

LEVI L. TATE, Editor.

Bloomshurg.

SATURDAY MORNING, JUNE 23, 1860.

FOR PRESIDENT IN 1860. John C. Breckinridge, OF KENTUCKY.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT: Charles R. Buckalew, OF PENNSYLVANIA.

DEMOCRATIC STATE NOMINATIONS.

FOR GOVERNOR: HENRY D. FOSTER, OF WESTMORLAND.

The Editor of this Journal, has been serving his country the past week at Williamsport, in the capacity of a Grand Juror in the United States Court.

Charles Sawyer, a financial abolition Senator from Massachusetts, has recently been applied in making an enthusiastic in Congress, for the "softening of this deranged brain."

The Clerical "Baltimore Journal" always an acceptable visitor, but has shown its pleasant face in our columns the past several weeks. That is all wrong and would be tolerated. Friend Rowe, send along your Journal, every time.

Notice Special.—Candidates for official promotion whether to County or District local positions, who wish to have distinctly understood, will in no wise have their pretensions announced in the Columbia Democrat, without authority and pre-payment. This timely notice, will we trust, enable candidates to avoid misapprehension.—\$2 for each announcement.

The Atlantic Monthly for July is on our table.—This number is the beginning of a new volume; and its contents are varied and interesting. Since the Magazine passed into the hands of the present publishers we have not noticed any of those objectionable articles which appear in it previously. \$2 per year.—Ticknor & Fields 125 Washington Street Boston.

Our patriotic friends at Jerseytown, propose holding a social Pic Nic Party, at that enterprising village upon the Fourth of July. They will accept our thanks for a written invitation to be present and participate in the services of the occasion, of which pleasure we will certainly avail ourselves, unless prevented by pre-engagement. Absent or present, we heartily wish them a good time and a meeting of unalloyed pleasure.

John Binnis, Esq., an old publisher and editor, died in Philadelphia on Saturday in his 85th year. Mr. Binnis was a native of Ireland, born in Dublin in 1775; but entering warmly into the political agitation of that period, he was tried for high treason and uttering seditious language. Acquitted of these charges he came to America and entered into the newspaper business. First in Northampton, then in Philadelphia. The "Democratic Freeman" was established by him, and long sustained the Democratic party, especially in the war measure against England in 1812. He subsequently, however, turned against General Jackson. He soon after gave up his paper and became a magistrate.

Daniels Institute.—J. M. Kean, A. M., Principal of the Daniels Institute publishes his Card in this "Columbia Democrat." This is an excellent Literary Institution, having already attained a high position in the annals of Literature, and now enjoys a most liberal patronage, as we observe by the report of the Second Annual Catalogue—October 1859. The Institution numbers 75 males and 25 female, making in all 100 Pupils. Parents and Guardians will ask nothing in regard to the morals of their Children and Wards, when placed in the family of the Principal, as boarders, whose high Christian character affords a reliable guarantee for their proper treatment and strict moral culture.

Both sides of the Grape Question.—This is the title of the new work announced some time since, and which has just been issued by A. M. Spangler, editor of "The Farmer and Gardener." It is a neat volume, in which the important question whether the present system of cultivation, pruning and general management, is better adapted to promote health, vigor, longevity and productiveness in the grape vine, than a closer proximity to nature's system, is fully discussed.

The article on the classification of the species and varieties of the grape vine, is not only new, but of the highest importance. Every grape grower, if he has but a single vine, should have a copy, particularly as it can be had for the trifling sum of 25 cts. in cloth, or 15 cts. in paper binding. Address, A. M. SPANGLER, Pa.

United States Court. The District and Circuit Courts of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania, were held the past week at Williamsport. Hon. ROBERT C. GREEN, and Hon. WILSON McCANDLES, Presiding, respectively. Marshal CAMPBELL, was on duty, and as usual, discharged his official functions with that degree of politeness and fidelity which has ever characterized the true gentleman and efficient officer.

The Bills were found against the following named persons for misdemeanors with the United States Mail.—viz. Isaac Keller, of Columbia county; Beverly Thompson, of Huntington county, and Owen Potts, of Bradford county. The case of the last named defendant was tried and he was acquitted. The trial of the two first named defendants was deferred until the third Monday of next September, when another session of the Court will convene in Williamsport.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:—Resolved, That when this Convention adjourns to-day, it adjourns to reassemble at Baltimore, Maryland, on Monday, the eighteenth day of June, and that it be respectfully recommended to the Democratic party of the several States to take provision for supplying all vacancies in their respective delegations to this Convention, when it shall reassemble.

