratic ranks upon this question. Even the New York Times and the Nation have been forced to admit that the mode of submitting the constitution to the people is such as to secure the legitimate ends of justice and fairness, while the whole press of the nation has spoken in high eulogy of the constitution itself. In view of these facts, how can democratic presses justify their glitter, unjust, and constant attacks upon the action of the convention? Are they desirous of aiding the New York Tribune in its opposition to the party and the national administration? Are their opinions to be considered above party discipline or party success? If these presses have been honestly mistaken in their interpretation of the facts that surround the question, let them say so at once. If determined to oppose the party and embarrass the national administration by siding with the black-republicans in this issue, why not hoist the flag at once, and fight openly on the black-republican platform? As for the democratic party in old Pennsylvania, they are for the admission of Kansas with the constitution that will be adopted by the citizens on the 21st of December, believing that the mode of submitting it to the people is in full accord with the principles of the Kansas Nebraska bill, and calculated to restore peace to that Territory, which has so long been distracted by black-republican intrigue."

The Providence Post thus sums up in a few words the question at issue: "The result is, that the free-State party—which has undoubtedly been itching for an excuse for staying away from the polls, and allowing a pro-slavery constitution to be adopted—refuses to be satisfied, and declares its determination to take no part in the settlement of the question at issue. Because it is not to be allowed to vote down a constitution against which it cannot offer a single valid objection, and in reference to any of the features of which there has been no controversy between parties, it obstinately and factiously refuses to vote down a clause of the instrument which it has always professed to dislike. It is obliged to admit that the slavery question is the only question which has been at issue, and that upon this question provision is made for a fair expression of the people's wishes. It is obliged to admit that, under the constitution, it could easily have obtained possession of the territorial government. It is obliged to admit that the constitution itself, so far as it is placed beyond the immediate reach of the people, is by no means partisan in character, or unjust in its assignments of power. It is obliged to admit that, save the bare fact that the constitution cannot be so voted down as it desires, it cannot be, it refuses to vote down slavery, or to have anything to do with the election of a State government."

Know-Nothing Resolutions over Mr. McRae's Letter.—The Wilmington Herald, one of the most inveterate "dark-lantern" journals in the State, thus notices Mr. McRae's letter to Mr. Dancy:

"D. K. McRae, Esq., late United States Consul to Paris, and a prominent member of the Democratic party, has written a long and able letter in favor of distribution, to W. F. Dancy, which appears in the last number of the Tarborough Southern. We rejoice to receive such a notice of the government of this State, and to see that so far from there being a serious and wide-spread difference of opinion among our northern contemporaries in regard to at best a non-essential question, the difference is slight, quite immaterial in extent, and we are disposed to believe, susceptible of an easy and early settlement. The position, sentiment, and language of the Democratic press of the North, at this juncture, cannot be mistaken. An honest difference of opinion as to whether the Kansas convention should have submitted to popular ratification the whole or the great essential part of the constitution framed by them may be tolerated; but the entire democratic press will hold no more neutral ground than we do in relation to the action of associations with black republicanism in any form. To sanction even for a moment the sectional objects, or to adopt even for a temporary purpose the wretched sophistries and fanatical appeals of the enemy, may be safely regarded as the preliminary steps of a formal desertion. White, Bell, and Tallmadge did not do so, and the party leaders and organization of the democratic party. Wilmot's utter apostasy was discovered amid the loudest protestations of his orthodoxy.

We have already placed before our readers a large number of extracts from northern democratic journals, in which the action of the Kansas convention was spoken of in the warm language of approval. We could fill whole pages of the Union with extracts of a similar character, and from the same source, if our limits permitted."

"The Probable Homicide" at Oxford.—We have received a communication from a highly respectable source, stating that the injury sustained by young Landis was but slight, and that it was the result of an accident, and not intentional. Our informant received his information, as we learn, from the officers sent in pursuit of young Bellamy.

