

VALLEY SPIRIT.

CHAMBERSBURG, PA.

Wednesday Evening, July 11, 1860.

RIPPER & SAWYER,
Publishers and Agents.FOR PRESIDENT,
STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS,
of Illinois.FOR VICE PRESIDENT,
HERSCHEL V. JOHNSON,
of Georgia.

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS.

ELECTORS AT LARGE.		
GEORGE M. KELLY.	RICHARD VAUX	
DISTRICT ELECTORS.		
1. Frederick A. Barker	14. Isaac Rockwell	
2. Wm. C. Patterson	15. Geo D. Jackson	
3. Joseph Crockett	16. J. A. Ahl	
4. J. G. Brenner	17. C. B. Danes	
5. G. W. Jacobs	18. J. M. Crawford	
6. Charles Kelly.	19. H. N. Lee.	
7. O. P. James	20. J. B. Howell.	
8. D. D. Salvail	21. N. P. Peterman.	
9. G. L. Lightner	22. Samuel Marshall	
10. S. H. Barber.	23. William Cook.	
11. T. H. Walker.	24. B. D. Hanna.	
12. S. S. Winchester.	25. Gaylord Church.	
13. Joseph Ludwick.		

FOR GOVERNOR,
HENRY D. FOSTER,
Of Warminster.

Who are to Blame?

When the Democratic National Convention adjourned at Charleston, with the purpose of re-assembling again at Baltimore, it was with a view to let all hot blood cool down, and to bury deep and decently all animosities, antagonisms and distractions engendered by the very natural and inevitable collision on the Presidential question. A frank, generous and conciliatory course was looked for when the Convention would again re-organize at Baltimore, and the masses were full of hope and encouragement for a restoration of unity and harmony among their leaders. There was no other reason for the adjournment, and no other purpose in re-assembling, than to heal distractions in the party by making a harmonious nomination. Had a single delegate, previous to leaving for Baltimore, declared his intention to bolt from the Convention, and oppose its nominee, he would have received his credentials to stay at home. All were sent there in good faith—expected to smother their personal predilections, and act together for the best interests of the whole party and nothing more. That the friends of Mr. Douglas met their opponents in the Convention, fair and square on this platform cannot be gainsayed. They took their seats in the Convention with honorable intentions and a determination to restore harmony to the councils of the Democracy—they never once thought of seceding—never suspected treachery, and were resolved to resort to no trickery to secure the nomination for their favorite. In this feeling Mr. Douglas was with them heart and soul as his letter to his friends in the Convention to withdraw his name, whenever it proved to be in the way of a harmonious nomination, indisputably and conclusively proves. Under these cheering auspices the Convention met and resumed its deliberations—all who participated in its proceedings at first were bound by its action to the last. This understanding was perfect—the contract explicit, and universally regarded as solemn and inviolate, and as the only way to heal dissensions and distractions in the party. A fearful responsibility must rest upon those who have violated this solemn compact! The malcontents in the Convention had the right, if they saw proper, to leave and go home, but they had no right—no authority to distract and disorganize the party by making another nomination, and no true Democrat will countenance such a treasonable scheme.

Who are to blame for this disruption of the great Democratic party?—Certainly not Mr. Douglas or his friends. He or they had nothing to gain by creating a split in the party. Their policy and their interest were opposed to any other course than an amiable adjustment of all difficulties that stood in the way of a harmonious nomination. We must look somewhere else than to the Douglas wing of the party for the source of trouble and the real offenders. We have a duty to perform which we cannot discharge by "silent contempt" towards the disunionists in our ranks. We must speak out for the good of the whole party, and call things by their right names. We honestly believe that a great outrage has been perpetrated on the Democratic party by the Malcontents, and that, at give these States which were not

present adhesion towards Mr. Douglas and that out of that has grown all our trouble. Are we to remain silent and tacitly encourage this outrage, or to rebuke at once, and without stint, the high source that gives it consequence and the suicidal and vindictive policy that dictates it? Must we enter the present Presidential contest with two candidates in the field, in our own party, and as a consequence defeat almost certain, and not raise a finger or utter a word against those whose perverseness have brought about this disastrous state of affairs, and who would glory in the overthrow of the regularly nominated candidate of the party? The faithful soldier will as soon shoot down the traitor in his own ranks as an open enemy. There is but one course left for every good Democrat to pursue, and that is, to fight the enemy in front, as well as the enemy in the rear, and trust for victory in the righteousness of our cause.

