BEDFORD GAZETTE.

—BEDFORD, Pa.—

FRIDAY, JULY 13, 1860.

B. F. Meyers, Editor and Proprietor.

FOR PRESIDENT,

HON. STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS,

OF ILLINOIS.

FOR VICE-PRESIDENT,

HON. HERSCHEL V. JOHNSON,

OF GEORGIA.

FOR GOVERNOR:

GEN. HENRY D. FOSTER,

OF WESTMORELAND COUNTY.

FOR CONGRESS,

HON. WILLIAM P. SCHELL,

(Subject to the decision of the District Conference.)

DEMOCRATIC COUNTY TICKET.

PROTHONOTARY,

MAJ. SAMUEL H. TATE,

BEDFORD BOROUGH.

SHERIFF,

JOHN J. CESSNA,

BEDFORD BOR.

COMMISSIONER,

RICHARD M'MULLIN,

NAPIER.

POOR DIRECTOR,

JOHN S. BRUMBAUGH,

S. WOODBERRY.

AUDITOR,

GEORGE BAUGHMAN,

W. PROVIDENCE,

CORONER,

JACOB WALTER,

ST. CLAIR.

Why we support Douglas.

We are for Douglas and Johnson for the following good and all sufficient reasons:

1. They are the regular nominees of the only regular Convention of the National Democracy, having been nominated in strict accordance with the usages of the party, not by a mere majority of the Convention, but by a bare two-thirds of all the votes given (either of which would have sufficed in the time of Jackson, Van Buren and Polk) *but by a unanimous vote* of more than two-thirds of the whole Convention.

2. Because Douglas and Johnson stand upon the time-honored platform of the National Democratic party;—the platform on which Jefferson and Jackson stood; on which Polk, Pierce and Buchanan were elected; the platform which embodies that sacred compromise between the North and the South, instituted by Webster, Clay and Calhoun, and ratified by the people of the whole Union, in two successive elections, *the principle of "Non-interference by Congress with slavery in State or Territory."*

3. Because Douglas and Johnson are eminent statesmen, national and conservative in their views, opposed to sectionalism of every sort, and admirably fitted by great natural powers and long experience in public affairs, for the offices for which they have been nominated.

4. Because Douglas and Johnson are the candidates that will insure the defeat of Lincoln and Hamlin, the nominees of the fanatical and sectional Black Republican party, a reason which should certainly operate most powerfully with every true and earnest Democrat.

For these and other equally forcible reasons, we have unfurled the banner of Douglas and Johnson, and every Democrat who believes in sustaining regular nominations and in standing by the regular organization of the party, will generously throw aside all his former prejudices and dislikes, (as we have done) and come with us under the flag of the gallant and undaunted leader, who has already vanquished in many a hard fought battle, the very foe that now assails us.

A COUNTY FAIR.

A plentiful harvest is just being garnered in; orchards bend beneath loads of ripening fruit; cattle, fat and sleek, walk in luxuriant pastures; and every sight and sound, in the country, betoken a season of plenty. Why is it, then, that we hear nothing said among our people of a County Fair? Have we lost all desire for improvement? Are we afraid to compare notes with our neighbors? Are we too sluggish to keep pace with other counties far less benignly favored in point of climate and of soil? We hope and believe that such is not the case, and, therefore, look forward to a general preparation on the part of our farmers, for the holding of a Fair during the coming Fall. Let every one who can raise any article, animal, or product for exhibition, interest himself in this matter, and he will do good to himself as well as to his neighbor.

....Gen. BOWMAN has sold the *Constitution* newspaper to Mr. W. M. Browne, formerly associate editor of the paper. The *Constitution* is a neatly printed paper, advocating the cause (!) of the Secessionists.

BEDFORD BOROUGH ERECT!

THE WATCH-FIRES BURNING BRIGHTLY.

An enthusiastic meeting of the DOUGLAS & FOSTER CLUB, was held in the Court House, on last Saturday evening. The Club was called to order by HON. JOB MANN, President. The Committee appointed at the last meeting to report a Constitution and permanent officers, reported through its Chairman. The report of the Committee, was unanimously adopted. The following persons were selected as permanent officers of the Club:

President,

HON. JOB MANN;

Vice-Presidents,

Samuel Davis,	William Chenoweth,
George Reimund,	William Shafer,
Hiram Lentz,	J. T. Gephart,
Job M. Shoemaker,	M. E. Barteges,
Jacob Semler,	David Elsrode,

Daniel Border.