The Convention will thus perceive that the order adopted by it provided, among other things, that it is respectfully recommended to the Democratic party of the several States, to make provision for supplying all vacancies in their respective delegations to this Convention, when it shall reassemble. What is the construction is a question not for the Chair to determine or to suggest to the Convention, but for the Convention itself to determine. However that may be, in the preparatory arrangement for the present assembling of this Convention there were addressed to the Chair the credentials of members elected, or purporting to be affirmed, and confirmed, by the original Conventions, and accredited, to this Convention. In three of those cases, or perhaps four, the credentials were authentic and complete, presenting no question of controverting delegates. In four others, to-wit—the States of Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana and Delaware, there were contesting applications.—Upon those applications the Chair was called to determine whether it possessed any power to determine prima facie membership of this Convention. That question was presented in its most absolute and complete form. In the case of Mississippi, where there was no contest either brought through irregularity of form, or of competing delegations, and so also in the cases of Florida, Texas and Arkansas. In those four States, there being an apparent au-

thentic, naked, abstract question whether he had power, and preliminarily to determine the prima facie membership of this Convention, the Chair would gladly have satisfied himself that he had this power, but upon examining the source of his power, to wit: the rules of the House of Representatives, he was unable to discern that he had any authority over prima facie to scrutinize and canvass the credentials, although they were such as upon their face were free from contest or controversy, either of form or substance, and therefore he deemed it his duty to reserve the determination of that question to be submitted to the Convention, and in due time the Chair will present that question as one of the privilege to this body.

And now, gentlemen, having thus presented to you the exact state of the question pending or involved in the action of the Convention when it adjourned, the Chair begs leave only to add a single observation of a more general nature. We assemble here now at a time when the enemies of the Democratic party, when, let me say, the enemies of the Constitution of the United States, are in the field [applause] with their banners displayed, advancing to a combat with the Constitution, the interests of the Democratic party of the United States; and upon you, gentlemen, upon your action, upon your spirit of harmony, upon your devotion to the Constitution, upon your solicitude to maintain the interests, the honor, and the integrity of the Democratic party, as the guardians of the Constitution. Upon you, gentlemen, it depends whether the issue of that combat is to be victory or defeat, for the Constitution of the United States. [Renewed applause.] It does not become the Chair to discuss any of the questions or the elements of the questions. It may be permitted, however, to exhort you in the spirit of our community, of party interests, in the faith of our common respect for the Constitution, in the sense of our common devotion to the interests and the honor of our country; I say to exhort you to feel that we come here this day not to determine any mere technical question of form, not merely to gain personal or party triumphs, but that we are here to exercise of a solemn duty, in a crisis of the condition of affairs of our country such as has never yet befallen the United States. Shall we not all enter upon the responsibilities thus devolved upon us with a sense of our high duty to our country, to ourselves, and to the States of this Union [Applause].—Gentlemen, the Convention is now in order for the transaction of business.

Mr. Howard, of Tennessee, moved to admit all the delegates to the Charleston Convention. Mr. Church asked that the motion might be withdrawn, so that he might be enabled to offer an amendment. The amendment was read for information, and was to refer all the claims of new delegates to the Committee on Credentials, with instructions to report as speedily as possible the names of those who are entitled to seats, but with the provision that all who accept seats in the Convention are bound in honor to abide by the action of the Convention, and support its nominees. Immense applause followed the reading of the amendment, but was checked momentarily by the President. Mr. Kavanaugh withdrew the motion to lay on the table, and moved the previous question. After a long debate on points of order, the amendment of Mr. Church was entertained, and the previous question demanded. A long discussion ensued on points of order, when Mr. Sausbury, of Delaware, moved to adjourn until 4 o'clock. The motion was negatived—yeas 374, nays 1784. On the vote being taken, a long discussion arose on the question between the Minnesota delegates, as to the right of a substitute to cast a vote. Mr. Howard, of Tennessee, on a question of privilege, desired to present to the Chair a communication from a state not now represented on the floor—the State of Mississippi. (Cries of "No—not in order.") The President—"The communication can only be received by unanimous consent. Mr. Kavanaugh—1 objection. The question was then put by States on the second to the motion for the previous question on the amendment of Mr. Church, of New York, to the motion of Mr. Howard, of Tennessee. The Convention refused to second the previous question by a vote of 1074 yeas, to 1404 nays—New York casting 25 votes in the negative. Mr. Gilmer, of Pennsylvania, moved to amend the amendment of Mr. Church, instructing the President to admit the delegations where there were no contestants, as from the States of Texas, Florida, and Mississippi. Mr. Randall moved to adjourn till 10 o'clock to-morrow. Lost. A motion to take a recess till 5 o'clock P. M., was then adopted. EVENING SESSION. The theatre was tolerably well filled when the Convention re-assembled at five o'clock. The question pending was the amendment of Mr. Gilmer, of Pennsylvania, to the amendment offered by Mr. Church, of New York. Mr. Gilmer, of Pennsylvania, perfected his amendment by making it read as follows:—Resolved, That the President of the Convention be authorized to issue tickets to the delegates to this Convention from Texas, Mississippi, Arkansas and Florida, in which States there are no contesting delegates; and that in those States—to-wit: Delaware, Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana—where there are contesting delegates, a Committee on Credentials be appointed by the several delegations to report upon the said States. Mr. Clark, of Maine, asked the consent of Mr. Gilmer to modify the last amendment. The proposition of Mr. Clark was read, as follows:—Resolved, That the citizens of the several States of the Union have an equal right to settle and remain in the Territories of the United States and to hold there in unobscured by any legislation whatever, their slave and other property; and that this Convention recognizes the opinion of

