

Democratic State Ticket. FOR GOVERNOR, GEORGE W. WOODWARD, of Philadelphia. FOR SUPREME JUDGE, WALTER H. LOWRIE, of Allegheny Co.

Democratic County Convention.

The Democratic voters of the county of Erie will meet at the usual places in the several Wards, Boroughs and townships, on Saturday, September 12th, next, to elect delegates to the County Convention to be held at

Wayne Hall, in the City of Erie, on Tuesday, the 15th of September, next, at 2 O'CLOCK IN THE AFTERNOON.

For the purpose of nominating candidates for Assembly, County Clerk, Clerk of the Courts, Register and Recorder, District Attorney, County Commissioner, Director of the Poor, County Auditor and Trustees of Erie Academy.

- The number of delegates to be elected from the respective districts are as follows: Erie, 1st district, 2; Second district, 2; Third district, 2; Fourth district, 2; Mill-creek 5; Harbor Creek 4; North East 1; 3; North East borg 2; Greenfield 2; Venango 3; Watburg 1; Amity 3; Wayne 3; Concord 3; Corry 2; Union Mills 2; Le Boeuf 3; Waterford tp. 3; Waterford borg 3; Greene 3; Summit 2; McKean 2; Middleboro 1; Washington 2; Edinboro 2; Franklin 2; Elk Creek 3; Conemaugh 3; Albion 2; Springfield 4; Girard tp. 3; Girard borg 1; Lockport 3; Fairview 3.

WM. A. GALBRAITH, Chairman Democratic Co. Committee.

The Feeling Elsewhere.

Our readers who have not the same opportunities of ascertaining public feeling as ourselves, can have no conception of the intense spirit of enthusiasm and confidence which pervades throughout the Democrats in the Southern portions of the State. Meetings are being held every day, attended as meetings never were before, and each occasion but adds to the earnestness of the people. Some of our exchanges come to us with announcements of no less than a dozen public meetings each week, in their respective counties. In former times, these assemblies were generally arranged at the county seats, by the leading politicians, who sent out handbills and "drummed up" the "faithful"; but now the people get them up themselves, and call for the speakers to come out and address them. We are vastly mistaken in the signs of the times, if Pennsylvania does not swell up a majority against ASBURY G. CURTIS and the mismanagements of the Federal Administration, this fall, such as has never been recorded in her history.

We have not met with a solitary Democrat, who has had an opportunity of learning the popular feeling, who does not agree with us, in our confident anticipations of the result. Amongst leading politicians, it seems to be a foregone conclusion that Judge Woodward's election is as certain as the coming of election day. The Republican leaders endeavor to keep up cheerful spirits, and will conduct a vigorous campaign; but they fight very much as we did in the campaign of 1850, with the desperation of certain defeat. A personal friend, writing to us from Harrisburg, says:

"The political news is good from all quarters. I never saw such manifestations of the popular will as are daily exhibited at the Democratic meetings throughout the State. Our party friends are fairly wild with enthusiasm. Nobody doubts the success of Judge Woodward, and — and — and who you know always manage to be on the strong side, are shaping their course accordingly. We will take care of them. The Democrats will remember such week-kneeled brethren in future. If we have any rewards to give, let them be given to those who have stood firm — those who have braved obloquy from the beginning for the sake of the cause. Tell our friends in Erie county to keep up brave hearts. There is a better time coming — depend on that. As you said in the former war, we are not fighting but greenbacks and bayonets can prevent our overwhelming success. The former will be used beautifully — the latter will be seen whether they dare to employ."

The Soldiers' Vote.

We would remind our friends that the utmost exertions are being made by the Republicans to obtain the influence of the soldiers in favor of their candidate. With this object, prominent Republicans are constantly visiting the army, and by speeches and the circulation of lying documents, attempting to convince them that Gor. Curtin has been their special friend, while Judge Woodward is their bitter enemy. The Governor himself has just returned from a mission to Virginia, undertaken for the avowed purpose of presenting a sword to Gen. Meade, but really to make political capital in his own favor. In such a canvass all the advantages are on the side of the Opposition, for the Administration has exclusive control over the avenues of approach to the soldiers. Democratic papers are not permitted to be sold in most of the camps, while Republican journals are flooded into the army by wholesale. But there are still remaining means by which the soldiers can ascertain the true issues between the two parties, and we hope that Democrats everywhere will be prompt to avail themselves of them. We refer to the sending of private letters, and of sound, conservative newspapers through the medium of the Post Office. There are hundreds of Democrats in this county who have sons or other relatives in the army, and it should be the special aim of them all, from now until the day of election, to make their soldier friends as fully acquainted with the doctrines of Democracy, and the high moral and patriotic character of the candidates we present for the people's suffrage, as possible. We are confident in the belief that the great mass of the soldiers, if they once fully understood the real questions at issue, would be heart and hand in sympathy with the Democratic party. Certain it is, that the vast majority — a majority so immense as almost to amount to un-