Secretaries,

John Palmer, T. R. Gettys.

Treasurer,

G. H. Spang.

Executive Committee,

O. H. Gaither,	Jos. W. Tate,
A. J. Statler,	Daniel Heltzell, jr.,
Thomas H. Lyons,	A. J. Sansom,

A. W. Mower.

Speeches were delivered by John Palmer, Esq., O. H. Gaither, Esq., Hon. John Cessna, Col. J. W. Tate, and Hon. J. F. Loy, of Wisconsin, after which a large number signed the Constitution. The club then adjourned to meet at the call of the President.

Local and Miscellaneous.

....THE FOURTH IN SCHELLSBURG.—Independence day was celebrated at Schellsburg, by the military and citizens. The "Black Plumed Riflemen," Capt. Mullin, and the "Bedford Riflemen," Capt. Lyons, paraded the streets, making quite a fine appearance. A sumptuous and elegant dinner was served up at the hotel of Mr. John A. Snively. The Declaration of Independence was read by O. H. Gaither, Esq., and eloquent and appropriate addresses were delivered by A. J. Statler, Esq., and Maj. S. H. Tate.

....We announce with pleasure, the arrival of our friend, MR. VALLADE, the distinguished artist in Photographic Painting, who was with us last summer. Mr. Vallade, in conjunction with Mr. T. R. Gettys, of this place, has put up a fine Gallery at the Springs, where Photographs, plain, or colored in the most fashionable style, can be had on liberal terms. It is needless for us to say anything in commendation of the skill of Messrs. Vallade and Gettys, as the former, as an artist in painting, and the latter as a Photographer, have acquired a reputation that is a sufficient guarantee for future success.

....The Somerset papers publish the Confession of Henry Pritts, recently executed at that place for the murder of Eli Weimer. Pritts confesses that he shot Weimer in the back when they were out hunting together, and says that [illegible] Mrs. Weimer who had acquired a strange influence over him.—Mrs. Weimer was the principal witness produced against Pritts at his trial.

....The farming community are now in the midst of harvest. The crops hereabouts are heavier than they have been for many years.—A bounteous Providence has poured with lavish hand its precious gifts upon the lap of mother Earth. How thankful should we be that after years of barrenness, the fields are once more smiling in plenty!

....Richard Madden, residing near Fort Littleton, Fulton county, killed his wife a few days ago, by knocking out her brains with a board. The wretched man, immediately after having done the horrible deed, committed suicide by hanging himself.

....It is with feelings of profound regret, that we are called upon to announce the death of MR. SAMUEL CARN, of this place, which occurred at his residence, on Tuesday night last. Mr. Carn was formerly Sheriff of this county, and held other honorable and responsible positions. He was a man of upright character, steady business habits, a good citizen and much esteemed and beloved. Peace be with him!

....Our good friend, the editor of the Philadelphia *Argus*, to our utter amazement, has fallen into the practice so popular at present with the disorganizing Breckinridge papers, to copy articles from Black Republican and Abolition newspapers to show that Breckinridge is strong and Douglas weak. The *Argus* of a few days since, transferred to its pages a half column editorial from the N. Y. *Tribune*, to prove that Breckinridge was *the* man for the Democracy. The *Argus* must have ninety-nine and nine-tenths of its hundred eyes entirely shut up, if it does not see that such a course, to say the least of it, looks a little suspicious.

...."Honest Old Abe!"—Our devil has tried his hand at an epigram, which he submits for the benefit of the Black Republicans:

Hurrah for "Honest Abe!" quoth Joe:
Why call him *honest*, now? says Jack.
Why, certes, that the world may know
Abe from the rest of Helper's pack!

....Whooping-cough, of a violent character, is at present prevailing among the youngsters of our town. It is said that females do not suffer as much from it as males. "Cause why?" They are better used to *hooping!*"

....Every Democrat should read the able article, from the pen of HON. JOHN CESSNA, published in this issue, giving an account of the Charleston Baltimore Convention. It well repays perusal.

....An examination of a portion of the Classes in the Bedford Classical Institute, will be held at the Lutheran Church, on Thursday, 19th July, 1860. The Public are respectfully invited to be present-

FOR THE BEDFORD GAZETTE.