"The Farmers' Guide"—Mr. E. L. Perkins, Editor of the Orlston Independent, proposes to publish an agricultural paper, under the foregoing title. The price of the paper will be \$1 per annum, payable on receipt of the first number. Mr. Perkins is an intelligent, working man, and well posted in agriculture and the improvements of the day. We wish him much success in his enterprise.

"The Tribune and the Northern Democratic Press." The Philadelphia Atlas, the Philadelphia Express, the Providence Post, and scores of sterling Democratic presses, have been gathering up manfully to the support of the action of the late Constitutional Convention of Kansas. The Argus then notices the course of the Press, Mr. Forney's paper:

"The black republicans, the conglomeration of negro advocates, traitors to the constitution and the Union, the tricksters and factious who make up the position party to the democracy, have had new life infused into their late departing and disunited forces by the 'aid and comfort' which has been extended to them by a daily morning paper published in this city, which was professedly established to advocate democratic doctrines and defend democratic principles. The abolitionist organs are thrown into spasmodic delight at finding their long-cherished ideas obtaining utterance and endorsement in a professedly democratic paper. The New York Tribune is in an ecstasy of pleasure that its own mischievous and fanatical opinions have been tacitly acknowledged to be sound and just by being promulgated through a democratic journal. The New York Courier and Enquirer find an echo to its own doctrine in the Press of Philadelphia. It is a matter that fills us with profound amazement and alarm that we have to acknowledge the painful and humiliating fact that our worst political foes at the present time are those of our own household.

We have a higher than human authority for saying that he that is not for us is against us. There exists no good living and no honorable halfway house between political truth and political error.—This test, or standard, is an inflexible one. They who are not engaged with their whole heart and soul on the democratic side, who only professedly advocate democratic opinions for a profitable consideration, who merely 'act with the party' because it affords them a good living and a responsible position, but who take no further interest in it, are not only no help to us, but in most cases are a hindrance to our prosperity, and a dead weight to our party and our cause. They exert an embarrassing and a discouraging influence; are not only not worth finding them; they are the worst of all things to all men who are engaged in a just and noble cause, and cannot be looked upon as a moment too soon."

The Pennsylvania says: "The question now is, Will the democratic party stand by the Kansas constitutional convention, and admit the State, with such a constitution as its people shall adopt on the 21st of December, or join forces with the black-republican party, and keep the issue still open to distract the nation and embarrass the national administration? This is the real and vital issue. The black-republican party are opposing the Kansas convention, and will contend against the admission of the State into the Union when the constitution is presented. Agitation upon the subject is their purpose. They have and are falsifying the whole action of the democratic party in Kansas, abusing and vilifying Mr. Buchanan, and his conservative and administrative policy upon that irritating and delicate affair, and thus preparing new difficulties for the coming Congress. They will not have a settlement of the question. With all these facts burning like plains along the pathway of the national administration, it is the duty of the democratic party to sustain the national administration, the constitutional convention, and admit Kansas when she presents herself to Congress and claims a place among her sister States. There is no excuse for a single desertion from the democratic ranks upon this question. Even the New York Times and the Nation have been forced to admit that the mode of submitting the constitution to the people is such as to secure the legitimate ends of justice and fairness, while the whole press of the nation has spoken in high eulogy of the constitution itself. In view of these facts, how can democratic presses justify their glitter, unjust, and constant attacks upon the action of the convention? Are they desirous of aiding the New York Tribune in its opposition to the party and the national administration? Are their opinions to be considered above party discipline or party success? If these presses have been honestly mistaken in their interpretation of the facts that surround the question, let them say so at once. If determined to oppose the party and embarrass the national administration by siding with the black-republicans in this issue, why not hoist the flag at once, and fight openly on the black-republican platform? As for the democratic party in old Pennsylvania, they are for the admission of Kansas with the constitution that will be adopted by the citizens on the 21st of December, believing that the mode of submitting it to the people is in full accord with the principles of the Kansas Nebraska bill, and calculated to restore peace to that Territory, which has so long been distracted by black-republican intrigue."