With the private grievances between the administration and Mr. Douglas the masses of the party are not concerned. Mr. Douglas, on his part, has long since "buried the hatchet" and is ready to forget and forgive the wrongs and contumely heaped upon him. The cause of difference has been whittled down to so small a point that it were meanness on the part of the administration, to push revenge further.—What other motive than that of revenge can array the administration in the hostile attitude assumed by it to the nomination of Mr. Douglas? Is it because that they do not consider him a sound Democrat? It would come with a bad grace from those who are so ready to sow discord and stir up disorganization in the party to make a charge of that kind. Is it because he is destitute of the proper qualifications for the high position to which the Democracy will assuredly elevate him unless frustrated by the secret combinations of traitors in their own ranks? The action of the Convention that indorsed him by a two-third vote is an ample refutation to a charge of that character. What then can be the motive for the violent opposition of the administration and its organs to his nomination? It can be no other than what we have named, and to this small matter—dastardly act of revenge against a single individual—are we indebted for the dissensions and distractions that now rage throughout the entire ranks of the party. Such an open and flagitious act of disorganization as that attempted at Baltimore by a handful of men, professing to be Democrats, and acting under the compulsory dictation of the national administration can only be viewed in one light—DISHONOR, and condemned in one word—TREASON.

The Seceders.

There is nothing more absurd and ridiculous than the assertion that the Convention which met at the Maryland Institute in Baltimore was the regular and proper one. Now, we do not intend to go into a lengthy discussion of this question; but a duty which we owe to ourselves as well as to our readers, compels us to state the true facts of the case at issue, as we find them in the proceedings of both the regular and Seceder's Conventions. In doing this, we are guided by no ill-will towards any of the delegates; all we desire is to give an impartial statement to them. But no! they had determined to "rule or ruin," to crush out the "Douglas faction," as we are sneeringly called. That was their object; the peace and harmony of the whole Democratic party was a secondary matter to them.

The shall now drop this subject, determined, however, to call things by their right names, no matter who it may concern, whenever the occasion demands it. Truth and Justice are our guide, and with them we enter the contest, hoping that the people will always be found on their side.

Inconsistency—The Two-Third Vote. We observe that some of the papers who advocate the election of Messrs. Breckinridge and Lane are making a huge fuss over the fact that Judge Douglas did not receive a two-third vote of a full Convention, as though it was a proceeding without precedent. If they will brush the cobwebs from their memories and look back as far as 1848, to the proceedings of the Baltimore Convention, they will find that Lewis Cass was nominated by a vote less than two-thirds of a full Convention; and they will find that the President of the Convention, Hon. Andrew Stevenson, decided—and rightly so—that it was not necessary to have more than two-thirds of the votes given. Indeed it would be ridiculous to decide in any other way; for the commissioners of State Delegates, as stated before,

represented, an opportunity to elect new delegates, who were to take the seats of those who had withdrawn or seceded. This was nothing more than just on the part of the Convention, and it goes to show the kind feeling with which they were indeed towards their Democratic brothers of the South. The Convention re-assembled at Baltimore, in accordance with the resolution adopted at Charleston. Some of these delegates who had not been again claimed their seats in that body, having been commissioned to do so by their constituents. In a number of States new delegates had been elected in place of the seceders. After reviewing the whole matter, the Convention admitted such of the delegates to seats as it thought most entitled, namely such as had been newly elected, and those who had been re-appointed. This caused another secession of about 50 delegates both from the North and from the South. None of the delegates from this State withdrew, but some 6 or 8 of them sneaked out about the time Judge Douglas was nominated, and joined the disunion Secessionists. The record shows that none of these men who took part in the Seceder's Convention had the manliness, either by verbal request or in writing, to put themselves on the record as withdrawing. Mr. Cushing, the resident of the regular Convention, left the Chair, saying he would keep his seat on the floor, but he finally joined the Seceders, where he was elected as their presiding officer.

