

COLT'S PISTOL FACTORY—The *Times*, in anticipation of what they feared might be said on the subject, have had a good deal to say about Colt's factory, and the wholesale discharge of hands in that concern, and to divert public attention from that establishment, got up the *slandrous* charge that Hammond of Rockville had compelled his men to vote the Republican ticket, under penalty of discharge.

The *Times* says that, so far, only about 20 hands have been dismissed—Democrats as well as Republicans; and they believe as great a proportion of one as the other. Col. Colt publishes in the *Times*, over his own signature, a note dated March 13, 1860, in which he says that up to that date he has reduced the number of his men some *twenty*—which is no more than usual at this season of the year, and that in no case has he discharged an operative for his political opinions. Here we have the statement of the *Times* and that of Col. Colt. We propose to give a few statements of facts, and leave the public to judge for themselves whether the whole truth has been told or not.

On the last day of February, or last but one, a notice was posted up in the factory that between the 1st and 15th of March, from one-third to one-half the number of hands employed would have to leave.—The same day that the notice was put up, some half a dozen of the best men, and good Republicans, received notice to quit; and almost daily since, have men been notified that they would not be wanted after the 15th.

The *Times* and Colt each state that 20 men have been discharged. We have before us a list of **63** employees discharged between the 1st and 15th of March, and we are told that the list is not full; and also that the **63** are entirely exclusive of quite a number who have left without waiting for a discharge. Of this list of 63, 8 are *Democrats*, 2 are *Americans*, and 53 are *Republicans*. The residences of these 63, ward-wise, are as follows: *First Ward*, 4; *Second Ward*, 2; *Third Ward*, 7; *Fourth Ward*, 36; and *Sixth Ward*, 2. Every contractor that has been discharged are well known Republicans, and the few Democrats among the discharged were in the employ of these same contractors, and had to leave with them. We are told that not a *single* Democrat who had men in his employ, is among the 63, while on the other hand, we are informed that Democratic contractors have been compelled to discharge Republicans in their employ, and in one case the contractor hinted that he had rather lose any two men in his employ than the one that he was directed to discharge; but there was no alternative, the man must go, and go he did. One of the contractors after being discharged, hired himself out by the day to another contractor, but was not allowed to go to work. A large number of the men under contractors applied yesterday for work, but could not obtain it.

Our space will not allow us, this morning, to go into any lengthy details of the affair. The simple statement of facts which we have given is sufficient without affidavits, to show that but very few if any of these 63 men would have been discharged before the first Monday of April, if they had been good *Democrats*. If this movement of *Col. Colt* was not in any way political, how comes it that the *Times*, before any public charge had been made, should have been so anxious over the matter? We know that a man of some note in the establishment has repeatedly stated that if he could have his own way, he would not have a *d—d* Republican in the shop. The men who have been discharged well know (at least many of them do) why they were discharged, and the public can draw their own inferences.

We farther learn that some of the eight democrats who were temporarily discharged, have already gone back to work. Comment is needless.