

high seas, and wherever else "Constitutional authority extends."  
You remember, sir, and your cheeks must have flushed in humiliation, as did those of many other Pennsylvanians, on seeing this in a printed slip, which was at one time sent through the hall headed "The Pennsylvania proposition." You may remember too, how soon these slips disappeared, and how innocent of advocates the proposition fell amongst us, when this new sphere of Congressional action in regard to Slavery, was discussed in the light furnished by Judge Magrath's recent opinion delivered in the Supreme Court of South Carolina, in the case of Capt. Corrie—holding that the Act of Congress of the 15th of May 1820, in regard to Piracy on the high seas, did not apply to the Slave trade prosecuted, between nations of the Southern States and others in Africa, in which Slavery was lawful!  
Precisely when and where this "high seas" feature of the bolters' platform was dropped, would be a very interesting fact to ascertain. Certain it is—those words were dropped out of the original, leaving, however, "the colored gentlemen" carefully enounced under the indefinite canopy "wherever else its authority extends." I suppose it must be to this section that Collector Baker has reference, when he so very lucidly boasts of sustaining "a platform clearly and explicitly defining our position on the question of State rights in the Territories!"  
The Alabama ultimatum, after respectful discussion, was rejected at Charleston, by a majority of twenty-seven; and we claim well understood and all dignified Cincinnati platform of 1856. We did, at first, offer a clause indicating our willingness, (although the same has always been our understanding of the obligation), to carry out faithfully the decisions of the Courts upon all questions of property arising in the territories. Some insisted that the Dred Scott case covered the whole question, and that it would be the result of that they should become the true state of affairs. But no, "out Caer, aut nihil," said Mr. Yancey and his companions; and so walked out of the Convention some thirty or forty of its members.

I need not speak of the balloting for a candidate which succeeded, except to say that Judge Douglas repeatedly received a majority of a full Convention; and from that moment, until the final adjournment, he reigned supreme, his reign and record of action commenced. How gracefully did Judge Douglas and his friends yield to a bare majority in 1858; and with what earnestness did certain Pennsylvania friends of James Buchanan declare, "this liberality should never be forgotten!" "Liberality!" conscience has no reproaches for me on this subject.  
After a series of tirades and intellectual halts, we adjourned on the motion of Virginia to the city of Baltimore; and gave an invitation to those States whose delegates had bolted, to supply their vacancies. On re-assembling at Baltimore, all our bolting friends except from South Carolina and Florida, re-appeared; not humbled or repentant, but just as before, with threats, and prescribed conditions that the majority were required to accept. Some of these represented the commissions—some species of Letters of Marque—accrediting them to two conflicting Conventions, then contemplated! Opposing delegations also came, appointed upon our invitation, and tendering no conditions, threats or reservations. We voted to receive the latter. It was enough for me that these new delegates had come out untrammelled, and upon their own responsibility. I was glad to see that the delegates from Virginia and Florida had bolted the original Alabama delegation, and came breathing renewed threats of secession, I would have spurned them by my vote, and sustained their competitors. I scorned by any act or admission of mine, to sink my constituents below the level of any southern secession; and this I should have done, if I had consented to send them to sit down in that Convention, and deliberate under the threats of assumed superiors. Nor had I much more hesitation in choosing between the two delegations from Louisiana.

Upon the adoption of the report admitting the freshly chosen delegations to those two States, rejecting I regret to say, the new one from Georgia—the work of the Convention was confined to the larger portion of several of the Southern delegations, bolted from our ranks. Two delegates representing different districts—therefore counted as two votes—of the New York delegation; and six and a half votes of that from Pennsylvania, seem to be missing on the final ballot.—How many remained and refused to vote, or exactly what was the Pennsylvania delegation, that proved false to the Democracy in its organization, it is difficult to seem difficult to determine. Certainly among these were Vincent L. Bradley, and H. A. Guernsey, two distinguished gentlemen, whom we find acting at the late meeting of the State Central Committee, counselling a quiet recognition of their own political treason, in an amalgamation ticket of electors? False to the Reading platform, bolters from the regular Democratic Convention, and yet, insisting to pledge the electoral ticket to similar falsehood and the same treachery.

When we reflect upon the course lately pursued by many of the Southern leaders, it seems absolutely incomprehensible, upon any generous or fair principles of human action. Why should they thus readily throw to the winds, their only remaining chances of preventing a Republican ascendancy in the Government? I claim to have had up to the latest hour, as warm a personal attachment to John C. Breckinridge, as any one in Pennsylvania. I vindicated this attachment in my heart's core, when on my way to the Charleston Convention, I endeavored to strengthen his apparent determination, not to become a Presidential candidate in this period of dark uncertainty and peril. Neither he, or any other Southern candidate could have succeeded, though placed on the Cincinnati platform by a harmonious nomination.  
I am well satisfied, that at this time, there is but one Democrat who can be elected, even by a united Democracy. If the bolters of the South persist in a sectional struggle, (for that is all they can make of it),—the result must be placed to their account. The current of feeling in favor of Judge Douglas has been running strongly for years, in all the Northern and Western States. Mark the character and position of the men who contended for him in the Convention. I mean no disparagement to any one; but I will say, you are not a Treasury officer, or professor of metaphysics, in all that numerous body of men who sought the nomination. There stood the very elite of West-

ern intelligence and Western energy—such men as could not be awed by threats, enlivened by soporifics, or tempted by promised political rewards. They had contended for years for the principles embodied in the Cincinnati platform, amidst defeats and party disasters of every kind. They had seen Douglas carry their favorite banner triumphant in almost every contest, and against the most fearful odds. With him, and him alone, they felt in this sectional struggle, the full assurance of success in Pennsylvania: who besides Douglas so certain to win back the votes we lost on the Leecompton foil? New Jersey is in precisely the same category; and after the rejection of Seward, New York might be reclaimed, with Douglas the candidate of a united Democracy.