The Providence Post thus sums up in a few words the question at issue: "The result is, that the free-State party—which has undoubtedly been itching for an excuse for staying away from the polls, and allowing a pro-slavery constitution to be adopted—refuses to be satisfied, and declares its determination to take no part in the settlement of the question at issue. Because it is not to be allowed to vote down a constitution against which it cannot offer a single valid objection, and in reference to any of the features of which there has been no controversy between parties, it obstinately and factiously refuses to vote down a clause of the instrument which it has always professed to dislike. It is obliged to admit that the slavery question is the only question which has been at issue, and that upon this question provision is made for a fair expression of the people's wishes. It is obliged to admit that, under the constitution, it could easily have obtained possession of the territorial government. It is obliged to admit that the constitution itself, so far as it is placed beyond the immediate reach of the people, is by no means partisan in character, or unjust in its assignments of power. It is obliged to admit that, save the bare fact that the constitution cannot be so voted down as it desires, it cannot be, it refuses to vote down slavery, or to have anything to do with the election of a State government."

Know-Nothing Resolutions over Mr. McRae's Letter.—The Wilmington Herald, one of the most inveterate "dark-lantern" journals in the State, thus notices Mr. McRae's letter to Mr. Dancy:

"D. K. McRae, Esq., late United States Consul to Paris, and a prominent member of the Democratic party, has written a long and able letter in favor of distribution, to W. F. Dancy, which appears in the last number of the Tarborough Southern. We rejoice to receive such a notice of the government of this State, and to see that so far from there being a serious and wide-spread difference of opinion among our northern contemporaries in regard to at best a non-essential question, the difference is slight, quite immaterial in extent, and we are disposed to believe, susceptible of an easy and early settlement. The position, sentiment, and language of the Democratic press of the North, at this juncture, cannot be mistaken. An honest difference of opinion as to whether the Kansas convention should have submitted to popular ratification the whole or the great essential part of the constitution framed by them may be tolerated; but the entire democratic press will hold no more neutral ground than we do in relation to the action of associations with black republicanism in any form. To sanction even for a moment the sectional objects, or to adopt even for a temporary purpose the wretched sophistries and fanatical appeals of the enemy, may be safely regarded as the preliminary steps of a formal desertion. White, Bell, and Tallmadge did not do so, and the party leaders and organization of the democratic party. Wilmot's utter apostasy was discovered amid the loudest protestations of his orthodoxy.

We have already placed before our readers a large number of extracts from northern democratic journals, in which the action of the Kansas convention was spoken of in the warm language of approval. We could fill whole pages of the Union with extracts of a similar character, and from the same source, if our limits permitted."

"The Probable Homicide" at Oxford.—We have received a communication from a highly respectable source, stating that the injury sustained by young Landis was but slight, and that it was the result of an accident, and not intentional. Our informant received his information, as we learn, from the officers sent in pursuit of young Bellamy.

"The Farmers' Guide"—Mr. E. L. Perkins, Editor of the Orlston Independent, proposes to publish an agricultural paper, under the foregoing title. The price of the paper will be \$1 per annum, payable on receipt of the first number. Mr. Perkins is an intelligent, working man, and well posted in agriculture and the improvements of the day. We wish him much success in his enterprise.