TO THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF BEDFORD COUNTY.

It is, no doubt, already known to you that the late National Convention at Charleston and Baltimore, nominated Stephen A. Douglas, of Illinois, for President, and H. V. Johnson, of Georgia, for Vice President. It is also, known that a portion of the Convention seceded and nominated John C. Breckinridge, of Kentucky, for President and Joseph Lane, of Oregon, for Vice President. Having been present at both sessions of the Convention, and a spectator of all that transpired, I propose to give a few of the reasons why I regard the nomination of Douglas and Johnson as the regular nomination of the party, entitled to its universal support, and that of Breckinridge and Lane as irregular and disorganizing, meriting no favor at the hands of any Democrat, but, on the contrary, as justly deserving the hearty condemnation of the whole party.

Under the regular call of the National Committee, acknowledged by every Democrat in the United States, and in conformity with the universal custom of the party, the Convention assembled at Charleston, on the 23d of April, 1860. After a preliminary organization, made without objection from any quarter, it was found that there was one contested seat from the State of Massachusetts, one from Maryland, eleven from Illinois and thirty five from New York. These cases were referred to a Committee of thirty three members, being one from each state.

After a careful and patient investigation by the Committee, a report was made to the Convention. This was unanimous in every case, except that of New York. Six members of the Committee made a minority report recommending the admission of one half of each delegation from that State. The report of the Committee was adopted by the convention after a full discussion. The vote in every case, except New York, was unanimous. That part of the report relating to the New York Delegation, was adopted by a vote of 210½ to 55.

This completed the organization of the Convention. The Rules of the House of Representatives of the United States were adopted for the government of the Convention. This was done by the entire vote of the Convention. The rule requiring two thirds of the votes *given*, to make a nomination, was also unanimously adopted, as was a rule requiring a two third vote of the Convention to alter or amend the Rules of the Convention. Every Congressional District in the United States and every state at large, was now fully represented. There was not a single vacancy. The Convention consisted of 303 members, and continued in session for several days, every member participating in the proceedings.

Two principles of Legislative, or Parliamentary law, may be here stated, as they have important bearings upon the regularity of the nomination now being considered.

First: *Every Legislative Body shall judge of the qualifications of its own members.*

Second: *A majority shall constitute a Quorum for the transaction of business.*

It is confidently asserted that both of these propositions are clearly established by the common law on the subject, in all civilized countries, unless some statute should provide otherwise. But in this case we are not only left to the common law, but have also the statute. The Convention, as we have seen, adopted the Rules of the House of Representatives. By these both of the propositions above stated, are clearly maintained. Indeed, it could not be otherwise, as the Constitution of the United States declares the same rules in the fifth section of the first Article thereof.

With the first of these propositions every member of the Convention was fully satisfied, because every one acquiesced in the decision of the Convention and remained to participate in the further proceedings thereof. The second proposition embraces two parts; to wit, that a majority *shall* constitute a Quorum and that less than a majority *shall not* constitute such Quorum.

Here it will be well to remember that every member of the whole Convention, including the subsequent Seceders, or Bolters, voted for the adoption of these rules.

The Convention continued in session with its 303 members, until the seventh and eigth days. At this time, some of the delegates became dissatisfied with the Platform adopted by the Convention, and for this reason and for this alone, fifty one members withdrew from the Convention, separated finally and entirely from it, met in another part of the city and attempted to organize another Convention in opposition to the one they had left. This they adjourned to Richmond. Most, if not all of you, have always held that every gentleman who agrees to enter a Convention, is in honor bound to abide by its decisions and support its nominees. These gentlemen, however, seemed to have adopted a different course.

As already stated, the ground and the only ground, of this secession was the Platform adopted by the Convention. You will, doubtless, feel anxious to know the character of the Platform which could thus drive off one-sixth of the members of the Convention. I think you will credit me when I assure you that it was the identical creed of the party in 1844—1848 the compromise measures of 1850—the Platform of Pierce, in 1852, the Kansas Nebraska Act of 1854, and the Cincinnati Platform, of 1856. The Convention re-affirmed the Cincinnati Platform, upon which James Buchanan was elected, and upon which the great battle of 1856 was fought and won; and this was deemed sufficient to justify 51 members in bolting.