I have glanced already at our position in Pennsylvania: who besides Douglas so certain to win back the votes we lost on the Leecompton foil? New Jersey is in precisely the same category; and after the rejection of Seward, New York might be reclaimed, with Douglas the candidate of a united Democracy.

As in campaigns that have passed, circumstances again point to Pennsylvania as the battle-ground in the pending presidential contest. The old saying, "as goes Pennsylvania, so goes the Union," has a peculiar significance. If we remember aright, Pennsylvania has never lost a majority vote upon a Presidential candidate. In 1856, Buchanan had a majority of some 80,000 over Fremont; and a small majority over all other candidates. The majority for Pierce in 1852 was still larger. In 1848, Gen. Taylor carried Pennsylvania. Poll received a handsome majority in 1844. In 1840, the memorable hard-fought campaign, Gen. Harrison was successful in Pennsylvania and in the Union. In 1836, the majority for Van Buren was large, still larger for Jackson, and nearly all on one side for Monroe, Madison and Jefferson. It is thus true in the past, that "as goes Pennsylvania, so goes the Union," and there is every probability that in the contest now pending, the rule will not be varied. How will Pennsylvania go this fall? If there was but one Democratic candidate in the field, (whether Douglas or Breckinridge,) the answer would be ready enough. Pennsylvania is now, as she always has been, a Democratic State; it is only by unfortunate distractions in the party, and local site issues, that the opposition have been able to accomplish anything in this State. The question now is, with two Democratic candidates, and two electoral tickets in the field, (for this now seems inevitable,) can either of them carry the state over the abolition candidate, Lincoln. It should be remembered that in this four-sided fight, the lines of division will be clearly marked. The 150,000 professed Democrats who for the last two years have either kept away from the polls or squandered their votes upon the opposition, will now have no motive or excuse for such folly. In this view of the matter, we have no hesitation in believing that Lincoln, the candidate of the moment, will also be shown as the candidate of the smallest political organization in the state. Our belief is, that Douglas will so far lead Lincoln in this state, that he can afford to divide a complimentary vote with Messrs. Breckinridge and Bell, and still come out ahead. Even in Susquehanna county, hitherto so terribly hide-bound and fooled by the Montrose clique of abolition demagogues, we have strong hopes that their small majority of last year will this fall be turned under, through the popularity of the "Little Giant."

The New York News has the following speculations upon the issue in this state, which seem to be fair and reasonable:—  
"In 1856, the Democratic vote in Pennsylvania was 230,772; the Republican vote was 147,963; the American, 82,202. Total, 460,937. Democratic over Republican, 82,809; over American, 148,574; over both, 607. The Republican minority on the popular vote was 165,011. Now divide the increase of votes in the State at the approaching election over that of 1856 equally between the two parties, and the Republicans must change 82,500 of those who voted against them in 1856, to carry the state by a majority vote. When we take into account the great popularity of young Fremont at that time, and the coldness with which the nomination of Lincoln has been received, and his consequent unpopularity in the State, we think no sane man can expect the Republicans to obtain a majority of the votes cast this Fall. Their partial success in the State elections since 1856, has been owing entirely to local causes and divisions in the Democratic party. These local causes will have but little influence in a Presidential contest, and the divisions in the Democratic party have been in a great measure healed by the nomination of Mr. Douglas. Those who have voted against the party in their State elections, since 1856, will now vote for Mr. Douglas. Under these circumstances, it is safe to calculate that the Republican party will not increase their vote on Lincoln above that which they gave Fremont more than their share of the increased vote of the State. Estimate this increase at 15 per cent. on the vote of 1856, and it amounts to 6,914; give the Republicans one-half, 3,457, and it increases their vote, taking 1856 as a basis, to 151,420, which will leave them 82,500 below a majority in the state. It is estimating their vote as high, we think as it can be carried to reach, under any circumstances, as it allows them to retain their entire vote for Fremont, a more popular candidate than Lincoln, and gives them one-half of the increased vote of the State. We doubt if the most ardent Republicans will claim more than this."  
The only question, then, for us further to examine is, will the 151,420 vote the Republican candidates may possibly receive in Pennsylvania be a plurality? We will see, that 216,481 votes are left from which one of the three other candidates in the field must obtain a larger vote than the Republicans to defeat them. The vote for Mr. Fillmore in 1856 was

32,202.

