

DEMOCRATIC NOMINATIONS.

FOR PRESIDENT: Hon. John C. Breckinridge, OF KENTUCKY.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT: Gen. Joseph Lane, OF OREGON.

FOR PRESIDENT: STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS, OF ILLINOIS.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT: HERSCHEL V. JOHNSON, OF GEORGIA.

DEMOCRATIC STATE NOMINATIONS.

FOR GOVERNOR: HENRY D. FOSTER, OF WESTMORELAND.

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS.

- Electors at Large: Richard Vaux, Geo. M. Keim. District Electors: 1. Ferd. A. Bremer, 2. Wm. C. Patterson...

RESOLUTION OF THE DEMOCRATIC STATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Profundly impressed with the importance of prompt, vigorous and judicious action on the part of the Democratic State Committee...

Our Candidates.

We have to-day placed at the most head of our paper, the names of JOHN C. BRECKINRIDGE, for President, and JOSEPH LANE, for Vice President...

We see, however, that Col. Forney, has issued his mandate to the Douglas wing, forbidding any such alliance. This is just what we had reason to expect...

Our National Flag.

We have raised the names of the two tickets, pronounced to have been nominated by the Baltimore Democratic Convention...

Noble Brothers.

Col. Wright's paper, The Luserna Union, and Col. Forney's paper, The Philadelphia Press, are both out in long and abusive editorials against the union proposed and agreed upon by the Democratic State Committee...

State Military Encampment.

Adjutant General Wilson has issued an order for a State Military Encampment for instruction, drill and discipline, to be called "Camp Patterson," and to be held at York, commencing on Monday, the 3d of September next...

Gen. Geo. W. Bowman, has retired from the Washington Constitution.

WILLIAM M. BROWN, Esq., long time the Assistant Editor of that paper, has become its sole Editor and Proprietor.

The fire burning.

The Editor of the Berwick Gazette, in a strongly written article last week, unfurled the flag of Breckinridge and Lane.

The Pennsylvania Democracy.

The State Central Committee Opposed to Douglas—Proposed Compromise on the Presidential Question.

PHILADELPHIA, July 8, 1860. The Democratic State Executive Committee met this afternoon at the Merchants' Hotel.

Robert E. Managlan, of the Sixth district, a prominent administration man and an opponent of Mr. Hickman in the last Congressional campaign, made a warm speech, saying that while he preferred Mr. Breckinridge he was obliged to regard Mr. Douglas as the regular democratic candidate.

About twenty-four out of the sixty members of the committee present were Douglasites, fifteen of whom bitterly opposed any conciliation, and were warmly sustained by outside pressure.

There were hot discussions between the leaders of both factions during the entire meeting, and various propositions were voted down.

At length Thomas C. McDowell, of Dauphin county, offered resolutions which were adopted by a vote of 45 against 15, as follows:—

First, Calling on the democracy to unite in support of General Foster for Governor, to bury all differences on the Presidential question in the local elections.

Second, Recommending the democratic party of the State to unite on the electoral ticket formed at Reading on the following basis:—If it should appear, on ascertaining the result in other States of the Union, that by casting the entire vote of Pennsylvania for Douglas it would elect him, said electors shall be under obligations to cast said vote in that way; if the said vote would not elect Douglas, but elect Breckinridge, then shall it be cast for Breckinridge.

The Chairman of the committee was authorized to communicate with the electors, and obtain their pledge within thirty days to act under this obligation.

Prior to the adoption of the compromise resolutions many propositions were made, among others one declaring Douglas the nominee of the democratic party for President, which was voted down by ayes 10, nays 43.

Action of the State Committee.

Victory is now within the grasp of the Democracy of Pennsylvania. The State Executive Committee, at their meeting on the 2d inst., as will be seen by the official proceedings, passed a resolution, by the strong vote of three to one, obligating the Electors chosen by the Reading Convention, in the event of their election, to vote as a unit for Messrs. DOUGLAS and JOHNSON, if the electoral vote of Pennsylvania will elect them.