the Supreme Court of the United States in the Dred Scott case as a true exposition of the Constitution in regard to the rights of the citizens of the several States in the Territories of the United States, and upon all the subjects concerning which it treats; and that the members of this Convention pledge themselves and require all others who may be authorized as delegates to make the same pledge to support the Democratic candidates who may fairly and in good faith be nominated by this Convention, according to the usages of the National Democratic party.

The resolution was received with applause and some hisses. Mr. Cochrane of New York, inquired if that proposition was now before the Convention.

The President—"The resolution was read for information only and would not now be in order. Mr. Randall, of Pennsylvania, withdrew from the floor in order to allow Mr. Gilmer to modify his amendment in the manner proposed.

Mr. Randall then took the floor and argued in favor of the amendment proposed by Mr. Gilmer, and against the amendment of Mr. Church. He denied the right of the Convention, which was simply a delegated body, to impose any conditions at all upon the seven seceding States. [Applause and hisses.] He also denied the policy of any such terms to the seceding States, for they would not accept an entrance into the Convention on such terms. The party was to fight a battle at the polls or which it would be necessary to unite all sections against the opposing party. [Applause and hisses from the galleries.]

Mr. Hoge, of Virginia, demanded to know whether the delegates were to sit here and submit to the insult of hisses from the galleries when sentiments favorable to the South, and in which they themselves coincided, were expressed by a gentleman of such respectability as Mr. Randall, of Pennsylvania. If this outside pressure was to be brought here to crush out fairness in discussion, Virginia had better know it at once and retire from a field in which she was prevented from defending her rights. [Loud applause.]

The President announced that if the galleries gave utterance again to such signs of disapprobation, they would be cleared. Mr. Richardson, of Illinois, was opposed to the resolution, because it sought to let into the Convention delegates from Florida, who were not delegated to this Convention at all. Their constituents had refused to send them here to seek seats and although a gentleman from Florida had informed him that the delegation would take seats in the Convention if the olive branch was extended to them, yet he for one was not willing to sit beside a gentleman who represented no constituency, and were bound by nothing that is done by the Convention, while he himself was bound by everything.

He was further opposed to the amendment because it proposed to admit the delegates from Arkansas when a contesting delegation was announced to be here from that State. Was the Convention by this resolution to judge this case? Mississippi came here accredited and without opposition and she was placed in the same list with those other States. When a contest arises it should be investigated by a committee.

The proposed investigation could not consume much time, and he repeated, it should be made in justice to all parties.—He should not be drawn into a notice of any issues not directly pertaining to the question immediately before them.

Mr. Cochrane of New York, said this question was not one of the admission of new delegates. It was of far greater import. A portion of the seats on this floor were vacant, and the question arises, Why are they thus vacant? The question also arises, was there a justification, or, if not a justification, was there an excuse for the secession that had left a portion of the seats here unoccupied? However this might be decided he deemed it well for the Convention to seek to call back their erring brethren. He was not favorable to either of the resolutions as they stood. He was unwilling to place any obligation on the returning delegates that could call a blush to their cheeks or cause a pain to their heart. But it should be remembered that such terms were placed upon the delegates from New York upon a former occasion, and there might be some excuse for its being offered by New York. Yet he could assure the Convention that New York would always be found as she hitherto had been found, on the side of liberality and justice.