Mr. Fillmore had held the office for nearly four years. He was an able statesman, and an upright, honest man. His administration was very popular in Pennsylvania, not only because of his integrity and his executive ability, but because he favored the protection of the iron manufactures, in which that State has much capital invested, and great interest involved. Take this as the measure of fact that there is no prospect of the election of Mr. Bell, as all must admit that his name cannot possibly go into the House of Representatives, should the election go there, is it not reasonable to estimate that his vote this Fall, under these circumstances, will not exceed 40,000. In accordance with this estimate there remains 276,481 votes to be divided between Mr. Douglas and Mr. Breckinridge. If we are to judge from the vote of Pennsylvania in favor of Mr. Douglas in the National Convention—if we are to form an estimate of the preferences of the Democratic party from public meetings and the public press, and from the opinions of intelligent citizens from every part of the State with whom we have conversed, Mr. Breckinridge cannot receive over one-fourth of the Democratic vote of the state. To avoid all appearance of unfairness or what of candor we will estimate it at one third, which will be 92,144 votes. As there are no other candidates to divide the Democratic vote, Mr. Douglas will receive 184,287. This is 32,867 over Mr. Lincoln, and give him the electoral vote of the State with a margin of 30,000 to cover contingencies.

If the Republicans claim that they can sweep from the 40,000 votes estimated by Mr. Bell sufficient to carry the State for Mr. Lincoln, we answer that Mr. Douglas will stand a better chance for these votes if Mr. Bell is dropped than Mr. Lincoln will. If Mr. Bell should poll a larger vote than we have named, we think the increase will come from the republican ranks—from those who are alarmed at the John Brown fiasco, disgusted with Mr. Sumner's fanaticism, and who tremble for the perpetuity of the Union rather than from conservative Union Democrats. On the other side, we are of opinion that Mr. Breckinridge will not receive 20,000 votes in the state. This will place the vote of Mr. Douglas beyond the reach of Mr. Lincoln, and give the electoral vote of the state to him beyond a doubt. As goes the Keystone State so goes the Union, is an old saying, and a true one!

**MR. CHASE'S BOOK.**  
We have received from the publisher, J. W. Bradley, 48 North Fourth street, Philadelphia, a copy of the work recently compiled by Ezra B. Chase, Esq., entitled "Teachings of Patriots and Statesmen, or the 'Founders of the Republic' on Slavery." Though mainly a compilation, the work is, both in respect to design and execution, a timely and welcome addition to the literature of the age and the nation, and one which, we doubt not, will often be referred to as a standard authority upon the subject of which it treats. The slavery question in this country has been seized upon by designing politicians to advance their selfish purposes—we have had our proof of this in the case of David Wilmore—who have perverted facts, and distorted general truths, that now assume a most threatening character. The only preventive of this state of things, is the enlightenment of the popular mind by affirming it in a cheap, compact and intelligible form, the necessary means to raise itself above the clap-trap of politicians and fanatics. This was the evident design of Mr. Chase in the compilation of this work, and we are well convinced that its general circulation would go far toward its wished-for consummation.  
It is not a partisan book. No party bias can be found in its pages; but, as its title indicates, it is a concentration of the thoughts and opinions, upon the subject of slavery, of the wisest and best of American statesmen from the foundation of the Republic to the present time.

The book is for sale by A. N. Bullard, at the Montrose Book Store. Price 81.

**FALL OF A METEOR.**—On Friday evening last, about half-past nine o'clock, a brilliant meteor was seen in the west. For a few seconds, its broad luminous trail lit up the earth and sky with sun-like brilliancy, and immediately after its disappearance, a heavy explosion, like that of a cannon at some distance, was distinctly heard here. We observe by our exchanges that the same erratic visitor was seen throughout a wide space of the country, and everywhere is hailed as the latest wonder. Some thought it was a sky-rocket, others were frightened with the belief that the comet was loose and coming to brush the earth, while all appear to be wild in describing its position and course. The New Yorkers think it passed directly over, and lit near that city, the Philadelphians also claimed it as a local phenomenon, while some of our villagers were quite sure, on the evening of its occurrence, that it was *rather too* near Montrose. At Richmond, Va., and Boston, Mass., 400 miles apart, it had the same local appearance.  
We publish in another column the timely and forcible reply of Wm. H. Welsh, Chairman of the Democratic State Committee, to the letter of the Hon. Richard Vaux, one of the Electors at Large, refusing to abate by the compromise agreed upon by the Committee. It will attract general attention. Mr. Welsh shows the lameness of the arguments advanced by Mr. Vaux, and handsomely turns upon him some of his union and harmony thunder, got off at the Reading Convention, at a time when there were no inducements to follow the factions course into which Mr. Vaux has since unfortunately been swept.  
From Mr. Welsh's letter we learn the pleasing intelligence that but two of the electors who have responded to the resolution have refused to give their assent.

Joseph Gales, senior editor of the National Intelligencer, died at Washington on Saturday night last, aged 75. Mr. Gales has been for fifty years connected with the Intelligencer, and by an upright life, has won the confidence and esteem of a large circle of influential friends.

**THE MONTROSE DEMOCRAT**

TERMS—\$1.00 PER ANNUM IN ADVANCE.  
A. J. GERRITSON,  
EDITOR, PUBLISHER, AND PROPRIETOR.  
OFFICE OPPOSITE THE POST-OFFICE.  
Charleston, July 26th, 1860.