The Convention (252 members remaining) continued in session and proceeded to ballot for a candidate. Fifty-seven votes were taken. On several of these, Judge Douglas received a majority of the whole electoral college—the vote standing 152½ for Douglas, to 99½ for all others.

Before proceeding to a ballot, a proposition was offered on behalf of some of the Southern States remaining in the Convention, to the effect that the President of the Convention should not declare any person nominated until such person should have received a two-thirds vote of the whole Convention when full. This was adopted by a vote of 141 to 112. It was not offered as a rule, or as a change of the rules, but simply as a resolution of construction and direction to the Chair. On the tenth day of the Convention, at Charleston, having failed to make a nomination and the 51 seats being vacant, the Convention adjourned to meet at Baltimore, on the 18th of June, having first passed a resolution requesting the Democratic party of the several States to supply vacancies in their respective delegations.

On the 18th of June, the Convention reassembled, at Baltimore. No delegates appeared from South Carolina and Florida. One delegation appeared from Mississippi—these were the Seceders at Charleston, but having been re-elected by a State Convention, they were admitted.

One delegation (the Seceders) appeared from Texas. This was not elected by the people, or by any Convention, but was accredited by the State Central Committee.—Owing to the position of Texas—her large size and great distance from the Convention, and difficulty of calling a Convention, this delegation was also admitted.

There was one contested seat from Massachusettsone from Missouri, onefrom Delaware, three from Arkansas, six from Louisiana, nine from Alabama and ten from Georgia. These were referred to the Committee on Credentials, then consisting of twenty-five members.

This Committee, after a session of several days, reported by an average vote of about fifteen to ten, in favor of the admission of the Seceders from Delaware, two Seceders and one new delegate from Arkansas, the new delegates from Alabama and Louisiana, and one-half of each from Georgia. The report of the Committee was adopted in every case, except that of Georgia, in which all of the Seceders were admitted. By this action of the Convention, seventeen votes were admitted to the Convention contrary to the views of the Seceders. Although this could in no way effect the result of the nomination, even if wrong, and although every member of the Convention had voted for and acknowledged the rule which declared that the Convention should judge of the qualifications of its own members, yet this was considered sufficient ground for a further secession of 50 members.

The Convention proceeded to make its nominations, passed an additional resolution on the subject of the platform, appointed a national committee and adjourned. Of the seventeen votes before mentioned, sixteen were in lieu of Seceders from Louisiana Alabama and Arkansas—one half vote from Massachusetts and Missouri each being contested on other grounds—51 and 50, or 101 deducted from 303, left in the Convention 202 members to which were added the 16 new delegates making 218 members.

On the first and second ballots at Baltimore, several of the delegates declined to vote—on the second ballot Judge Douglas received 181½ votes to 15 for all other candidates and the remainder blank. After the first vote Gov. Church, of New York, offered a resolution declaring him nominated and by implication rescinding the resolution of interpretation and instruction to the Chair adopted at Charleston. Objection being made Gov. Church withdrew his motion. After the second ballot it was renewed by Mr. Clark of Missouri and a delegate from Virginia. It was then distinctly put by the President (both the affirmative and the negative) and adopted by acclamation and without a dissenting voice in the Convention.

As we have already seen, the Seceders at Charleston, adjourned to meet at Richmond, on the 11th of June. At that time and place, they met and adjourned until the 21st of the same month.

At Baltimore the 50 Seceders were joined by 40 of the Seceders from Charleston (South Carolina with 8 members and Florida with 3 remaining at Richmond) met in another part of the city, organized an opposition, or hostile Convention, gathered up some fifteen additional delegates from some quarter, or other, and with 105, delegates of all descriptions nominated Breckinridge and Lane. At least 90 of those delegates were in the Charleston Convention and aided in the adoption of the rules of that body, one of which required a majority, or 152 members to constitute a quorum for the transaction of any business.