Mr. Russell of Virginia said that he had at a former period of the session, felt anxious to address the Convention. He felt lost anxious now, because the vote taken at the morning session gave promise of a desire on the part of the majority to secure harmony of action that could not fail to lead to a happy union on principles and on candidates. But as a proposition had been made to impose these terms on the seceding delegates, he might say a few words on the question. Virginia was here emphatically as she had been at Charleston, to harmonize the action of the Democracy.—She had seen a rule adopted empowering the votes to be cast in a manner she considered unfair to the delegations. She had seen a platform voted down which her whole people desired, and one adopted to which they were opposed. They had seen eight States of the South go out of the Convention and had yet remained in her devotion to the Democracy of the North?—but she desired to say now that she was equally devoted to the Democracy of the South. If true to the North, should she not also be true to the sunny South, united as she was with the Southern States by a unity of interests and sentiments. She meant to see fair play between the Democracy both of the North and South, and what was fair play? In the opinion of Virginia it was that all the State delegations accredited to Charleston should be admitted to this floor. But he did not desire to press this upon the Convention. At least, however, the delegations not contested at all should be admitted at once without any delay, and the contested delegations should then be referred to a committee.

He called the attention of the gentleman from Illinois, who had made the objection to the admission of the delegates whose seats were contested, to the fact that at Charleston the Illinois delegates themselves were admitted although their seats

were contested. He was in favor of admitting all uncontested delegates at once, and then referring the contested seats to a committee. As to imposing any restriction or pledge upon the delegates, he deemed that all who were here as men of honor, to be bound by all such pledges as honor places upon us. [Applause.]

Mr. Montgomery, of Pennsylvania, regretted that the previous question had not been insisted on when first moved, and the time of the Convention thus saved. As the discussion had arisen, however he desired to say that the pledge now required was a proper one. [Applause.] His colleague had stated that no man could be bound by any such resolution. He told his colleague that every man who was a Democrat and a man of honor was bound by the action of the Convention. If he refused to be so bound he was no Democrat. [Applause.] If his colleague from Pennsylvania refused to be so bound why the sooner he left the party the better for it. [Loud applause.] He was for one unwilling to allow these delegates to return to this hall in order to enable them to secede in a different form. [Applause and cheers.]

Mr. Ewing, of Tennessee, desired to know what the Convention meant. Have they no enemy in front? Have they any States to spare? Any State to give up to the enemy? If so, he did not know of it. He thought they were pressed by an advancing enemy, constantly growing more formidable, until they are now almost irresistible. And yet we hear sentiments calculated to excite feelings of animosity on both sides of the House and to widen the breach. He desired earnestly to see the Democracy presenting a united front and fighting, not their own friends, but the Republican party. He would, therefore, use no words of bitterness. It had been said that there were no contesting delegations from Mississippi, Florida and Arkansas, and nothing official was known of any contest.

Mr. Claiborne, of Missouri, stated that there was a contest in Arkansas, and that information of the fact had been sent to the President of the Convention. Mr. Ewing resumed: He did not desire to pause and inquire what were the facts in regard to Arkansas. But if there is any real contest there, then strike that State out, and admit Florida, Mississippi and Texas. There was no contest in these States, and no reason why they should be left out. These States are wanted. While they are left out questions of moment in which they are interested are being acted upon. Why should they be harshly spoken of and driven further and further away.—The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Montgomery), spoke of these seceding delegations as though they were traitors.—But he would say, the South does not regard them as such.

The North believes that if the majority of the South adopt principles which the Southern States cannot with honor endorse it is competent and honorable for those States to withdraw and say to the Convention:—Select your candidates, and we will see what we can do. He was not in favor of secession, and had earnestly protested against it and exhorted the Southern States not to secede. His constituents would not justify him in such an action, and as a life-long Democrat he believed that the safety of the lives and property of the South depended upon the preservation of the National Democratic party. He concluded by exhorting the Convention to strike out the State of Arkansas and admit at least all the States whose seats are uncontested at once.

Mr. Loring, of Massachusetts, rose for the first time in the Convention, having been prevented by a severe domestic affliction from attending at Charleston. He was surprised to hear any allusion made hostile to the so-called seceding delegations and to find an opposition made to the admission of certain States, standing upon what they believed to be their constitutional rights, and retired from the Convention. He repudiated the idea of their being therefore deprived of the right to return. The Convention should gladly welcome them back. He heard with surprise, for the first time in a Democratic Convention the talk of sections of the country and the party. He thought such talk and such sentiments were confined to another organization. He denied the right of the Convention to impose a pledge on any of the delegates. Would those who proposed it like the doctrine to be applied to themselves? [Loud cries of Yes! yes! he would!]