**DEMOCRATIC NOMINATIONS.**

- FOR GOVERNOR.  
**HENRY D. FOSTER,**  
Of Westmoreland County.
- PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS.**
- ELECTORS AT LARGE.  
**RICHARD VAUX, GEO. M. KEM.**
- DISTRICT ELECTORS.
1. Fred. A. Survej,
  2. W. C. Patterson,
  3. Jos. Crockett,
  4. J. G. Bremner,
  5. G. W. Jacoby,
  6. Charles Kelly,
  7. O. P. James,
  8. David Schall,
  9. J. H. Lightner,
  10. S. S. Harber,
  11. T. H. Walker,
  12. S. S. Winchester,
  13. Joseph Laubsach,
  14. Isaac Reekhow,
  15. Geo. D. Jackson,
  16. J. A. Aul,
  17. J. B. Dunner,
  18. J. R. Crawford,
  19. H. N. Lee,
  20. J. B. Howell,
  21. P. Poterman,
  22. Samuel Marshall,
  23. William Book,
  24. B. D. Hamlin,
  25. Gaylor Church,

**THE BATTLE-GROUND.**

As in campaigns that have passed, circumstances again point to Pennsylvania as the battle-ground in the pending presidential contest. The old saying, "as goes Pennsylvania, so goes the Union," has a peculiar significance. If we remember aright, Pennsylvania has never lost a majority vote upon a Presidential candidate. In 1856, Buchanan had a majority of some 80,000 over Fremont; and a small majority over all other candidates. The majority for Pierce in 1852 was still larger. In 1848, Gen. Taylor carried Pennsylvania. Poll received a handsome majority in 1844. In 1840, the memorable hard-fought campaign, Gen. Harrison was successful in Pennsylvania and in the Union. In 1836, the majority for Van Buren was large, still larger for Jackson, and nearly all on one side for Monroe, Madison and Jefferson. It is thus true in the past, that "as goes Pennsylvania, so goes the Union," and there is every probability that in the contest now pending, the rule will not be varied. How will Pennsylvania go this fall? If there was but one Democratic candidate in the field, (whether Douglas or Breckinridge,) the answer would be ready enough. Pennsylvania is now, as she always has been, a Democratic State; it is only by unfortunate distractions in the party, and local site issues, that the opposition have been able to accomplish anything in this State. The question now is, with two Democratic candidates, and two electoral tickets in the field, (for this now seems inevitable,) can either of them carry the state over the abolition candidate, Lincoln. It should be remembered that in this four-sided fight, the lines of division will be clearly marked. The 150,000 professed Democrats who for the last two years have either kept away from the polls or squandered their votes upon the opposition, will now have no motive or excuse for such folly. In this view of the matter, we have no hesitation in believing that Lincoln, the candidate of the moment, will also be shown as the candidate of the smallest political organization in the state. Our belief is, that Douglas will so far lead Lincoln in this state, that he can afford to divide a complimentary vote with Messrs. Breckinridge and Bell, and still come out ahead. Even in Susquehanna county, hitherto so terribly hide-bound and fooled by the Montrose clique of abolition demagogues, we have strong hopes that their small majority of last year will this fall be turned under, through the popularity of the "Little Giant."

The New York News has the following speculations upon the issue in this state, which seem to be fair and reasonable:—  
"In 1856, the Democratic vote in Pennsylvania was 230,772; the Republican vote was 147,963; the American, 82,202. Total, 460,937. Democratic over Republican, 82,809; over American, 148,574; over both, 607. The Republican minority on the popular vote was 165,011. Now divide the increase of votes in the State at the approaching election over that of 1856 equally between the two parties, and the Republicans must change 82,500 of those who voted against them in 1856, to carry the state by a majority vote. When we take into account the great popularity of young Fremont at that time, and the coldness with which the nomination of Lincoln has been received, and his consequent unpopularity in the State, we think no sane man can expect the Republicans to obtain a majority of the votes cast this Fall. Their partial success in the State elections since 1856, has been owing entirely to local causes and divisions in the Democratic party. These local causes will have but little influence in a Presidential contest, and the divisions in the Democratic party have been in a great measure healed by the nomination of Mr. Douglas. Those who have voted against the party in their State elections, since 1856, will now vote for Mr. Douglas. Under these circumstances, it is safe to calculate that the Republican party will not increase their vote on Lincoln above that which they gave Fremont more than their share of the increased vote of the State. Estimate this increase at 15 per cent. on the vote of 1856, and it amounts to 6,914; give the Republicans one-half, 3,457, and it increases their vote, taking 1856 as a basis, to 151,420, which will leave them 82,500 below a majority in the state. It is estimating their vote as high, we think as it can be carried to reach, under any circumstances, as it allows them to retain their entire vote for Fremont, a more popular candidate than Lincoln, and gives them one-half of the increased vote of the State. We doubt if the most ardent Republicans will claim more than this."  
The only question, then, for us further to examine is, will the 151,420 vote the Republican candidates may possibly receive in Pennsylvania be a plurality? We will see, that 216,481 votes are left from which one of the three other candidates in the field must obtain a larger vote than the Republicans to defeat them. The vote for Mr. Fillmore in 1856 was

32,202.