I have already stated that the admission of 17 votes contrary to the wishes of the seceders did not affect the result. On the second ballot, Judge Douglas had 181½ votes. All others 15; balance declining to vote. Deduct the 17 votes from 181½ and you have 164½, and add them to 15 you have 32 votes for all others.—There still being more than a quorum present and voting and Judge D. having received more than two thirds of the votes given, he is clearly entitled to the support of every Democrat who acknowledges the binding force of nominating conventions. To say that he is *not* and that Breckinridge *is* the regular nominee of the party seems to me to be an insult to the understanding of every impartial voter. I have full confidence in the wisdom and patriotism of the masses of the Democratic party of the country, and hope that upon sober reflection the people everywhere will as heretofore rally to the support of regular nominations, and preserve the integrity of the party. In the present aspect of affairs, it becomes important to determine correctly who is responsible for the present situation of the party. I assert that the Seceders and their allies and abettors, alone are responsible. There are but two reasons given by themselves for the secession. The platform at Charleston and the admission of the 17 delegates at Baltimore. These I propose to consider very briefly. Before I do this, however, I venture to assert that there are at least three causes which have led to this result:—First, the failure of the Convention to adopt "Intervention" instead of "Non-Intervention" by Congress with the question of slavery in the territories. Second, the desire among the friends of the Seceders, if not among themselves, to bring about a dissolution of the Union itself. Third, the personal hostility of some of these gentlemen and others high in authority, towards Judge Douglas. These propositions shall also be briefly considered. The first secession of 51 members took place at Charleston on the adoption of the Platform. This we have already seen was a simple re-affirmation of the Cincinnati platform of 1856. The bolters desired the convention to declare in favor of Congressional Intervention in favor of slavery in the Territories. The same doctrine was demanded by Mr. Yancey of Alabama, from the Baltimore Convention in 1848. He there obtained 36 votes for it to 216 against it. He demanded it in 1852 and failed to obtain it. I learn that Mr. Yancey who headed the Secessionat Charleston, declared before the Committee on Credentials that he had opposed General Cass in 1848 and General Pierce in 1852, because he failed to obtain a recognition of his doctrine by the nominating Conventions. Time will not permit a further examination of this reason for the secession. It was upon a question of doctrine—one of the cardinal principles of the party. The Convention stood upon the same ground occupied in former times, adhering to the Cincinnati platform. The Seceders demanded a change and because it was refused, withdrew. The Republicans of the North declare that it is the right and duty of Congress, to intervene against slavery in the Territories—the Seceders declare that it is the right and duty of Congress to intervene in favor of Slavery in the Territories. The Convention regarded both propositions as erroneous in principle, and adhered to the old doctrine of the party that it belonged to the people to regulate their domestic affairs in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States. True, there was, to some extent, a difference of opinion as to the time when the right to legislate on the subject of slavery commenced. But the Convention, by an almost unanimous vote, disposed of this subject, by a resolution declaring it the duty of all good citizens to abide by the decisions of the Supreme Court upon this question.

The right to hold slave property in the Territories, even against an enactment of the Territorial legislature, involving as it does, a case at law, or in equity, as well as the constitutionality of the supposed law, is committed by the Constitution directly to the judiciary. Should the decision of that tribunal be in favor of the right to hold the slave, all the powers of the Federal government are pledged to enforce the judgment. This is substantially the doctrine of the platform, unanimously adopted at Reading, in March, 1860.

The second and only remaining reason given by themselves, to justify their secession, was the action of the Convention on the contested seats. Here it will be well to observe that had not the first secession taken place, no such reason as the second would ever have existed. If then the judgment of the country should be that the adoption of the Cincinnati platform was no good cause of complaint, the entire responsibility for the present state of affairs rests with the Seceders. Had they remained in the Convention at Charleston, there would have been no contested seats at Baltimore.

We have already seen that a majority, or 152 delegates, constituted a Quorum, and that the Convention was to judge of the qualifications of its own members. From such a decision there could be no appeal. In our State, the Lower House of the Legislature, consists of 100 members, 51 being a quorum; the Senate consists of 33 members, 17 being a quorum. Suppose ten seats in the House and five in the Senate are contested. They are, however, settled—even erroneously if you please. Some law receives 26 votes in the Lower House with 25 against it, and 9 votes in the Senate with 8 against it, being signed by the Governor, even though 5 of the 9 votes in the Senate and 10 of the 26 in the House were members whose seats were contested, it becomes as binding upon all the citizens of the Commonwealth as though it had received one hundred votes in the House and 33 in the Senate, and no seat in either branch had ever been contested. As well might the criminal on his way to the gallows, or to the prison, call upon the people to assemble in town meeting for his rescue, because the laws which tried and condemned him, were not regularly passed according to his notions of justice, as for these gentlemen to say that these nominations were not regular.