"The Tribune and the Northern Democratic Press." The Philadelphia Atlas, the Philadelphia Express, the Providence Post, and scores of sterling Democratic presses, have been gathering up manfully to the support of the action of the late Constitutional Convention of Kansas. The Argus then notices the course of the Press, Mr. Forney's paper:

"The black republicans, the conglomeration of negro advocates, traitors to the constitution and the Union, the tricksters and factious who make up the position party to the democracy, have had new life infused into their late departing and disunited forces by the 'aid and comfort' which has been extended to them by a daily morning paper published in this city, which was professedly established to advocate democratic doctrines and defend democratic principles. The abolitionist organs are thrown into spasmodic delight at finding their long-cherished ideas obtaining utterance and endorsement in a professedly democratic paper. The New York Tribune is in an ecstasy of pleasure that its own mischievous and fanatical opinions have been tacitly acknowledged to be sound and just by being promulgated through a democratic journal. The New York Courier and Enquirer find an echo to its own doctrine in the Press of Philadelphia. It is a matter that fills us with profound amazement and alarm that we have to acknowledge the painful and humiliating fact that our worst political foes at the present time are those of our own household.

We have a higher than human authority for saying that he that is not for us is against us. There exists no good living and no honorable halfway house between political truth and political error.—This test, or standard, is an inflexible one. They who are not engaged with their whole heart and soul on the democratic side, who only professedly advocate democratic opinions for a profitable consideration, who merely 'act with the party' because it affords them a good living and a responsible position, but who take no further interest in it, are not only no help to us, but in most cases are a hindrance to our prosperity, and a dead weight to our party and our cause. They exert an embarrassing and a discouraging influence; are not only not worth finding them; they are the worst of all things to all men who are engaged in a just and noble cause, and cannot be looked upon as a moment too soon."

The Pennsylvania says: "The question now is, Will the democratic party stand by the Kansas constitutional convention, and admit the State, with such a constitution as its people shall adopt on the 21st of December, or join forces with the black-republican party, and keep the issue still open to distract the nation and embarrass the national administration? This is the real and vital issue. The black-republican party are opposing the Kansas convention, and will contend against the admission of the State into the Union when the constitution is presented. Agitation upon the subject is their purpose. They have and are falsifying the whole action of the democratic party in Kansas, abusing and vilifying Mr. Buchanan, and his conservative and administrative policy upon that irritating and delicate affair, and thus preparing new difficulties for the coming Congress. They will not have a settlement of the question. With all these facts burning like plains along the pathway of the national administration, it is the duty of the democratic party to sustain the national administration, the constitutional convention, and admit Kansas when she presents herself to Congress and claims a place among her sister States. There is no excuse for a single desertion from the democratic ranks upon this question. Even the New York Times and the Nation have been forced to admit that the mode of submitting the constitution to the people is such as to secure the legitimate ends of justice and fairness, while the whole press of the nation has spoken in high eulogy of the constitution itself. In view of these facts, how can democratic presses justify their glitter, unjust, and constant attacks upon the action of the convention? Are they desirous of aiding the New York Tribune in its opposition to the party and the national administration? Are their opinions to be considered above party discipline or party success? If these presses have been honestly mistaken in their interpretation of the facts that surround the question, let them say so at once. If determined to oppose the party and embarrass the national administration by siding with the black-republicans in this issue, why not hoist the flag at once, and fight openly on the black-republican platform? As for the democratic party in old Pennsylvania, they are for the admission of Kansas with the constitution that will be adopted by the citizens on the 21st of December, believing that the mode of submitting it to the people is in full accord with the principles of the Kansas Nebraska bill, and calculated to restore peace to that Territory, which has so long been distracted by black-republican intrigue."

The Providence Post thus sums up in a few words the question at issue: "The result is, that the free-State party—which has undoubtedly been itching for an excuse for staying away from the polls, and allowing a pro-slavery constitution to be adopted—refuses to be satisfied, and declares its determination to take no part in the settlement of the question at issue. Because it is not to be allowed to vote down a constitution against which it cannot offer a single valid objection, and in reference to any of the features of which there has been no controversy between parties, it obstinately and factiously refuses to vote down a clause of the instrument which it has always professed to dislike. It is obliged to admit that the slavery question is the only question which has been at issue, and that upon this question provision is made for a fair expression of the people's wishes. It is obliged to admit that, under the constitution, it could easily have obtained possession of the territorial government. It is obliged to admit that the constitution itself, so far as it is placed beyond the immediate reach of the people, is by no means partisan in character, or unjust in its assignments of power. It is obliged to admit that, save the bare fact that the constitution cannot be so voted down as it desires, it cannot be, it refuses to vote down slavery, or to have anything to do with the election of a State government."