Mr. Fillmore had held the office for nearly four years. He was an able statesman, and an upright, honest man. His administration was very popular in Pennsylvania, not only because of his integrity and his executive ability, but because he favored the protection of the iron manufactures, in which that State has much capital invested, and great interest involved. Take this as the measure of fact that there is no prospect of the election of Mr. Bell, as all must admit that his name cannot possibly go into the House of Representatives, should the election go there, is it not reasonable to estimate that his vote this Fall, under these circumstances, will not exceed 40,000. In accordance with this estimate there remains 276,481 votes to be divided between Mr. Douglas and Mr. Breckinridge. If we are to judge from the vote of Pennsylvania in favor of Mr. Douglas in the National Convention—if we are to form an estimate of the preferences of the Democratic party from public meetings and the public press, and from the opinions of intelligent citizens from every part of the State with whom we have conversed, Mr. Breckinridge cannot receive over one-fourth of the Democratic vote of the state. To avoid all appearance of unfairness or what of candor we will estimate it at one third, which will be 92,144 votes. As there are no other candidates to divide the Democratic vote, Mr. Douglas will receive 184,287. This is 32,867 over Mr. Lincoln, and give him the electoral vote of the State with a margin of 30,000 to cover contingencies.

**HARRIS'S MAGAZINE.**—This prince of monthlies, for August, fully sustains its high reputation. All the illustrations, as well as the letter-press, are precise, lively and we would wish to see in a popular magazine for the million. For sale by A. N. Bullard in this village. Published by Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square, New York. 33 per annum.

The Democratic State Committee of New Jersey, has issued a call for a State Convention to be held on the 25th inst., to form an electoral ticket. They recommend that a ticket composed of four Democratic men and three Breckenridges be chosen and the whole seven votes be given to the candidate having the highest vote.

The steamer Pennsylvania, plying between Philadelphia and Richmond, was burned to the water's edge on Thursday night last, on James River. Three children were drowned. The steamer and cargo are a total loss.

Read the card of Prof. J. W. Williams in another column. The Professor occupies the shop in Tarkell's Hotel, and is certainly quick and skillful enough in his art to suit everybody.

**LETTER.**  
From Wm. H. Welsh, Chairman of the Democratic State Executive Committee of Pennsylvania to the Hon. RICHARD VAUX, Elector at Large.  
York, Pa., July 16th, 1860.

MY DEAR SIR:—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th inst., which, however, it was my privilege to read in the daily papers, before it was furnished me with a printed copy. It is glad you have adopted this public mode of answering my brief note, as it enables me to lay before the people, in the same manner, my reasons for acting with the majority of the Democratic State Executive Committee at its last meeting. Had you contented yourself with a simple refusal to accede to the compromise proposed by the State Committee, I would have remained silent; but the ground you have publicly taken, demands from me a respectful answer, in justification of myself to those who placed me in the responsible position I now occupy towards the Democracy of Pennsylvania.  
The public will look in vain throughout your letter, for any tangible objection to the proposed compromise, on the score of expediency, policy, or principle. The one objection urged in the daily press, is that the State Committee acted without any authority. The question of jurisdiction is thus raised in your own mind, and is promptly decided by yourself, without argument, in your own favor.  
Now, with all your political knowledge—and I am willing to concede to you the most enlarged experience, and the highest integrity of purpose—I am afraid you have failed to learn that really, we are the certain specific duties which belong to a State Committee. Certainly, I have no wish to extend the powers of the one over which I have the honor to preside; nor do I desire to shield any action of my own, under the broad and general terms of the resolution which authorized its appointment, for which, I believe, you cordially voted in the Reading Convention. But I take it, that a State Committee is fully invested with the power, in such cases, which involve the working machinery of a party for whose benefit it was specially created; as well as to arrange and direct all the details of organization, and to propose and effectually carry out all measures which tend to secure successful results in an impending struggle. Hence it was that the National Executive Committee appointed by the Democratic Convention which met at the Front Street Theatre, in the city of Baltimore, with the command of the same chain to their implied power contained in the resolution which created it, assumed the power to make a nomination for the Democracy of the Union, when Benjamin Fitzpatrick declined to accept the Vice Presidency of the ticket with Stephen A. Douglas—and the adoption of the resolution by the same Committee, in reference to the power of its members over electoral tickets formed by bodies entirely separate and distinct from that which gave its political life, clearly shows that the gentlemen who compose that organization have no very narrow or contracted ideas of the authority and "specific duties" of an Executive Committee.  
You say, in your letter, that "the Reading Convention gave no power to its Committee to compromise the integrity of Democratic principles, the Democratic organization, or Democratic candidates." This is strictly true. But while you commend the same chain to their implied power contained in the resolution which created it, assumed the power to make a nomination for the Democracy of the Union, when Benjamin Fitzpatrick declined to accept the Vice Presidency of the ticket with Stephen A. Douglas—and the adoption of the resolution by the same Committee, in reference to the power of its members over electoral tickets formed by bodies entirely separate and distinct from that which gave its political life, clearly shows that the gentlemen who compose that organization have no very narrow or contracted ideas of the authority and "specific duties" of an Executive Committee.  
You say, in your letter, that "the Reading Convention gave no power to its Committee to compromise the integrity of Democratic principles, the Democratic organization, or Democratic candidates." This is strictly true. But while you commend the same chain to their implied power contained in the resolution which created it, assumed the power to make a nomination for the Democracy of the Union, when Benjamin Fitzpatrick declined to accept the Vice Presidency of the ticket with Stephen A. Douglas—and the adoption of the resolution by the same Committee, in reference to the power of its members over electoral tickets formed by bodies entirely separate and distinct from that which gave its political life, clearly shows that the gentlemen who compose that organization have no very narrow or contracted ideas of the authority and "specific duties" of an Executive Committee.  
You say, in your letter, that "the Reading Convention gave no power to its Committee to compromise the integrity of Democratic principles, the Democratic organization, or Democratic candidates." This is strictly true. But while you commend the same chain to their implied power contained in the resolution which created it, assumed the power to make a nomination for the Democracy of the Union, when Benjamin Fitzpatrick declined to accept the Vice Presidency of the ticket with Stephen A. Douglas—and the adoption of the resolution by the same Committee, in reference to the power of its members over electoral tickets formed by bodies entirely separate and distinct from that which gave its political life, clearly shows that the gentlemen who compose that organization have no very narrow or contracted ideas of the authority and "specific duties" of an Executive Committee.  
You say, in your letter, that "the Reading Convention gave no power to its Committee to compromise the integrity of Democratic principles, the Democratic organization, or Democratic candidates." This is strictly true. But while you commend the same chain to their implied power contained in the resolution which created it, assumed the power to make a nomination for the Democracy of the Union, when Benjamin Fitzpatrick declined to accept the Vice Presidency of the ticket with Stephen A. Douglas—and the adoption of the resolution by the same Committee, in reference to the power of its members over electoral tickets formed by bodies entirely separate and distinct from that which gave its political life, clearly shows that the gentlemen who compose that organization have no very narrow or contracted ideas of the authority and "specific duties" of an Executive Committee.