Having thus stated the true position of this matter to our readers—and we defy contradiction—we would now ask, which of these two Conventions is to be considered the regular and legal one? It is indisputable, and beyond all question, that the body which, after the Seceders had left, nominated Judge Douglas, was the regular National Convention of the party. The fact that a portion of the delegates accredited to it saw proper to secede, in no degree detracted from its authority to make a nomination, and does not at all release Democrats from their obligation to support the nomination. If it did, it would then always put it into the power of minority to nullify the action of the majority. After the secession had taken place there were still more than two thirds of the original delegates in the Convention, and Judge Douglas received the vote of every man who remained.

How the Secessionists can lay just claim to the title of being the regular Convention is a wonder with us. Did not these very men meet with the rest of the delegates in one and the same regularly organized body? Did they not take an active part in electing officers and in conducting the proceedings? Were they not as true Democrats honestly and firmly bound to acquiesce in the decision of the majority?

No man but one bent on deception, will pretend to say that the course pursued by the Seceders was right and proper. If they had been sincere in their actions, could not they have prevented the nomination of Judge Douglas, who seemed to be so obnoxious to them? But no! they had determined to "rule or ruin," to crush out the "Douglas faction," as we are sneeringly called. That was their object; the peace and harmony of the whole Democratic party was a secondary matter to them.

We shall now drop this subject, determined, however, to call things by their right names, no matter who it may concern, whenever the occasion demands it. Truth and Justice are our guide, and with them we enter the contest, hoping that the people will always be found on their side.

Inconsistency—The Two-Third Vote. We observe that some of the papers who advocate the election of Messrs. Breckinridge and Lane are making a huge fuss over the fact that Judge Douglas did not receive a two-third vote of a full Convention, as though it was a proceeding without precedent. If they will brush the cobwebs from their memories and look back as far as 1848, to the proceedings of the Baltimore Convention, they will find that Lewis Cass was nominated by a vote less than two-thirds of a full Convention; and they will find that the President of the Convention, Hon. Andrew Stevenson, decided—and rightly so—that it was not necessary to have more than two-thirds of the votes given. Indeed it would be ridiculous to decide in any other way; for the commissioners of State Delegates, as stated before,

any single delegate—or, in the case of a State not instructed to vote as a unit, a single disloyal delegate, might prevent a nomination. If these persons wish to injure the election of Mr. Douglas, they must resort to better arguments than this, because such stale nonsense will only raise him the more in the estimation of the Democracy.

State Central Committee.

This Committee met at the Merchant's Hotel, in Philadelphia, last week. We give the following portion of their proceeding for the information of our readers, and not that we ask, or expect, them to acquiesce in their recommendation. The Committee adopted the following resolutions by a vote of 45 against 15:

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

Second, Recommending the democratic party of the State to unite on the elect 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 obligation to cast their vote in that way; if the said vote would not elect Douglas, but elect Breckinridge, then shall it be cast for Breckinridge. If the said vote will elect neither Douglas or Breckinridge, then the electors may divide according to their own judgment—the basis of this united action being that it is the first and highest duty of all good democrats, however differing about various points of principle and men, to unite firmly against the common enemy.

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

Now we must look upon the above as a very cool proposition coming from the quarter it does. The brothers from the Baltimore Convention, not satisfied with creating all the discord possible in the party by withdrawing from its councils and patching up a nomination with the express purpose of defeating the regular candidate of the party, now step up, hat in hand, and modestly ask us to help them to elect their disorganizing candidate! There was a time when the honored name of John C. Breckinridge would gladly have been accepted by the party as a peace-offering, but that time has gone by and forever. Why was not the same effort made by his friends at Charleston and Baltimore to place him in a position that the whole party might rally to his support that is now being made in his behalf? It is too late a day to ask the friends of Mr. Douglas to give "aid and comfort" to his implacable enemies. It is not safe to hold fellowship with traitors and we should prefer defeat to victory purchased at the price of dishonor.

