The New Orleans Bee.

Office, 78 Chartres street. NEW ORLEANS, SATURDAY MORNING, NOVEMBER 3, 1860. Vol. XVII—New Series. Vol. XXXIII.—Whole No. 11,821.

THE DAILY BEE.

C. G. PARKER, Publisher and Proprietor.

P. LOVELL, Editor.

Daily Paper, one year (in advance).....$8

In all cases, subscriptions will date from receipt, unless by ordering otherwise they can be dated to begin with the commencement of the month. Subscribers will be considered as desiring a continuance of their subscription, unless the contrary be ordered, or subscription be paid, before the expiration of the month.

NEW ORLEANS:

SATURDAY MORNING, NOVEMBER 3.

SUBSCRIPTIONS to THIS WEEK

The carriers of the BEE are authorized to receive subscriptions to our paper, at the rate of ten cents a week, payable in all cases to the carriers themselves.

Notice to Accounts To-Day.

By E. Roger & Co., at 10 o'clock, at Nos. 45 and 47 Old Levee street, ready-made clothing, silk goods, shirts, &c.

By Hoffbrandt, Jr., at 10 o'clock, at the corner St. Louis and Chartres streets, dry goods, hosiery, gloves, hats, &c., at half-past 10 o'clock, complete Sept. trade sale, &c.

By E. Vignie, at 12 o'clock, at the St. Louis Exchange, the upper room John; also, the gold watch, &c., &c.

By D. E. Murphy, at 10 o'clock, at No. 37 Magazine street, blankets, quilts and other goods; also, at half-past 11 o'clock, at 56 and 58 Poydras street, whisky, brandy and Jamaica rum.

By Vincent & Co., at 10 o'clock, at No. 39 Camp street, household furniture, brandy and Assembly dry goods.

By Chas. E. Fordell, at 12 o'clock, at the St. Louis Exchange, lots of ground, &c.—immediate sale.

The Chief Point of the Contest.

The Presidential canvass is now virtually closed, and in three days the people will be required to record their solemn verdict upon the momentous issues which have agitated and divided them. We consider the question to be determined as one of paramount interest and magnitude—perhaps involving the destiny of the Republic for years to come. Individuals are almost lost sight of and forgotten in the mighty contest for principle. It is not so much whether JOHN BELL, STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS, or JOHN C. BRECKINRIDGE shall be chosen President, as whether sectionalism or nationality shall triumph at the ballot-box; or, in other words, whether the Union—the priceless heritage of our fathers—shall be preserved, or whether, by the success and ascendant policy of secession, it shall be broken up and dismembered! Hence the importance of the election on Tuesday next overshadows and dwarfs all previous political conflicts.

We have in good faith and with our utmost energy supported the Constitutional-Union candidates, not because they were our personal preferences, because they represented any political ideas dear to every patriotic American citizen. They were the candidates of the Union party, and therefore worthy the suffrages of all Union men. It is frequently affirmed by the adherents of BRECKINRIDGE that they, too, are friends of the Union. Some of them undoubtedly believe what they assert, and are honestly laboring under the conviction that they are fighting the battles of the Union, equally with the advocates of BELL and EVERETT. But the palpable tendency of their policy is a downright error, and that those who hold to this belief are unwittingly pursuing a dangerous course. From the nature of the disruption of the Democratic party at Baltimore, the faction which founded and nominated JOHN C. BRECKINRIDGE was in opposition to the regular Democratic candidate, nearly displayed its character as a Southern sectional organization. The leaders constituted the quadrumvirate of the nine State Rights Democrats, and of Southern men who for years had preached the doctrines of Secession. The men who disorganized and destroyed the Democratic party went to Charleston and to Baltimore with a deliberately concerted purpose to compel the Convention to acquiesce in all their demands, or to send the party to wreck. Such was their intention—they unhesitatingly adopted the other.

In further evidence of the incendiary designs of the Secession faction demanded? What are the issues of the Breckinridge leaders of the South? Do they not promise open and armed resistance to the inauguration of ABRAHAM LINCOLN, in case of the election of that individual? Do they not uphold the right of Secession, and boldly proclaim that a State is absolutely sovereign and has unrestrained no let of power which she cannot resist? Wherein consists the Union sentiments of the champions of JOHN C. BRECKINRIDGE? Perhaps Senator WIGFALL, of Texas, supposes them, when he swears he would be glad to see them "dead and peppered" rather than submit to the election of LINCOLN, and informs the President that in such a contingency he will not resume his seat in the United States Senate. Or, perhaps Mr. MUSE is an unchangeable friend of the Union, when he says that a State may secede, and is in favor of the measure should LINCOLN triumph. Or, perhaps Governor PETTUS, of Mississippi, Governor BROWN, of the same State, Senator BIGGY, KETT and ORR, of South Carolina, TOOMBS, of Georgia, MOUTON and SLIDELL, of Louisiana, YANCEY, of Alabama, CRITTENDEN, of Tennessee, and other prominent adherents of Mr. BRECKINRIDGE—all of whom are urging revolution at the North in the event of a Black Republican victory—are in the position of "patriots" unmasked on the Union side, and we suppose that the armed legions which are forming; the minute men who are being drilled and disciplined; the resources now concocting with a view of subjugating the entire States into the southern area so many proofs of their patriotism and loyalty to the Union which animates the bosoms of the partisans of BRECKINRIDGE. What rank folly and delusion must have seized upon the minds of those who, whilst sustaining the Secession faction, in full view of these and ten thousand other evidences of the Disunion tendencies of that party, still fancy they can cheat themselves or others into the impression that that party is dedicated purely to the Union! Such infatuation is indeed lamentable.