The proposition is so manifestly fair and proper, and must commend itself so strongly to the approbation of every Democrat in the State who is sincerely desirous for the defeat of the Black Republicans, that we cannot refrain from congratulating our friends upon this auspicious opening of the Presidential campaign.

Let our friends all stand shoulder to shoulder in this conflict, in defence of the Constitution and the Union; by so doing we shall defeat the plans of the Republicans, and secure the vote of the State for a Democratic President, whether the choice fall upon DOUGLAS or BRECKINRIDGE. We also render certain the triumphant election of our excellent candidate for Governor, Gen. HENRY D. FOSTER, (who, we happen to know, is gratified with the action of the Committee), a majority of Congressmen and Legislators, as well as the local officers in the Democratic counties of the Commonwealth.

Let Mr. Forney carry out his programme of disorganization—let him strike from the roll of electors appointed at Reading those who refuse to comply with his demands—let him convoke a State Convention of congenial spirits similar to that which assembled at the Capital in April of 1850—let them concoct a spurious electoral ticket—let the issue be made up between this bogus contrivance—every vote for which would be a vote for Lincoln & Hannlin—and the regular ticket, which alone can defeat Lincoln and Hannlin, and we will see how many Demo-

Visit of the Prince of Wales.

Private letters from official sources state that the Prince of Wales, during his visit to America, will go east as far as Portland, and west as far as Cincinnati.

Plans of the Disunionists.

The programme of the disunionists in Pennsylvania is foreshadowed in the Philadelphia Press edited by the Black Republican Clerk of the House of Representatives, who is laboring to deserve the daily pay he receives from the worst enemies of the Democratic party.

This is the plan by which Forney and his handful of followers expect to divide the Democratic vote of Pennsylvania, throw the electoral vote of the State for Lincoln and Hannlin, and earn renewed gratitude and compensation from the Black Republican party.

The electors appointed by the Reading Convention will treat this attempted usurpation of authority with the contempt it deserves. They will regard the insolent interrogatories of Forney, or any one acting under his direction, with just about the same amount of consideration as if the Republican State Committee should address them, demanding to know their individual preferences concerning Presidential candidates.

Speaking on this subject, the Harrisburg Patriot very truthfully remarks:—"No sincere friend of Mr. Douglas can follow such a leader. They know to what end all his endeavors tend.

We find in the York Gazette the vote of the members of the State Committee at their recent meeting upon adopting the plan of Union. It is as follows: YRAS—Messrs. Anderson, Askins, Barr (Philadelphia), Blair, Bratton, Brown, (Berks) Brewster, Burnham, Cetti, Chadwick, Cleary, Clark (Lancaster), Cummings, Diefenbach, Donovan, Dunlap, Eut Glatz, Gleim, Gutcheson, Hamilton, Hobart, Hunter, Hutchins, Irwin, (Philadelphia), Linderman, Magee, Manly, McCoy, MacDowell, M. Padden, M. Intyre, Myers, (Northampton), Miller, (Berks), Monaghan, Mulhberg, Parker, (Millin) Petrikon, Pyfer, Riley, Salaman, Sanson, Shadle, Weiser and Welsh Chairman—46.

The analysis of this vote is only necessary to disprove the accusation that the resolutions of the Committee were forced upon the friends of Douglas by the friends of Breckinridge, and that they were a trick intended to work exclusively to the advantage of the latter.

On the other side, we find the very first name recorded against the plan of Union is that of Vincent L. Bradford, a supporter of Breckinridge, and one of the members of the Pennsylvania delegation who assisted in his nomination at Baltimore.

The programme of the disunionists in Pennsylvania is foreshadowed in the Philadelphia Press edited by the Black Republican Clerk of the House of Representatives, who is laboring to deserve the daily pay he receives from the worst enemies of the Democratic party.