But there is no just ground for complaint. In Massachusetts Mr. Hallett was elected a delegate, Mr. Chaffee was *elected* alternate, Mr. H. could not go to Charleston. H. notfied Mr. Chaffee of his inability to attend and as I learn he (Mr. H.) removed with his family, from the District. The seat was contested at Charleston and decided unanimously in favor of Mr. Chaffee. At Baltimore Mr. H. appeared and claimed his seat. He was rejected. In Arkansas neither Convention was regular nor in accordance with the usages of the party. Both were admitted—the seceders with power to cast two votes—the new delegates to cast one. The Missouri case was similar to that from Massachusetts. In Louisiana two Conventions were called. The one a Convention of the people—the other the old Convention whose time had expired and who had no more power to send delegates than any other similar number of individuals accidentally called together.

The new delegates were admitted—the old ones were liable to the objection already stated and also to the same objections hereafter given in the Alabama case. The old Delegates from Georgia were liable to the same objection. Yet, the Convention refused to admit the new delegates and actually admitted the old Delegates, because a part of the Delegates to the Georgia Convention, by whom the new Delegation was chosen, at first met in Convention with those who had seceded at Charleston. It was because a portion of these had seceded or bolted, that their representatives were rejected.

In the State of Alabama, the Delegation admitted to seats, were chosen by a State Convention called together by the people, "for the purpose of appointing Delegates to the National Democratic Convention at Baltimore, to nominate candidates who may be able to save the Government from the hands of those who will not regard our constitutional rights, and be the *means of securing the perpetuity of the Constitution and the Union.*"

The Seceders from this State, were rejected. They were elected to the Richmond Convention—a body hostile to the Democratic party and proposing to nominate their own candidates. The meetings by which the delegates to the State Convention which elected the Seceders, were chosen and the speeches made at those meetings, were almost entirely of a character hostile to the Democratic party. One of their orators (and a Delegate) said of the Baltimore Convention, that "the man who would represent Alabama in that Convention should be branded with the brand of Cain. Though not a murderer of his kin, he would be a murderer of principle and of the constitutional rights of his section, that he would be more than the assassin who but takes the life of a fellow man."

Others declared "that to entertain the proposition to send delegates to Baltimore, would be at once to step with a coward's tread from the highest pinnacle of honor to the lowest depths of degradation and abasement."—

Such was the tenor of all their meetings and speeches. Their Delegates showed credentials to Richmond and utterly refused to be bound by the action of our Convention. Under these circumstances, the Convention deemed it wise to learn whether the great horse contained soldiers who were allies, or enemies, before it should be safely stabled within the gates of Troy.—I have before stated that the admission of the 17 delegates already named, did not affect the general result. I have shown that on the vote given. I now desire to show the same thing in case no secession had taken place. 101 delegates seceded. Of these South Carolina and Florida remained at Richmond. This left 90. From this number deduct 16 Seceders whose places were supplied by new delegates, and we still have 74, who, by the action of the Baltimore Convention, had at any moment a right to resume their seats. There remained in the Convention 2½ from Maine, 2½ from Connecticut, 4½ from N. Jersey, 17 from Pennsylvania, 3½ from Missouri, 2 from Delaware and 7 from Kentucky, in all 39, who declined to vote for Judge Douglas. These added to the 74 were more than sufficient to prevent his nomination.

It is well known that some persons in the South have for a long time desired a dissolution of the Union. I believe some, if not all of the South Carolina Delegation to Richmond, avow that desire. This Convention at Richmond also nominated Breckinridge and Lane. Some declare that the election of a Republican President will be sufficient ground for a dissolution. Those who really desire a dissolution, could scarcely devise a surer method to accomplish it than by the dissolution of the Democratic party, thereby promoting the election of Mr. Lincoln. Is not the fact that such sentiments are avowed, a sufficient reason for all true Democrats to shun the nomination of Breckinridge and Lane, as they would shun the enemies of their country?—

Hostility to Mr. Douglas has had much to do with effecting the secession. That this hostility is unwise and unfounded in reason, public judgment and future history will surely determine. That he is able, patriotic and capable few if any will deny. That this hostility exists, a very few examples will clearly prove. In Massachusetts, three gentlemen were elected to Charleston as the open and avowed friends of Judge Douglas. All three of them were found among the Seceders at Baltimore. Two of them were appointed to high positions and lucrative offices after their election as delegates and before the meeting of the Convention. The third has been similarly rewarded since the adjournment of the Convention. Almost all the officers of the General Government and all the papers under their control, are now bitter against Douglas and warm for Breckinridge.

