



Staunton Spectator.

STAUNTON, VA.

TUESDAY, JULY 3, 1860.

THE STAUNTON SPECTATOR having the large circulation as a paper published in Western Virginia, has an extensive circulation in the Southern States.

FOR PRESIDENT, JOHN BELL, OF TENNESSEE. FOR VICE PRESIDENT, EDWARD EVERETT, OF MASSACHUSETTS.

Persons desiring money to pay their accounts due to J. A. & L. Wadell, Jr., will have any amount they may desire to pay for the current year. This will save persons committing the trouble of sending fractions of a dollar, which is often quite inconvenient.

July 3rd, 1860.

What one National Party.—Duty of all to sustain it.

The nationality of the Democratic party is now a proper subject of history—it is no longer a political issue. It is "numbered among the things that were." That party has been divided, dismembered, out in two—one part belonging to the North and the other to the South.

What a Democratic Delegation Says. A Douglas delegate from the Greenback District to the Democratic Convention in Baltimore passed through this place on Wednesday and on his way home.

He said the object of the Richmond Convention was to corrupt the Virginia delegation, and that that object was effected.

He asserted that a thousand persons had been offered the appointment of Judge in the Supreme Court, to supply the vacancy occasioned by the death of Judge Daniel.

That Washington City under this Administration is the "most corrupt place this side the Atlantic."

He says the people are for Douglas, and that it is only the politicians who are for Breckinridge and Lane.

We do not profess to quote the language, but think we have correctly given the substance of his remarks, as they were poured forth with the rapidity of electricity, the vim of condensed steam, and the heat of molten lava.

When asked his opinion of the Massachusetts delegation, he said that if he owned a negro within 25 miles of the border he would be afraid he would be stolen by that delegation.

Presidential Candidates. There are now four regularly nominated Presidential tickets in the field, viz: Constitutional Union Ticket—John Bell, of Tennessee, for President, Edward Everett, of Massachusetts, for Vice President.

Republican Ticket—Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois, for President, Hannibal Hamlin, of Maine, for Vice President.

Abolition Ticket—Gerrit Smith, of New York, for President, Stephen A. Douglas, of Illinois, for Vice President.

Seceders' Democratic Ticket—John C. Breckinridge, of Kentucky, for President, Jos. L. Houston, of Oregon, for Vice President.

In addition to these, we believe that Geo. Sam Houston, of Texas, is an independent candidate for the Presidency, making the sixth ticket in the field.

As the Lincoln, Douglas and Breckinridge tickets are all sectional—the former being so in its origin, and the latter two made so by division in Baltimore—there being now but one truly National ticket, that of Bell and Everett, there need no longer be any hesitancy on the part of national men, no matter to what party they have heretofore belonged, as to the choice they should make.

take the following spirit stirring and patriotic extract: "While there is still a Union of States, it is our duty to support a National Party. There is now only one party remaining. The Democratic party is returned into sectional politics. We say from a national organization to the platform of—The Union—the Constitution—and the Enforcement of the Laws."

"We are living in a Democratic Nation. We are entitled to rule under the banner of Bell and Everett, who have a Whig and American Constitution. We will not be a Whig of America, but a Democrat of the world."

"The size of the skull and leg bone shows that it was a large animal, and the articulations of the leg bone indicate that that limb was not thrown directly forward as in the case with quadrupeds, but that it was used laterally after the manner of the creeping monsters of the deep."

The latter part of the head is very long proportionally—has an elevated process in the direction of its length—and seems to have been covered with a very thick skin like that of a crocodile. But the character of its teeth, and the fact that it had tusks inserted in the same manner and locality as that which characterizes the elephant, negates the idea of its belonging to the alligator or crocodile species.

What a Democratic Delegation Says. A Douglas delegate from the Greenback District to the Democratic Convention in Baltimore passed through this place on Wednesday and on his way home.

He said the object of the Richmond Convention was to corrupt the Virginia delegation, and that that object was effected.

He asserted that a thousand persons had been offered the appointment of Judge in the Supreme Court, to supply the vacancy occasioned by the death of Judge Daniel.