On the other side, we find the very first name recorded against the plan of Union is that of Vincent L. Bradford, a supporter of Breckinridge, and one of the members of the Pennsylvania delegation who assisted in his nomination at Baltimore.

crats can be induced to lend their assistance to the disorganizing schemes of the Republican Clerk. The true Democracy of the State scorn to follow the lead of a purchased traitor, who flaunts the price of his treason in their very faces, and cannot be seduced from maintaining the cause of united Democracy against Republicanism and all its mercenary allies.—Patriot & Union.

Modest—Very!

The Philadelphia Press, of the 4th inst., is very indignant because Gen. FOSTER, the Democratic candidate for Governor, approves of the action of the State Central Committee, and threatens him with the loss of fifty thousand voters at the October election!

The Press is evidently playing a deep game to secure the election of LINCOLN. With all its professions of friendship for Judge DOUGLAS, it essays to defeat the very plan by which the vote of Pennsylvania can be insured for that gentleman.

Speaking on this subject, the Harrisburg Patriot very truthfully remarks:—"No sincere friend of Mr. Douglas can follow such a leader. They know to what end all his endeavors tend.

We find in the York Gazette the vote of the members of the State Committee at their recent meeting upon adopting the plan of Union. It is as follows: YRAS—Messrs. Anderson, Askins, Barr (Philadelphia), Blair, Bratton, Brown, (Berks) Brewster, Burnham, Cetti, Chadwick, Cleary, Clark (Lancaster), Cummings, Diefenbach, Donovan, Dunlap, Eut Glatz, Gleim, Gutcheson, Hamilton, Hobart, Hunter, Hutchins, Irwin, (Philadelphia), Linderman, Magee, Manly, McCoy, MacDowell, M. Padden, M. Intyre, Myers, (Northampton), Miller, (Berks), Monaghan, Mulhberg, Parker, (Millin) Petrikon, Pyfer, Riley, Salaman, Sanson, Shadle, Weiser and Welsh Chairman—46.

Voto of the State Committee.

We find in the York Gazette the vote of the members of the State Committee at their recent meeting upon adopting the plan of Union. It is as follows: YRAS—Messrs. Anderson, Askins, Barr (Philadelphia), Blair, Bratton, Brown, (Berks) Brewster, Burnham, Cetti, Chadwick, Cleary, Clark (Lancaster), Cummings, Diefenbach, Donovan, Dunlap, Eut Glatz, Gleim, Gutcheson, Hamilton, Hobart, Hunter, Hutchins, Irwin, (Philadelphia), Linderman, Magee, Manly, McCoy, MacDowell, M. Padden, M. Intyre, Myers, (Northampton), Miller, (Berks), Monaghan, Mulhberg, Parker, (Millin) Petrikon, Pyfer, Riley, Salaman, Sanson, Shadle, Weiser and Welsh Chairman—46.

These principles flow directly from the absence of sovereignty in the Territorial Governments, and from the equality of the States. Indeed they are essential to that equality which is, and ever has been, the vital principle of our constitutional Union.

It is idle to attempt to smother these great issues, or to misrepresent them by the use of partisan phrases, which are misleading and deceptive. The people will look beneath such expressions as "intervention," "Congressional slave code," and the like, and will penetrate to the real questions involved. The friends of constitutional equality do not, and never did, demand a "Congressional slave code," nor any other code in regard to property in the Territories.

It is idle to attempt to smother these great issues, or to misrepresent them by the use of partisan phrases, which are misleading and deceptive. The people will look beneath such expressions as "intervention," "Congressional slave code," and the like, and will penetrate to the real questions involved. The friends of constitutional equality do not, and never did, demand a "Congressional slave code," nor any other code in regard to property in the Territories.

On the other side, we find the very first name recorded against the plan of Union is that of Vincent L. Bradford, a supporter of Breckinridge, and one of the members of the Pennsylvania delegation who assisted in his nomination at Baltimore.

men, that the resolution was carried by the Breckinridge men. It was adopted, without reference to candidates, for the good of the party—and adopted by the friends and supporters of Douglas, as offering the only reasonable prospect of securing the vote of the State for him.