service, is not opposed to Abolitionism, and almost as strongly to the acts of the Administration. The radical measures of Mr. Lincoln and his Cabinet have their most earnest opposers in the ranks of the army, while the atrocious injustice which they have exhibited towards Gen. McClellan is commented upon by officers and men with severe and well deserved denunciation. But the soldiers are studiously taught that the Democrats are opposed to their interests, that they are in sympathy with the rebels, and indifferent to the best interests of the country. Having little or no opportunity to learn the contrary, with few beside Republican journals furnished them to read, and of course unacquainted with the platform of Democracy, it is no wonder that they should look upon our organization with distrust, and labor to defeat it. Let them once thoroughly understand that the Democratic party is striving, not to destroy the Union, but to make it permanent, — that it is pledged to maintain the old Constitution and restore the old Confederation of States — that its object is to put a speedy end to the war, and save the lives of thousands of gallant and patriotic men — that it is unanimous in demanding the recall of Gen. McClellan from the command of his loved and loving troops — that it is opposed to making this a war for the freedom of negroes, and to placing the colored man on an equality in the ranks and at the ballot box with the white one — that it denounces the very acts of the Administration which the soldiers themselves most object to — that it speaks out in bold indignation against the frauds of contractors who plunder the treasury and supply the army with unwholesome food and worthless clothing, while the Republican leaders have no word of condemnation for the same — that it adheres to the old and well settled maxims of freedom for the people to criticize the acts of their public servants, and to condemn those which are deserving of condemnation — that, in short, it sustains everything that the soldiers themselves enlisted to sustain, and regards Secession and Abolition as twin enemies of the nation, alike to be resisted and vanquished — and we believe there would be an almost spontaneous sentiment of endorsement in its favor on the part of the rank and file at least. In what way can these truths be so well inculcated, as by private letters, from those in whom they have been accustomed to confide? We trust that our suggestion will be adopted by all who have friends in the army.

The Gazette still persists in praising the noble devotion to the Union evinced by Kentucky in her late election. General Burnside also claims that Kentucky is more thoroughly loyal than Ohio, Indiana or Illinois. Such being the testimony of two organs of Republicanism, we presume no member of the party will object to the following sentence, expressed by Col. Bramlette, the new Governor of the State, and recited in all the other made by him: "The condemnation of the Radical measures of the Administration in power is the highest obligation of a patriot."

And here are the commentaries thereon of Judge Agnew: "But the right of search and seizure is not forbidden in the Constitution, as ignorant and wicked clamor would have us suppose. It is only a search for treason, or for some other crime, which is forbidden. The common law right of arrest still remains. For example, arrests may be made without warrant by inferior officers, such as constables and even by private persons." The Judge thus seems to reason that because the officers can upon their actual knowledge of a crime, or his strong suspicion that one has been committed, arrest without a warrant an actual or supposed offender, and hold him for a short time for trial before a jury, that a military officer may arrest in like manner a citizen who has committed treason, or who holds him without a trial, and consign him to a prison without the aid of a jury. A keen and discriminating legal mind, or a candidate for the suffrages of that faction which is so much like their great idol "necessity," in that it knows no law, may be able to get over the objection. We are not sure, however, that Judge Agnew believes that freedom of speech is a crime? Has the learned expounder of constitutional law forgotten his definitions? Is he not aware that under our form of government no man can write or speak treason? And if he writes or speaks treason, he is liable to be arrested, and held to answer for the same, in the same manner, and for the same term, as a man who has committed a crime? Has the learned expounder of constitutional law forgotten his definitions? Is he not aware that under our form of government no man can write or speak treason? And if he writes or speaks treason, he is liable to be arrested, and held to answer for the same, in the same manner, and for the same term, as a man who has committed a crime? Has the learned expounder of constitutional law forgotten his definitions? Is he not aware that under our form of government no man can write or speak treason? And if he writes or speaks treason, he is liable to be arrested, and held to answer for the same, in the same manner, and for the same term, as a man who has committed a crime?