Know-Nothing Resolutions over Mr. McRae's Letter.—The Wilmington Herald, one of the most inveterate "dark-lantern" journals in the State, thus notices Mr. McRae's letter to Mr. Dancy:

"D. K. McRae, Esq., late United States Consul to Paris, and a prominent member of the Democratic party, has written a long and able letter in favor of distribution, to W. F. Dancy, which appears in the last number of the Tarborough Southern. We rejoice to receive such a notice of the government of this State, and to see that so far from there being a serious and wide-spread difference of opinion among our northern contemporaries in regard to at best a non-essential question, the difference is slight, quite immaterial in extent, and we are disposed to believe, susceptible of an easy and early settlement. The position, sentiment, and language of the Democratic press of the North, at this juncture, cannot be mistaken. An honest difference of opinion as to whether the Kansas convention should have submitted to popular ratification the whole or the great essential part of the constitution framed by them may be tolerated; but the entire democratic press will hold no more neutral ground than we do in relation to the action of associations with black republicanism in any form. To sanction even for a moment the sectional objects, or to adopt even for a temporary purpose the wretched sophistries and fanatical appeals of the enemy, may be safely regarded as the preliminary steps of a formal desertion. White, Bell, and Tallmadge did not do so, and the party leaders and organization of the democratic party. Wilmot's utter apostasy was discovered amid the loudest protestations of his orthodoxy.

Know-Nothing Resolutions over Mr. McRae's Letter.—The Wilmington Herald, one of the most inveterate "dark-lantern" journals in the State, thus notices Mr. McRae's letter to Mr. Dancy:

"D. K. McRae, Esq., late United States Consul to Paris, and a prominent member of the Democratic party, has written a long and able letter in favor of distribution, to W. F. Dancy, which appears in the last number of the Tarborough Southern. We rejoice to receive such a notice of the government of this State, and to see that so far from there being a serious and wide-spread difference of opinion among our northern contemporaries in regard to at best a non-essential question, the difference is slight, quite immaterial in extent, and we are disposed to believe, susceptible of an easy and early settlement. The position, sentiment, and language of the Democratic press of the North, at this juncture, cannot be mistaken. An honest difference of opinion as to whether the Kansas convention should have submitted to popular ratification the whole or the great essential part of the constitution framed by them may be tolerated; but the entire democratic press will hold no more neutral ground than we do in relation to the action of associations with black republicanism in any form. To sanction even for a moment the sectional objects, or to adopt even for a temporary purpose the wretched sophistries and fanatical appeals of the enemy, may be safely regarded as the preliminary steps of a formal desertion. White, Bell, and Tallmadge did not do so, and the party leaders and organization of the democratic party. Wilmot's utter apostasy was discovered amid the loudest protestations of his orthodoxy.

We have already placed before our readers a large number of extracts from northern democratic journals, in which the action of the Kansas convention was spoken of in the warm language of approval. We could fill whole pages of the Union with extracts of a similar character, and from the same source, if our limits permitted."

"The Probable Homicide" at Oxford.—We have received a communication from a highly respectable source, stating that the injury sustained by young Landis was but slight, and that it was the result of an accident, and not intentional. Our informant received his information, as we learn, from the officers sent in pursuit of young Bellamy.

"The Farmers' Guide"—Mr. E. L. Perkins, Editor of the Orlston Independent, proposes to publish an agricultural paper, under the foregoing title. The price of the paper will be \$1 per annum, payable on receipt of the first number. Mr. Perkins is an intelligent, working man, and well posted in agriculture and the improvements of the day. We wish him much success in his enterprise.