Letter from the Hon. John C. Breckinridge.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE NOMINATION FOR THE PRESIDENCY.

WASHINGTON, July.—The letter of acceptance from Hon. John C. Breckinridge of the nomination for President, has just been made public. It is in answer to the following letter from Hon. Caleb Cushing: SIR:—I am directed by a vote of the Democratic National Convention to inform you that you have been this day unanimously nominated by it as the candidate of the Democratic party for the office of President of the United States, and in their behalf to request you to accept the nomination.

I beg leave, at the same time, to enclose you a copy of the resolutions adopted by the Convention as the political platform on which the party stands.

I have the honor to be, Very respectfully, C. CUSHING, President.

WASHINGTON CITY, June 22, 1860.

DEAR SIR:—I have your letter of the 23d inst., by which I am officially informed of my nomination for the office of President of the United States by the Democratic National Convention, lately assembled at Baltimore.

The circumstances of this nomination will justify me referring to its personal aspect.

I have not sought nor desired to be placed before the country for the office of President. When my name was presented to the Convention at Charleston, it was withdrawn by a friend in obedience to my expressed wishes. My views had not changed when the Convention reassembled at Baltimore; and when I heard of the difference which occurred there, my indignation to be connected prominently with the canvass was confirmed, and expressed to my friends.

Without discussing the occurrences which preceded the nominations, and which are or soon will be well understood by the country, I have only to say that I approve as just, and necessary to the preservation of the national organization, and the sacred right of representation, the action of the Convention over which you continued to preside; and thus approving it, and having resolved to sustain it, I feel that it does not become me to select the position I shall occupy, nor to shrink from the responsibilities of the post to which I have been assigned. Accordingly, I accept the nomination from a sense of public duty; and, as I think, influenced in any degree by the allurements of ambition.

I avail myself of this occasion to say that the confidence in my personal and public character implied by the action of the Convention, will always be gratefully remembered; and it is but just, also to my own feelings, to express my gratification at the association of my name with that of my friend General Lane, a patriot and a soldier, whose great services in the field and in council entitle him to the gratitude and confidence of his countrymen.

The resolutions adopted by the Convention have my cordial approval. They are just to all parts of the Union—to all our citizens, native and naturalized—and they form a noble policy for any Administration.

The question touching the rights of person and property, which have of late been much discussed, find in these resolutions a constitutional solution. Our Union is a confederacy of equal sovereign States, for the purposes enumerated in the Federal Constitution. Whatever the common Government holds in trust for all the States, must be enjoyed equally by each. It controls the Territories in trust for all the States. Nothing less than sovereignty can destroy or impair the rights of persons or property. Hence they cannot destroy or impair the rights of persons or property. While they continue to be Territories they are under the control of Congress, but the Constitution nowhere confers on any branch of the Federal Government the power to discriminate against the rights of the States, or the property of their citizens in the Territories.

It follows that the citizens of all the States may enter the Territories of the Union with their property of whatever kind, and enjoy it during the territorial condition, without let or hindrance, either by Congress or by the subordinate Territorial Governments.

These principles flow directly from the absence of sovereignty in the Territorial Governments, and from the equality of the States. Indeed they are essential to that equality which is, and ever has been, the vital principle of our constitutional Union. They have been settled legislatively, settled judicially, and are sustained by right reason. They rest on the rock of the Constitution. They will preserve the Constitution—they will preserve the Union.

It is idle to attempt to smother these great issues, or to misrepresent them by the use of partisan phrases, which are misleading and deceptive. The people will look beneath such expressions as "intervention," "Congressional slave code," and the like, and will penetrate to the real questions involved. The friends of constitutional equality do not, and never did, demand a "Congressional slave code," nor any other code in regard to property in the Territories.

On the other side, we find the very first name recorded against the plan of Union is that of Vincent L. Bradford, a supporter of Breckinridge, and one of the members of the Pennsylvania delegation who assisted in his nomination at Baltimore.

way through clouds and passion, the country to meet the issue. There are no middle grounds. Already the multitude of a fanatical and growing party which denies that under the Constitution, by any other law, slave property exist; and ultimately the struggle will come between this party and the Democracy, sustained by all the other conservative elements in the Union.