Mr. Loring—Then he could only add, that if the proposition made to-day to exclude Florida because she had not again accredited her delegates here, was carried out, he would himself withdraw from the Convention, and not be seen in it again.—[Loud applause.]

Mr. Metrick, of Illinois, said that the State of Illinois was prepared to abide by the action of the Convention, and recognized the right that every man should be similarly bound in honor. He could only say to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Loring) that if his threat was carried out there would be but one seceder more. The delegates who seceded at Charleston had withdrawn because, as they say, their honor demanded it. He could recognize no right by which they could now claim seats in the Convention if Mississippi had no contestants, they were accredited also to another Convention here. He argued against the right of any delegates, owing a double allegiance and acting with a rival Convention, to take seats upon the floor and act with this Convention in its deliberations. If the contest must come, he was willing that it should be met now.

Mr. King, of Missouri, obtained the floor. He desired to know if these seceding delegates, as was reported in the newspapers, had a roving commission to come to this Convention, and to go to the Richmond Convention to play fast and loose with this Convention? This he knew was the suspicion, and he wished to ascertain if it was true. He argued that under any circumstances the seceding delegations should be subject to the scrutiny of a committee, and if these reports were true he did not believe that they were entitled to seats at all. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Loring), had stated that he would himself withdraw from the Convention if its action did not suit. He (Mr. King) was not prepared to say that, but he thought the seceders, who owed a double allegiance, were not entitled to

seats in the Convention, although if the Convention decided otherwise he should bow to its decision. There had been since the Charleston Convention no meeting of any State Convention in Texas. Could any one say that there had?

Mr. Johnson, of Maryland, replied that the action of the Texas delegation had been endorsed by the people of the State. Mr. King had asked a question and could only consent to be interrupted for an answer, not for irrelevant remarks. He denied that any Convention had been held in Texas, and that the delegates were accredited to this Convention. He then reviewed the protest of the Texas delegation when they withdrew, and designated it as an insult to the Convention. Mississippi had come duly accredited and without contestants. He was willing to submit her claims to the committee, but if it was found that her delegates have been accredited to a rival and opposing Convention, that they have not adjourned but had taken a recess only, he would not vote to admit them. One of the delegates had said that they came here as they went to a camp-meeting, because they had a right to do so. But he believed that they came for mischief. There certainly was ground for supposing that they meant to go back to their own adjourned Convention if they cannot have their own way here, and to do all in their power to discredit this Convention and to put up some candidates who had not heads and bottom enough to get a Democratic nomination. If these delegates are elected to Richmond with the right to come here for these purposes, so help him, God! they never would get his vote, although if the Convention thought fit to admit them he would be prepared to treat them as gentlemen. He next reviewed the action of Florida, the delegates from which State had not been accredited to this Convention at all, and yet the Convention was asked to close its eyes to the fact and admit them. He declared that South Carolina alone had preserved its consistency and dignity, for her delegates did not come here at all. She was a disunionist now. The Charleston secession, which was the organ of the Rhett and of the delegation, declares this Convention to be a stambling block in the path of a dissolution of the Union. Mr. King then alluded to the orders that had gone forth from Washington, signed by gentlemen who had better have been attending to their duties, directing the seceders to come back, and telling them they would probably get their platform, and if not they could again secede and Virginia would go with them. Yes, Virginia—God bless her!—had been told that she too must secede, and her oldest daughter, Kentucky, was to go with her. Then, by the programme, North Carolina and Tennessee, another mother and daughter, were to go forth, and even Missouri, it was said, was to follow.

The object and meaning of these Washington orders was simply this:—If Douglas was not nominated, we will draw forth these States from the Convention and to be able to turn round upon him and say, "you are a sectional candidate, like Lincoln!" It was said, too, that the highest legal authority in Washington—he supposed that must be the Attorney-General [laughter]—had declared that this was a bogus Convention and that it was not regularly in session. And so he supposed the Richmond Convention was to lay claim to regularity and term this Convention bogus! He exhorted the Convention to hold on firmly to the National Democratic organization and to yield its principles to the demands of no section.