The editor of the Montrose Republican, in this week's issue, bravely claims that we would not be frightened at a dissolution of the Union. This degree, exactly with the bravado of Fred Douglas, Sarnsbury, Redpath, and all the other republican leaders, who are very harmonious on the dissolution question. The Republican editor knows very well that Lincoln is a sectional candidate, pledged to the one idea of abolishing slavery, and he may estimate what would be the effect of the election of such a man. The editor also wastes a great many idle words upon the Democratic platform, without giving his readers the slightest idea what those platforms are.

Col. Pomey, in the Philadelphia Press, of a late date, proposes a union of the friends of Lincoln, Douglas and Bell, to defeat Breckinridge. The infancy of such a proposition is only equalled by the impudence of this paid hireling of black republicanism in claiming to be a Democrat. Bought and paid for by the abolitionists, and supporting Judge Douglas only to betray him, his effrontery is most brazen and shameless.

The Honorable Herald says that a report is in circulation that Richard M. Johnson, a resident of Prompton, Wayne County, was found near the turnpike to Carbondale a few days since, with his throat cut, and dead. It is not certain whether the fatal act was the work of his own hands, or that of others.

This Democratic State Committee of New Jersey, has issued a call for a State Convention to be held on the 25th inst., to form an electoral ticket. They recommend that a ticket composed of four Democratic men and three Breckenridges be chosen and the whole seven votes be given to the candidate having the highest vote.

The steamer Pennsylvania, plying between Philadelphia and Richmond, was burned to the water's edge on Thursday night last, on James River. Three children were drowned. The steamer and cargo are a total loss.

Read the card of Prof. J. W. Williams in another column. The Professor occupies the shop in Tarkell's Hotel, and is certainly quick and skillful enough in his art to suit everybody.

**LETTER.**  
From Wm. H. Welsh, Chairman of the Democratic State Executive Committee of Pennsylvania to the Hon. RICHARD VAUX, Elector at Large.  
York, Pa., July 16th, 1860.