I think it will be impossible for me to discover hostility to the Union or a taint of sectionalism in the resolutions adopted by the Convention. The situation and the Union repose on the equality of the States, which lies in a broad foundation underneath our political structure. As I construe the resolutions simply assert this equality. They demand nothing for any state which is not cheerfully conceded to the rest. It will be remembered the chief disorders which have afflicted our country have grown out of the violation of State equality, and that, as long as a great principle has been respected, have been blessed with harmonious peace. Nor will it be easy to see the country that resolutions are not which command the support of a majority of the States, and are approved by a vast mass of conservative opinion, very where, without regard to party.

It has been necessary more than in our history to pause and solemnly assert the true character of this Government. A memorable instance occurred in a struggle which ended in the civil war of 1860. The Republicans of that day, like the Democracy of this day, stigmatized as disunionists, but they concluded the contest under the Constitution and saved our political system a like constitutional struggle it is now to assert and establish the equality of the States as the only basis of national peace. When this object, so national, constitutional, so just, shall be secured, the last cloud will disappear from American sky, and with emancipation and hearts the States and the people unite to develop the resources of the country, to find it together with the United States, and the equality of the States are symbols of everlasting life. Let these be the rallying cries of the people.

I trust that this canvass will be conducted without rancor, and that thoughtful and patriotic Americans, above party and personal interests, to whom we owe our origin, growth, and all our prosperity, will unite to protect our beloved country, and avert the dangers, foreign and domestic, which are threatening it.

I am, with great respect, your friend, JOHN C. BRECKINRIDGE, Hon. C. CUSHING, President of the Democratic National Convention.

More Expressions in Favor of Union.

The Reading Gazette holds the Breckinridge and Lane ticket and says:—"The reasons that have guided our choice are abundant and strong, and we feel they will be satisfactory to at least four-fifths of the Democratic voters of the county. We shall take an early opportunity to make them known, explicitly in detail. Meanwhile, we demand the right to declare our willingness to unite in any practicable arrangement that will be honorably devised by the State Executive Committee (who are to meet today) by which the unity of our Democratic organization may be preserved, and the whole vote of the county directed to the single electoral ticket of the field, no less than to our candidate for Governor, the Hon. Henry D. Foster, whose unanimous and enthusiastic nomination by the Reading Convention, has been ratified and confirmed by the Pennsylvania Democracy, as with one voice, regard to their differing sentiments in reference to a Presidential candidate; and when the election is within our power, if we give him the united Democratic vote."

We were foretold to be a unit at that electoral ticket made at the Reading Convention ought to be voted by the friends of Breckinridge and Lane, and whoever has the largest number of electors in the United States, shall give the vote of the electors of the State of Pennsylvania.

We think this is a fair proposition. Should Douglas receive the largest electoral vote, the State of Pennsylvania cast her vote for him, and to the electoral vote of Breckinridge receive the electoral vote, then Pennsylvania will have voted for him. If this plan be adopted, there can be no doubt but that the democracy of the old Keystone will give glorious battles to be fought in October and November next, and show the world that it is still holding to the situation and the laws of the land.

From the Patriot, Mansfield.

Our hope is in the action of the Democratic State Central Committee. We believe that the success of the Democracy party, its contemplation alone has prevented us from doing what we believe to be the Democratic duty in this crisis.

It will be worse than nonsense for us to run two electoral tickets. We have the strength in Pennsylvania to have done up into fragments. We have a right to elect, Members of Congress, Legislators to secure, and the electors of the State. We repeat that the success of the Democracy party depends upon the action of the State Central Committee; if it will have the contending elements, all will be well. The watchword should be "every man for the cause, nothing for men."

The members of the Altoona Convention were every one of them life-long Democrats. There was not an office-holder among them; and not one of them active Democrats in the Philadelphia Press.