Mr. West, of Connecticut, said the Democrats of his State had been attacked at Charleston as little better than Black Republicans, and had been unable to defend themselves because they had not been recognized and awarded the floor. He denounced the man who would denounce the State of Connecticut. It had been said that Virginia had sat in the Convention and heard things that had grated on her ears. We have been compelled to hear things that have grated harshly on our ears, and one of these things was the assertion that the seceders had been driven from the Convention. He read from the protest of the Mississippi delegation to prove that the withdrawal of the seceders was their voluntary act and that they had not been driven from the Convention. He reviewed the position of the Northern Democracy, and asserted their right to demand the same platform that had been forced upon them four years ago. They wanted nothing but right, and, so help them God! they would not submit to anything that was wrong. The North has its rights as well as the South, and must maintain them as well. He continued to argue forcibly in support of the position of the majority of the Convention and against the admission of any unaccredited delegates, or of any delegates who would not pledge themselves to abide by the action of the Convention.

Mr. Hunter, of Missouri, was astonished to hear the remarks of his colleague from Missouri, who had said that he would not give his vote for the admission of the South to the Convention. He asked him how long it was since he cast his last Democratic vote, and he reviewed what he represented to have been the political action of his colleague in the recent elections. He charged that Gov. King was disregarding the wishes of his constituents in his present action. Mr. King—I deny it. Mr. Hunter said he was not a lawyer and he did not desire to argue, but only to state a few facts. Mr. Rynders—Go on. A speech from an honest man is better than one from a lawyer. [Laughter.] Mr. Hunter had heard with heartfelt pleasure the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and when he had asked who it was and learned that it was Judge Loring, his heart beat with pride. [Loud laughter and cries of—"It's not Judge Loring; he is a doctor."] Mr. Hunter—Well, his name is Loring, and he is from Massachusetts. He agreed with him, that it was proper to let in the seceders, and he was glad they were prepared to come here and acknowledge the error of their ways. He had lived for sixty years in Missouri, and had only cast one vote not Democratic in his life. [laughter] and that one was the vote that turned Col. Benton out of the Senate.

Mr. Avery, of North Carolina, desired to indulge in no sectional or personal allusions, but he would say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Montgomery), that if his speech of to-day was an indication of the sentiments of his heart towards one section of the country, he would not himself entertain such a sentiment to be made President of the United States. He would say also to the gentleman from Illinois, as well as to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that such speeches as they had both made, were not calculated to elect their candidate. He could not resist the impression that these remarks were designed to drive the South in a body from the Union. But he would say, no person had the power to drive him from the National Democratic Convention. He alluded to the former action of Democratic Conventions, where one man had been permitted to cast the vote of a State rather than that State should have no representation. He held that the delegates had all the right under the original commission to reclaim their seats, and if the Northwestern delegates had been the seceders instead of the South, he would have extended them just as cordial a welcome back. If it is the purpose to disfranchise these States, right or wrong, he had nothing to say. He was opposed to the New York resolution prescribing the terms for receiving the seceding delegates. If you cannot trust them without a pledge, you ought not to trust them with one. Our Northern friends are in a majority and they wish to overthrow us both on the platform and candidate.

Mr. Atkins, of Tennessee, said he was from the South but he had a high regard for his Northern friends. Tennessee was a sound Democratic State, and her Democracy needs no pledges and no tests. Nominate your candidate fairly and honorably, and I will swim every river and ford every creek to secure the success to our banner. For the sake of our banner, for the sake of our Union, for God's sake, harmonize. Is there any man here who is willing to sacrifice the Democratic party at the altar of personal ambition? He would constrain the next Christian friend he had in the world to do or believe he would endeavor the permanency of the Democratic party to secure his advancement. He feared that it was the case that there would be no difficulty in harmonizing if it were not for the devotion to the personal interests of some one man. He would to God that we had a Jackson among us to bring harmony out of this chaos. He concluded by moving the previous question, declaring that it was his purpose, when the question was ordered, to move an adjournment until tomorrow.

Pending the question a motion was made to adjourn. Negatived. Mr. Stewart, of Michigan, demanded a vote by States on seconding the call for the previous question.

And much excitement, the delegates being all on their feet, the roll was called, and the vote recorded as follows:—Yeas 233, nays 14.

So the previous question was seconded. On motion of Mr. Richardson, of Illinois, the Convention adjourned till 10 o'clock to-morrow.