MY DEAR SIR:—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th inst., which, however, it was my privilege to read in the daily papers, before it was furnished me with a printed copy. It is glad you have adopted this public mode of answering my brief note, as it enables me to lay before the people, in the same manner, my reasons for acting with the majority of the Democratic State Executive Committee at its last meeting. Had you contented yourself with a simple refusal to accede to the compromise proposed by the State Committee, I would have remained silent; but the ground you have publicly taken, demands from me a respectful answer, in justification of myself to those who placed me in the responsible position I now occupy towards the Democracy of Pennsylvania.  
The public will look in vain throughout your letter, for any tangible objection to the proposed compromise, on the score of expediency, policy, or principle. The one objection urged in the daily press, is that the State Committee acted without any authority. The question of jurisdiction is thus raised in your own mind, and is promptly decided by yourself, without argument, in your own favor.  
Now, with all your political knowledge—and I am willing to concede to you the most enlarged experience, and the highest integrity of purpose—I am afraid you have failed to learn that really, we are the certain specific duties which belong to a State Committee. Certainly, I have no wish to extend the powers of the one over which I have the honor to preside; nor do I desire to shield any action of my own, under the broad and general terms of the resolution which authorized its appointment, for which, I believe, you cordially voted in the Reading Convention. But I take it, that a State Committee is fully invested with the power, in such cases, which involve the working machinery of a party for whose benefit it was specially created; as well as to arrange and direct all the details of organization, and to propose and effectually carry out all measures which tend to secure successful results in an impending struggle. Hence it was that the National Executive Committee appointed by the Democratic Convention which met at the Front Street Theatre, in the city of Baltimore, with the command of the same chain to their implied power contained in the resolution which created it, assumed the power to make a nomination for the Democracy of the Union, when Benjamin Fitzpatrick declined to accept the Vice Presidency of the ticket with Stephen A. Douglas—and the adoption of the resolution by the same Committee, in reference to the power of its members over electoral tickets formed by bodies entirely separate and distinct from that which gave its political life, clearly shows that the gentlemen who compose that organization have no very narrow or contracted ideas of the authority and "specific duties" of an Executive Committee.  
You say, in your letter, that "the Reading Convention gave no power to its Committee to compromise the integrity of Democratic principles, the Democratic organization, or Democratic candidates." This is strictly true. But while you commend the same chain to their implied power contained in the resolution which created it, assumed the power to make a nomination for the Democracy of the Union, when Benjamin Fitzpatrick declined to accept the Vice Presidency of the ticket with Stephen A. Douglas—and the adoption of the resolution by the same Committee, in reference to the power of its members over electoral tickets formed by bodies entirely separate and distinct from that which gave its political life, clearly shows that the gentlemen who compose that organization have no very narrow or contracted ideas of the authority and "specific duties" of an Executive Committee.  
You say, in your letter, that "the Reading Convention gave no power to its Committee to compromise the integrity of Democratic principles, the Democratic organization, or Democratic candidates." This is strictly true. But while you commend the same chain to their implied power contained in the resolution which created it, assumed the power to make a nomination for the Democracy of the Union, when Benjamin Fitzpatrick declined to accept the Vice Presidency of the ticket with Stephen A. Douglas—and the adoption of the resolution by the same Committee, in reference to the power of its members over electoral tickets formed by bodies entirely separate and distinct from that which gave its political life, clearly shows that the gentlemen who compose that organization have no very narrow or contracted ideas of the authority and "specific duties" of an Executive Committee.

You say, in your letter, that "the Reading Convention gave no power to its Committee to compromise the integrity of Democratic principles, the Democratic organization, or Democratic candidates." This is strictly true. But while you commend the same chain to their implied power contained in the resolution which created it, assumed the power to make a nomination for the Democracy of the Union, when Benjamin Fitzpatrick declined to accept the Vice Presidency of the ticket with Stephen A. Douglas—and the adoption of the resolution by the same Committee, in reference to the power of its members over electoral tickets formed by bodies entirely separate and distinct from that which gave its political life, clearly shows that the gentlemen who compose that organization have no very narrow or contracted ideas of the authority and "specific duties" of an Executive Committee.  
You say, in your letter, that "the Reading Convention gave no power to its Committee to compromise the integrity of Democratic principles, the Democratic organization, or Democratic candidates." This is strictly true. But while you commend the same chain to their implied power contained in the resolution which created it, assumed the power to make a nomination for the Democracy of the Union, when Benjamin Fitzpatrick declined to accept the Vice Presidency of the ticket with Stephen A. Douglas—and the adoption of the resolution by the same Committee, in reference to the power of its members over electoral tickets formed by bodies entirely separate and distinct from that which gave its political life, clearly shows that the gentlemen who compose that organization have no very narrow or contracted ideas of the authority and "specific duties" of an Executive Committee.  
You say, in your letter, that "the Reading Convention gave no power to its Committee to compromise the integrity of Democratic principles, the Democratic organization, or Democratic candidates." This is strictly true. But while you commend the same chain to their implied power contained in the resolution which created it, assumed the power to make a nomination for the Democracy of the Union, when Benjamin Fitzpatrick declined to accept the Vice Presidency of the ticket with Stephen A. Douglas—and the adoption of the resolution by the same Committee, in reference to the power of its members over electoral tickets formed by bodies entirely separate and distinct from that which gave its political life, clearly shows that the gentlemen who compose that organization have no very narrow or contracted ideas of the authority and "specific duties" of an Executive Committee.  
You say, in your letter, that "the Reading Convention gave no power to its Committee to compromise the integrity of Democratic principles, the Democratic organization, or Democratic candidates." This is strictly true. But while you commend the same chain to their implied power contained in the resolution which created it, assumed the power to make a nomination for the Democracy of the Union, when Benjamin Fitzpatrick declined to accept the Vice Presidency of the ticket with Stephen A. Douglas—and the adoption of the resolution by the same Committee, in reference to the power of its members over electoral tickets formed by bodies entirely separate and distinct from that which gave its political life, clearly shows that the gentlemen who compose that organization have no very narrow or contracted ideas of the authority and "specific duties" of an Executive Committee.