We have heard some of these misguided politicians advance the argument that we should support BRECKINRIDGE in order to unite the South. Unite the South! For what? For Secession, for civil war perhaps, for the promulgation and practical application of the doctrine, at least, of the right of Secession, and they alike profess to deprecate. Because there is danger that the North may be nationalized, the South must forthwith annihilate every symptom of nationality, and present a solid sectional front to the North. Because Mr. BUCHANAN has no strength in the North, we in the South must abandon DOUGLAS and BELL, and go over to him that the Democracy may be rebuked! The absurdity of the proposition is transparent and to most submission. Again, we have heard Breckinridge Union men excuse themselves by alleging that no matter for which of the nominees they voted, they were equally opposed to LINCOLN. True, but the deduction that we unwisely vote for Secessionists in opposition to Union men is somewhat illogical, and to us a mystery. It will be considered that we voted for the Secession ticket, and for them it was the refusal of John Cochrane, of New York, junior of Mr. TOOMBS, to submit to him and his associates, because from TOOMBS, whose name is a tower of strength in the Secession ranks, he refused to receive his Secession commission, because he declined to violate his marriage vows, and thus be murder of his own sister. Mr. TOOMBS will be willing to write letters of abuse and ridicule against Secession leaders.

Are not these truths undeniable, and, if so, with what show of consistency can any citizen maintain that he is a lover of the Union, and at the same time an adherent of BRECKINRIDGE and LANE? There is no political affinity between the two parties. They are the reverse. The one is for the Union, the other for disunion. But to return to the point in controversy, and to which we have digressed. We consider the question to be determined as one of paramount interest and magnitude—perhaps involving the destiny of the Republic for years to come. Individuals are almost lost sight of and forgotten in the mighty contest for principle. It is not so much whether JOHN BELL, STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS, or JOHN C. BRECKINRIDGE shall be chosen President, as whether sectionalism or nationality shall triumph at the ballot-box; or, in other words, whether the Union—the priceless heritage of our fathers—shall be preserved, or whether, by the success and ascendant policy of secession, it shall be broken up and dismembered! Hence the importance of the election on Tuesday next overshadows and dwarfs all previous political conflicts.

We have in good faith and with our utmost energy supported the Constitutional-Union candidates, not because they were our personal preferences, because they represented any political ideas dear to every patriotic American citizen. They were the candidates of the Union party, and therefore worthy the suffrages of all Union men. It is frequently affirmed by the adherents of BRECKINRIDGE that they, too, are friends of the Union. Some of them undoubtedly believe what they assert, and are honestly laboring under the conviction that they are fighting the battles of the Union, equally with the advocates of BELL and EVERETT. But the palpable tendency of their policy is a downright error, and that those who hold to this belief are unwittingly pursuing a dangerous course. From the nature of the disruption of the Democratic party at Baltimore, the faction which founded and nominated JOHN C. BRECKINRIDGE was in opposition to the regular Democratic candidate, nearly displayed its character as a Southern sectional organization. The leaders constituted the quadrumvirate of the nine State Rights Democrats, and of Southern men who for years had preached the doctrines of Secession. The men who disorganized and destroyed the Democratic party went to Charleston and to Baltimore with a deliberately concerted purpose to compel the Convention to acquiesce in all their demands, or to send the party to wreck. Such was their intention—they unhesitatingly adopted the other.

In further evidence of the incendiary designs of the Secession faction demanded? What are the issues of the Breckinridge leaders of the South? Do they not promise open and armed resistance to the inauguration of ABRAHAM LINCOLN, in case of the election of that individual? Do they not uphold the right of Secession, and boldly proclaim that a State is absolutely sovereign and has unrestrained no let of power which she cannot resist? Wherein consists the Union sentiments of the champions of JOHN C. BRECKINRIDGE? Perhaps Senator WIGFALL, of Texas, supposes them, when he swears he would be glad to see them "dead and peppered" rather than submit to the election of LINCOLN, and informs the President that in such a contingency he will not resume his seat in the United States Senate. Or, perhaps Mr. MUSE is an unchangeable friend of the Union, when he says that a State may secede, and is in favor of the measure should LINCOLN triumph. Or, perhaps Governor PETTUS, of Mississippi, Governor BROWN, of the same State, Senator BIGGY, KETT and ORR, of South Carolina, TOOMBS, of Georgia, MOUTON and SLIDELL, of Louisiana, YANCEY, of Alabama, CROCKETT