The arrangement proposed by the State Central Committee is universally denounced by the Douglas press over the State, and the National Democratic Committee have very justly determined to yield to no such conditions. The chairman of that Committee, Hon. Miles Taylor, Representative in Congress, from New Orleans, La., has issued the following direct rebuke of such proceedings:

NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ROOMS,

WASHINGTON June 30, 1860.

Sir: Reports have been busily disseminated, in the shape of telegraphic despatches, from Washington, appearing simultaneously in newspapers published in different parts of the Union, to the effect that the friends of Stephen A. Douglas and Herschel V. Johnson, Democratic candidates designated for the Presidency and Vice Presidency, presented for the suffrages of the people by the National Convention recently assembled in Baltimore, were engaged, in several of the States, with the friends of John C. Breckinridge and Joseph Lane, candidates designated for the same office by the seceders from the National Convention, in making arrangements for the running of electoral tickets in different States, to be supported by them jointly in the approaching Presidential election, with the understanding that the vote of the electors, elected by such combination, shall be given for Douglas and Johnson, or for Breckinridge and Lane, as subsequent events might require. What gave rise to these reports, and to what agency their circulation is to be attributed, we have no means of determining. The fact of their prevalence, however, is so notorious that, when it is taken in connection with the fact that it is said in some quarters that movements looking towards such a result are about to be inaugurated in Mississippi and New Jersey, the subject becomes one sufficient importunity, in the opinion of the committee, to be made the subject of a special communication to the friends of the National Convention of the regular Convention of the Democratic party, and, whenever possible, in due season, to the friends of the seceders, who, it is believed, will be greatly annoyed by such a disclosure.

"So far as it relates to the members of the resident Executive Committee, no person who supports the views of the National Democratic Opposition at Baltimore—so far as persons who designate the election of Stephen A. Douglas to the Presidency, and of Herschel V. Johnson to the Vice Presidency, has ever expressed a wish for any such arrangement, or contemplated, or even countenanced, for a single moment, any suggestion or proposition tending towards it. Nor does the committee believe that any such arrangement can with propriety be made at any time, in any place, or under any circumstances with those who have placed Breckinridge and Lane in nomination, and are now their avowed supporters in opposition to the regular nominees of the Democratic party.

"The Democratic party, as a national party, stands now where it stood for years upon the ground of non-intervention by Congress with the subject of slavery in the States or Territories. Those who receded from the Baltimore Convention did so because they were unwilling to stand on that ground. They have again and again repudiated that principle, and both at Charleston and Baltimore declared that they would sever their connection with the majority of the delegates accredited in Convention in accordance with Democratic usage, unless they, too, would solemnly repudiate it in obedience to their demand. When the majority of the Convention refused to yield to their dictation, and were their actions conform to the will of the majority, these gentlemen receded, formed themselves into a minority Convention, and nominated candidates with the majority of the delegates accredited in Convention in accordance with the principle of "non-intervention" by Congress, as recognized by the majority Convention, and as advocated by their candidates. Under these circumstances it is clear to the committee that if the indecision between the Seceders and the majority of the Democratic Convention was such that the Seceders could no longer take part in their deliberations and were compelled to act up to their obligation to those elected by the majority, that antagonism still continues, and it may be must preclude the possibility of any union between them in the support of a common electoral ticket in any State, no matter what may be the probable result of the election in it without such a union.

"The Democratic party, which is now united in the support of Douglas and Johnson, stands upon the only principle which is capable, it maintains in its integrity of preserving and perpetuating the Union of the States. The Seceders, and their candidates, are opposed to this principle. Their course, it maintained in the South, necessarily tends, though it may not be designed, to the breaking up of the National Government.

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The Democratic party, which is now united in the support of Douglas and Johnson, stands upon the only principle which is capable, it maintains in its integrity of preserving and perpetuating the Union of the States. The Seceders, and their candidates, are opposed to this principle. Their course, it maintained in the South, necessarily tends, though it may not be designed, to the breaking up of the National Government.

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the principle of Congressional "non-intervention."

"The committee, there is no room for doubt, in the mind of any National Democrat, as to the duty of duty in the present crisis. The Seceders, by withdrawing from the National Convention and setting up their candidates, have arrayed themselves in opposition to the