You say, in your letter, that "the Reading Convention gave no power to its Committee to compromise the integrity of Democratic principles, the Democratic organization, or Democratic candidates." This is strictly true. But while you commend the same chain to their implied power contained in the resolution which created it, assumed the power to make a nomination for the Democracy of the Union, when Benjamin Fitzpatrick declined to accept the Vice Presidency of the ticket with Stephen A. Douglas—and the adoption of the resolution by the same Committee, in reference to the power of its members over electoral tickets formed by bodies entirely separate and distinct from that which gave its political life, clearly shows that the gentlemen who compose that organization have no very narrow or contracted ideas of the authority and "specific duties" of an Executive Committee.  
You say, in your letter, that "the Reading Convention gave no power to its Committee to compromise the integrity of Democratic principles, the Democratic organization, or Democratic candidates." This is strictly true. But while you commend the same chain to their implied power contained in the resolution which created it, assumed the power to make a nomination for the Democracy of the Union, when Benjamin Fitzpatrick declined to accept the Vice Presidency of the ticket with Stephen A. Douglas—and the adoption of the resolution by the same Committee, in reference to the power of its members over electoral tickets formed by bodies entirely separate and distinct from that which gave its political life, clearly shows that the gentlemen who compose that organization have no very narrow or contracted ideas of the authority and "specific duties" of an Executive Committee.  
You say, in your letter, that "the Reading Convention gave no power to its Committee to compromise the integrity of Democratic principles, the Democratic organization, or Democratic candidates." This is strictly true. But while you commend the same chain to their implied power contained in the resolution which created it, assumed the power to make a nomination for the Democracy of the Union, when Benjamin Fitzpatrick declined to accept the Vice Presidency of the ticket with Stephen A. Douglas—and the adoption of the resolution by the same Committee, in reference to the power of its members over electoral tickets formed by bodies entirely separate and distinct from that which gave its political life, clearly shows that the gentlemen who compose that organization have no very narrow or contracted ideas of the authority and "specific duties" of an Executive Committee.  
You say, in your letter, that "the Reading Convention gave no power to its Committee to compromise the integrity of Democratic principles, the Democratic organization, or Democratic candidates." This is strictly true. But while you commend the same chain to their implied power contained in the resolution which created it, assumed the power to make a nomination for the Democracy of the Union, when Benjamin Fitzpatrick declined to accept the Vice Presidency of the ticket with Stephen A. Douglas—and the adoption of the resolution by the same Committee, in reference to the power of its members over electoral tickets formed by bodies entirely separate and distinct from that which gave its political life, clearly shows that the gentlemen who compose that organization have no very narrow or contracted ideas of the authority and "specific duties" of an Executive Committee.  
You say, in your letter, that "the Reading Convention gave no power to its Committee to compromise the integrity of Democratic principles, the Democratic organization, or Democratic candidates." This is strictly true. But while you commend the same chain to their implied power contained in the resolution which created it, assumed the power to make a nomination for the Democracy of the Union, when Benjamin Fitzpatrick declined to accept the Vice Presidency of the ticket with Stephen A. Douglas—and the adoption of the resolution by the same Committee, in reference to the power of its members over electoral tickets formed by bodies entirely separate and distinct from that which gave its political life, clearly shows that the gentlemen who compose that organization have no very narrow or contracted ideas of the authority and "specific duties" of an Executive Committee.

You say, in your letter, that "the Reading Convention gave no power to its Committee to compromise the integrity of Democratic principles, the Democratic organization, or Democratic candidates." This is strictly true. But while you commend the same chain to their implied power contained in the resolution which created it, assumed the power to make a nomination for the Democracy of the Union, when Benjamin Fitzpatrick declined to accept the Vice Presidency of the ticket with Stephen A. Douglas—and the adoption of the resolution by the same Committee, in reference to the power of its members over electoral tickets formed by bodies entirely separate and distinct from that which gave its political life, clearly shows that the gentlemen who compose that organization have no very narrow or contracted ideas of the authority and "specific duties" of an Executive Committee.  
You say, in your letter, that "the Reading Convention gave no power to its Committee to compromise the integrity of Democratic principles, the Democratic organization, or Democratic candidates." This is strictly true. But while you commend the same chain to their implied power contained in the resolution which created it, assumed the power to make a nomination for the Democracy of the Union, when Benjamin Fitzpatrick declined to accept the Vice Presidency of the ticket with Stephen A. Douglas—and the adoption of the resolution by the same Committee, in reference to the power of its members over electoral tickets formed by bodies entirely separate and distinct from that which gave its political life, clearly shows that the gentlemen who compose that organization have no very narrow or contracted ideas of the authority and "specific duties" of an Executive Committee.  
You say, in your letter, that "the Reading Convention gave no power to its Committee to compromise the integrity of Democratic principles, the Democratic organization, or Democratic candidates." This is strictly true. But while you commend the same chain to their implied power contained in the resolution which created it, assumed the power to make a nomination for the Democracy of the Union, when Benjamin Fitzpatrick declined to accept the Vice Presidency of the ticket with Stephen A. Douglas—and the adoption of the resolution by the same Committee, in reference to the power of its members over electoral tickets formed by bodies entirely separate and distinct from that which gave its political life, clearly shows that the gentlemen who compose that organization have no very narrow or contracted ideas of the authority and "specific duties" of an Executive Committee.  
You say, in your letter, that "the Reading Convention gave no power to its Committee to compromise the integrity of Democratic principles, the Democratic organization, or Democratic candidates." This is strictly true. But while you commend the same chain to their implied power contained in the resolution which created it, assumed the power to make a nomination for the Democracy of the Union, when Benjamin Fitzpatrick declined to accept the Vice Presidency of the ticket with Stephen A. Douglas—and the adoption of the resolution by the same Committee, in reference to the power of its members over electoral tickets formed by bodies entirely separate and distinct from that which