QUESTIONS BEFORE THE CONVENTION. The questions before the Convention now stand as follows:—

Mr. Howard, of Tennessee, made the original motion directing the Sergeant at Arms to admit to the Convention all the delegates accredited to the Charleston Convention. Mr. Church, of New York, moved to amend by referring all the claims for admission to the Convention to the Committee on Credentials, and to request them to report, as soon as practicable, the names of the persons entitled to admission with the proviso that all the delegates accepting seats in the Convention are bound in honor and good faith to abide by the action of the Convention and to support its nominees.

Mr. Gilmer, of Pennsylvania, moved to amend the amendment by resolving that the delegations from Arkansas, Mississippi, Florida and Texas, be at once admitted to the Convention, and that the contested seats of the other seceding States be referred to a Committee on Credentials to be selected by each State.

The previous question is called on the last amendment, and the call has been seconded. The question at the meeting of the Convention to-morrow will be, "Shall the previous question be now put?"

There is a probability that the previous question will be ordered; that Mr. Gilmer's amendment will be voted down; that a division will be called on Mr. Church's amendment; and that the first part of it will be adopted without the proviso respecting a pledge.

It looks now as though the vote of New York would decide in favor of the admission of the Southern delegations generally where there is no contest, and of both delegations where a contest exists.

The chances still seem to favor a harmonious termination of the Convention, as New York evidently holds the entire balance of power and seems to favor some sort of a compromise.

SECOND DAY. BALTIMORE, June 19.—The Convention was called to order soon after 10 o'clock. The theatre was well filled, but not crowded. The day is dark and gloomy, and the appearance of the inside of the theatre is improved by the brilliant illumination with gas.

On motion of Mr. Ludlow, of New York the reading of the journal was dispensed with.

The question pending being on ordering the previous question on the several motions respecting the admission of delegates Mr. Church, of New York, asked the question which was calculated to harmonize the pending motion and dispose in a friendly manner of the question of the admission of delegates.

Cries of "hear him," and the unanimous consent was given.

Mr. Church continued on consultation with the gentleman from Pennsylvania. (Mr. Gilmore) an arrangement has been agreed upon, honorable to both parties, which he hoped would meet the concurrence of the Convention. It was proposed that Mr. Gilmore should withdraw his amendment, and that he, Mr. Church, should withdraw the latter portion of his amendment, leaving before the Convention

the Supreme Court of the United States in the Dred Scott case as a true exposition of the Constitution in regard to the rights of the citizens of the several States in the Territories of the United States, and upon all the subjects concerning which it treats; and that the members of this Convention pledge themselves and require all others who may be authorized as delegates to make the same pledge to support the Democratic candidates who may fairly and in good faith be nominated by this Convention, according to the usages of the National Democratic party.

The resolution was received with applause and some hisses. Mr. Cochrane of New York, inquired if that proposition was now before the Convention.

The President—"The resolution was read for information only and would not now be in order. Mr. Randall, of Pennsylvania, withdrew from the floor in order to allow Mr. Gilmer to modify his amendment in the manner proposed.

Mr. Randall then took the floor and argued in favor of the amendment proposed by Mr. Gilmer, and against the amendment of Mr. Church. He denied the right of the Convention, which was simply a delegated body, to impose any conditions at all upon the seven seceding States. [Applause and hisses.] He also denied the policy of any such terms to the seceding States, for they would not accept an entrance into the Convention on such terms. The party was to fight a battle at the polls or which it would be necessary to unite all sections against the opposing party. [Applause and hisses from the galleries.]

Mr. Hoge, of Virginia, demanded to know whether the delegates were to sit here and submit to the insult of hisses from the galleries when sentiments favorable to the South, and in which they themselves coincided, were expressed by a gentleman of such respectability as Mr. Randall, of Pennsylvania. If this outside pressure was to be brought here to crush out fairness in discussion, Virginia had better know it at once and retire from a field in which she was prevented from defending her rights. [Loud applause.]

The President announced that if the galleries gave utterance again to such signs of disapprobation, they would be cleared. Mr. Richardson, of Illinois, was opposed to the resolution, because it sought to let into the Convention delegates from Florida, who were not delegated to this Convention at all. Their constituents had refused to send them here to seek seats and although a gentleman from Florida had informed him that the delegation would take seats in the Convention if the olive branch was extended to them, yet he for one was not willing to sit beside a gentleman who represented no constituency, and were bound by nothing that is done by the Convention, while he himself was bound by everything.

He was further opposed to the amendment because it proposed to admit the delegates from Arkansas when a contesting delegation was announced to be here from that State. Was the Convention by this resolution to judge this case? Mississippi came here accredited and without opposition and she was placed in the same list with those other States. When a contest arises it should be investigated by a committee.