"The Tribune and the Northern Democratic Press." The Philadelphia Atlas, the Philadelphia Express, the Providence Post, and scores of sterling Democratic presses, have been gathering up manfully to the support of the action of the late Constitutional Convention of Kansas. The Argus then notices the course of the Press, Mr. Forney's paper:

"The black republicans, the conglomeration of negro advocates, traitors to the constitution and the Union, the tricksters and factious who make up the position party to the democracy, have had new life infused into their late departing and disunited forces by the 'aid and comfort' which has been extended to them by a daily morning paper published in this city, which was professedly established to advocate democratic doctrines and defend democratic principles. The abolitionist organs are thrown into spasmodic delight at finding their long-cherished ideas obtaining utterance and endorsement in a professedly democratic paper. The New York Tribune is in an ecstasy of pleasure that its own mischievous and fanatical opinions have been tacitly acknowledged to be sound and just by being promulgated through a democratic journal. The New York Courier and Enquirer find an echo to its own doctrine in the Press of Philadelphia. It is a matter that fills us with profound amazement and alarm that we have to acknowledge the painful and humiliating fact that our worst political foes at the present time are those of our own household.

We have a higher than human authority for saying that he that is not for us is against us. There exists no good living and no honorable halfway house between political truth and political error.—This test, or standard, is an inflexible one. They who are not engaged with their whole heart and soul on the democratic side, who only professedly advocate democratic opinions for a profitable consideration, who merely 'act with the party' because it affords them a good living and a responsible position, but who take no further interest in it, are not only no help to us, but in most cases are a hindrance to our prosperity, and a dead weight to our party and our cause. They exert an embarrassing and a discouraging influence; are not only not worth finding them; they are the worst of all things to all men who are engaged in a just and noble cause, and cannot be looked upon as a moment too soon."

The Pennsylvania says: "The question now is, Will the democratic party stand by the Kansas constitutional convention, and admit the State, with such a constitution as its people shall adopt on the 21st of December, or join forces with the black-republican party, and keep the issue still open to distract the nation and embarrass the national administration? This is the real and vital issue. The black-republican party are opposing the Kansas convention, and will contend against the admission of the State into the Union when the constitution is presented. Agitation upon the subject is their purpose. They have and are falsifying the whole action of the democratic party in Kansas, abusing and vilifying Mr. Buchanan, and his conservative and administrative policy upon that irritating and delicate affair, and thus preparing new difficulties for the coming Congress. They will not have a settlement of the question. With all these facts burning like plains along the pathway of the national administration, it is the duty of the democratic party to sustain the national administration, the constitutional convention, and admit Kansas when she presents herself to Congress and claims a place among her sister States. There is no excuse for a single desertion from the democratic ranks upon this question. Even the New York Times and the Nation have been forced to admit that the mode of submitting the constitution to the people is such as to secure the legitimate ends of justice and fairness, while the whole press of the nation has spoken in high eulogy of the constitution itself. In view of these facts, how can democratic presses justify their glitter, unjust, and constant attacks upon the action of the convention? Are they desirous of aiding the New York Tribune in its opposition to the party and the national administration? Are their opinions to be considered above party discipline or party success? If these presses have been honestly mistaken in their interpretation of the facts that surround the question, let them say so at once. If determined to oppose the party and embarrass the national administration by siding with the black-republicans in this issue, why not hoist the flag at once, and fight openly on the black-republican platform? As for the democratic party in old Pennsylvania, they are for the admission of Kansas with the constitution that will be adopted by the citizens on the 21st of December, believing that the mode of submitting it to the people is in full accord with the principles of the Kansas Nebraska bill, and calculated to restore peace to that Territory, which has so long been distracted by black-republican intrigue."

The Providence Post thus sums up in a few words the question at issue: "The result is, that the free-State party—which has undoubtedly been itching for an excuse for staying away from the polls, and allowing a pro-slavery constitution to be adopted—refuses to be satisfied, and declares its determination to take no part