All the rules, usages and customs by which they went into power are now disregarded and held inferior to the personal hatred and subserviency of at least some of the minions of power. It is no use to multiply examples on this point.

The two causes of Secession given by those who withdrew and the reasons to which their conduct has been attributed, have been hastily considered.

There are two other causes of complaint, not yet mentioned—these are not given in justification of secession, but as reasons of dissatisfaction. One of these was the course of the Convention in regard to the motion, or resolution of construction of the two thirds rule. This was, or was not, a rule of the Convention. If a rule, it never was adopted because that (then) required a two third vote and this only received 141 to 112. If it was not a rule, then it was a mere resolution, subject to the will of the majority at any time.—It was clearly rescinded, or repealed, by the motion made by Gov. Church and renewed by Mr. Clark. Even if it had been a rule, it was repealed, because the motion was adopted unanimously. The motion was adopted after the secession at Charleston, never received a majority of a full Convention, and was repealed by the entire vote of the Convention, 218 delegates being present.

Another objection urged in some quarters, was the unit rule of the Convention.

This was simply reducing the common law of the party on the subject of voting to a statute. The rule provided that minorities might vote, except in cases when the State Convention had directed the vote to be cast as an unit. Such had been almost the universal custom of former Conventions. The records of Conventions will show minority votes from many of the States of the Union. Under the old rules and practice, it seldom, if ever, happened that the majority of an uninstructed delegation attempted to stifle the will of the minority. But from the fact that such high-handed efforts were being made by some of the delegations to this Convention, the rule was adopted. It was fully considered and discussed in committee, and passed by a vote of 25 to 2. In the Convention it was again fully discussed and adopted by a vote of 197 to 103½. Indeed, the chief, if not the only argument against it, was that it was unnecessary, as the right to cast such votes already existed. This rule received the votes of Kentucky, Tennessee, half of Delaware, nearly all of Missouri and Arkansus, part of North Carolina and several other delegates who afterwards seceded. But aside from this, it was right in itself. It provided that in cases of instruction so to do, Delegations should vote as a unit.—In other cases, delegates should be allowed to vote for themselves.

The first part of the Rule can not be objected to. When a gentleman accepts the trust under instructions, he does not represent himself, but his State. He has no individual views and if he had, he is in honor bound to suppress them. Any other course of action by the individual, or by the Convention, would conflict with State rights and State sovereignty.

This method made N. York, Ohio and Indiana unanimous for Douglas, and Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi and Louisiana unanimous against him.

On the other hand, in all cases where the State Conventions had neglected or refused to instruct, the delegates were allowed to vote as they saw fit. Any other course would again have been an interfeference with State Sovereignty, in electing their delegations, and an act of tyrranny by the majority towards the minority. This method gave Judge Douglas, a few votes in Pennsylvania, one in North Carolina, one in Tennessee and one in Virginia. It lost him 3 in Maine, 2½ in Connecticut and 1½ in Minnesota. Maryland, Missouri and Massachusetts, being equally divided, were not affected by the Rule.

All these, however, appear to me to be objections hunted up, on purpose, by men determined in advance to be dissatisfied, and going abroad in search of reasons to justify or bolster up as far as possible their course of action. Half the effort to find reasons in favor of the action of the national convention of their party, and in support of its nominees, would lead to a very different result.

Not only have we the regular nomination of the National Convention to urge us to the support of Douglas & Johnson, but we have also the action of our own delegation. Mr. Douglas received 10 votes on both ballots at Baltimore from our Delegation. This required twenty members of our Delegation, while it contained in all 54. In addition to these 20 delegates, the nomination was ratified by several others of the delegation—Messrs Dawson, Hughes, Jones, McGee, Blood, Brodhead, Clymer, Van Sant, Gloninger and others.

We have then all the binding force of a regular nomination and we have the usages of the party urging us to the support of our nominees. We have candidates in every way worthy of our support. We have the union and harmony of the Democratic party of the country to preserve. Let no personal preferences, or