And here are the commentaries thereon of Judge Agnew: "But the right of search and seizure is not forbidden in the Constitution, as ignorant and wicked clamor would have us suppose. It is only a search for treason, or for some other crime, which is forbidden. The common law right of arrest still remains. For example, arrests may be made without warrant by inferior officers, such as constables and even by private persons." The Judge thus seems to reason that because the officers can upon their actual knowledge of a crime, or his strong suspicion that one has been committed, arrest without a warrant an actual or supposed offender, and hold him for a short time for trial before a jury, that a military officer may arrest in like manner a citizen who has committed treason, or who holds him without a trial, and consign him to a prison without the aid of a jury. A keen and discriminating legal mind, or a candidate for the suffrages of that faction which is so much like their great idol "necessity," in that it knows no law, may be able to get over the objection. We are not sure, however, that Judge Agnew believes that freedom of speech is a crime? Has the learned expounder of constitutional law forgotten his definitions? Is he not aware that under our form of government no man can write or speak treason? And if he writes or speaks treason, he is liable to be arrested, and held to answer for the same, in the same manner, and for the same term, as a man who has committed a crime? Has the learned expounder of constitutional law forgotten his definitions? Is he not aware that under our form of government no man can write or speak treason? And if he writes or speaks treason, he is liable to be arrested, and held to answer for the same, in the same manner, and for the same term, as a man who has committed a crime?

And here are the commentaries thereon of Judge Agnew: "But the right of search and seizure is not forbidden in the Constitution, as ignorant and wicked clamor would have us suppose. It is only a search for treason, or for some other crime, which is forbidden. The common law right of arrest still remains. For example, arrests may be made without warrant by inferior officers, such as constables and even by private persons." The Judge thus seems to reason that because the officers can upon their actual knowledge of a crime, or his strong suspicion that one has been committed, arrest without a warrant an actual or supposed offender, and hold him for a short time for trial before a jury, that a military officer may arrest in like manner a citizen who has committed treason, or who holds him without a trial, and consign him to a prison without the aid of a jury. A keen and discriminating legal mind, or a candidate for the suffrages of that faction which is so much like their great idol "necessity," in that it knows no law, may be able to get over the objection. We are not sure, however, that Judge Agnew believes that freedom of speech is a crime? Has the learned expounder of constitutional law forgotten his definitions? Is he not aware that under our form of government no man can write or speak treason? And if he writes or speaks treason, he is liable to be arrested, and held to answer for the same, in the same manner, and for the same term, as a man who has committed a crime? Has the learned expounder of constitutional law forgotten his definitions? Is he not aware that under our form of government no man can write or speak treason? And if he writes or speaks treason, he is liable to be arrested, and held to answer for the same, in the same manner, and for the same term, as a man who has committed a crime?

And here are the commentaries thereon of Judge Agnew: "But the right of search and seizure is not forbidden in the Constitution, as ignorant and wicked clamor would have us suppose. It is only a search for treason, or for some other crime, which is forbidden. The common law right of arrest still remains. For example, arrests may be made without warrant by inferior officers, such as constables and even by private persons." The Judge thus seems to reason that because the officers can upon their actual knowledge of a crime, or his strong suspicion that one has been committed, arrest without a warrant an actual or supposed offender, and hold him for a short time for trial before a jury, that a military officer may arrest in like manner a citizen who has committed treason, or who holds him without a trial, and consign him to a prison without the aid of a jury. A keen and discriminating legal mind, or a candidate for the suffrages of that faction which is so much like their great idol "necessity," in that it knows no law, may be able to get over the objection. We are not sure, however, that Judge Agnew believes that freedom of speech is a crime? Has the learned expounder of constitutional law forgotten his definitions? Is he not aware that under our form of government no man can write or speak treason? And if he writes or speaks treason, he is liable to be arrested, and held to answer for the same, in the same manner, and for the same term, as a man who has committed a crime? Has the learned expounder of constitutional law forgotten his definitions? Is he not aware that under our form of government no man can write or speak treason? And if he writes or speaks treason, he is liable to be arrested, and held to answer for the same, in the same manner, and for the same term, as a man who has committed a crime?

State Normal School, Edenboro, Erie County, Pa. FACULTY: J. A. Cooper, A. M., Mrs. L. M. Cooper, J. T. Stretz, A. B., Miss M. Coburn, E. C. McNeckles, Miss S. M. Thomas. SAPONIFIER, CONCENTRATED LYE, THE FAMILY SOAP MAKER. NEW FALL GOODS! NEW OPENING AT WM. P. HAYES & CO'S. The Universal Clothes Wringer! FINKLE & LYON'S SEWING MACHINES. THE N. J. Journal of Commerce. UNION AND CONSTITUTION. GREAT DEMOCRATIC MEETING AT OAK GROVE. OYSTERS & GLAMS. V. SCHULTZ & BRO. WHOLESALE AND RETAIL DEALERS IN GROCERIES AND PROVISIONS. CHANGE OF TIME. PHILADELPHIA & ERIE R. R.