The proposed investigation could not consume much time, and he repeated, it should be made in justice to all parties.—He should not be drawn into a notice of any issues not directly pertaining to the question immediately before them.

Mr. Cochrane of New York, said this question was not one of the admission of new delegates. It was of far greater import. A portion of the seats on this floor were vacant, and the question arises, Why are they thus vacant? The question also arises, was there a justification, or, if not a justification, was there an excuse for the secession that had left a portion of the seats here unoccupied? However this might be decided he deemed it well for the Convention to seek to call back their erring brethren. He was not favorable to either of the resolutions as they stood. He was unwilling to place any obligation on the returning delegates that could call a blush to their cheeks or cause a pain to their heart. But it should be remembered that such terms were placed upon the delegates from New York upon a former occasion, and there might be some excuse for its being offered by New York. Yet he could assure the Convention that New York would always be found as she hitherto had been found, on the side of liberality and justice.

Mr. Russell of Virginia said that he had at a former period of the session, felt anxious to address the Convention. He felt lost anxious now, because the vote taken at the morning session gave promise of a desire on the part of the majority to secure harmony of action that could not fail to lead to a happy union on principles and on candidates. But as a proposition had been made to impose these terms on the seceding delegates, he might say a few words on the question. Virginia was here emphatically as she had been at Charleston, to harmonize the action of the Democracy.—She had seen a rule adopted empowering the votes to be cast in a manner she considered unfair to the delegations. She had seen a platform voted down which her whole people desired, and one adopted to which they were opposed. They had seen eight States of the South go out of the Convention and had yet remained in her devotion to the Democracy of the North?—but she desired to say now that she was equally devoted to the Democracy of the South. If true to the North, should she not also be true to the sunny South, united as she was with the Southern States by a unity of interests and sentiments. She meant to see fair play between the Democracy both of the North and South, and what was fair play? In the opinion of Virginia it was that all the State delegations accredited to Charleston should be admitted to this floor. But he did not desire to press this upon the Convention. At least, however, the delegations not contested at all should be admitted at once without any delay, and the contested delegations should then be referred to a committee.

He called the attention of the gentleman from Illinois, who had made the objection to the admission of the delegates whose seats were contested, to the fact that at Charleston the Illinois delegates themselves were admitted although their seats

were contested. He was in favor of admitting all uncontested delegates at once, and then referring the contested seats to a committee. As to imposing any restriction or pledge upon the delegates, he deemed that all who were here as men of honor, to be bound by all such pledges as honor places upon us. [Applause.]

Mr. Montgomery, of Pennsylvania, regretted that the previous question had not been insisted on when first moved, and the time of the Convention thus saved. As the discussion had arisen, however he desired to say that the pledge now required was a proper one. [Applause.] His colleague had stated that no man could be bound by any such resolution. He told his colleague that every man who was a Democrat and a man of honor was bound by the action of the Convention. If he refused to be so bound he was no Democrat. [Applause.] If his colleague from Pennsylvania refused to be so bound why the sooner he left the party the better for it. [Loud applause.] He was for one unwilling to allow these delegates to return to this hall in order to enable them to secede in a different form. [Applause and cheers.]

Mr. Ewing, of Tennessee, desired to know what the Convention meant. Have they no enemy in front? Have they any States to spare? Any State to give up to the enemy? If so, he did not know of it. He thought they were pressed by an advancing enemy, constantly growing more formidable, until they are now almost irresistible. And yet we hear sentiments calculated to excite feelings of animosity on both sides of the House and to widen the breach. He desired earnestly to see the Democracy presenting a united front and fighting, not their own friends, but the Republican party. He would, therefore, use no words of bitterness. It had been said that there were no contesting delegations from Mississippi, Florida and Arkansas, and nothing official was known of any contest.

Mr. Claiborne, of Missouri, stated that there was a contest in Arkansas, and that information of the fact had been sent to the President of the Convention. Mr. Ewing resumed: He did not desire to pause and inquire what were the facts in regard to Arkansas. But if there is any real contest there, then strike that State out, and admit Florida, Mississippi and Texas. There was no contest in these States, and no reason why they should be left out. These States are wanted. While they are left out questions of moment in which they are interested are being acted upon. Why should they be harshly spoken of and driven further and further away.—The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Montgomery), spoke of these seceding delegations as though they were traitors.—But he would say, the South does not regard them as such.