That Washington City under this Administration is the "most corrupt place this side the Atlantic."

He says the people are for Douglas, and that it is only the politicians who are for Breckinridge and Lane.

We do not profess to quote the language, but think we have correctly given the substance of his remarks, as they were poured forth with the rapidity of electricity, the vim of condensed steam, and the heat of molten lava.

When asked his opinion of the Massachusetts delegation, he said that if he owned a negro within 25 miles of the border he would be afraid he would be stolen by that delegation.

Presidential Candidates. There are now four regularly nominated Presidential tickets in the field, viz: Constitutional Union Ticket—John Bell, of Tennessee, for President, Edward Everett, of Massachusetts, for Vice President.

Republican Ticket—Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois, for President, Hannibal Hamlin, of Maine, for Vice President.

Abolition Ticket—Gerrit Smith, of New York, for President, Stephen A. Douglas, of Illinois, for Vice President.

Seceders' Democratic Ticket—John C. Breckinridge, of Kentucky, for President, Jos. L. Houston, of Oregon, for Vice President.

In addition to these, we believe that Geo. Sam Houston, of Texas, is an independent candidate for the Presidency, making the sixth ticket in the field.

As the Lincoln, Douglas and Breckinridge tickets are all sectional—the former being so in its origin, and the latter two made so by division in Baltimore—there being now but one truly National ticket, that of Bell and Everett, there need no longer be any hesitancy on the part of national men, no matter to what party they have heretofore belonged, as to the choice they should make.

We do not profess to quote the language, but think we have correctly given the substance of his remarks, as they were poured forth with the rapidity of electricity, the vim of condensed steam, and the heat of molten lava.

When asked his opinion of the Massachusetts delegation, he said that if he owned a negro within 25 miles of the border he would be afraid he would be stolen by that delegation.

The Bones of an Unknown Animal. A gentleman in making a walk in a park here lately discovered a skull in a hole.

The size of the skull and leg bone shows that it was a large animal, and the articulations of the leg bone indicate that that limb was not thrown directly forward as in the case with quadrupeds, but that it was used laterally after the manner of the creeping monsters of the deep."

The latter part of the head is very long proportionally—has an elevated process in the direction of its length—and seems to have been covered with a very thick skin like that of a crocodile.

What a Democratic Delegation Says. A Douglas delegate from the Greenback District to the Democratic Convention in Baltimore passed through this place on Wednesday and on his way home.

He said the object of the Richmond Convention was to corrupt the Virginia delegation, and that that object was effected.

He asserted that a thousand persons had been offered the appointment of Judge in the Supreme Court, to supply the vacancy occasioned by the death of Judge Daniel.

That Washington City under this Administration is the "most corrupt place this side the Atlantic."

He says the people are for Douglas, and that it is only the politicians who are for Breckinridge and Lane.

We do not profess to quote the language, but think we have correctly given the substance of his remarks, as they were poured forth with the rapidity of electricity, the vim of condensed steam, and the heat of molten lava.

When asked his opinion of the Massachusetts delegation, he said that if he owned a negro within 25 miles of the border he would be afraid he would be stolen by that delegation.

Presidential Candidates. There are now four regularly nominated Presidential tickets in the field, viz: Constitutional Union Ticket—John Bell, of Tennessee, for President, Edward Everett, of Massachusetts, for Vice President.

Republican Ticket—Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois, for President, Hannibal Hamlin, of Maine, for Vice President.

Abolition Ticket—Gerrit Smith, of New York, for President, Stephen A. Douglas, of Illinois, for Vice President.

Seceders' Democratic Ticket—John C. Breckinridge, of Kentucky, for President, Jos. L. Houston, of Oregon, for Vice President.

In addition to these, we believe that Geo. Sam Houston, of Texas, is an independent candidate for the Presidency, making the sixth ticket in the field.

As the Lincoln, Douglas and Breckinridge tickets are all sectional—the former being so in its origin, and the latter two made so by division in Baltimore—there being now but one truly National ticket, that of Bell and Everett, there need no longer be any hesitancy on the part of national men, no matter to what party they have heretofore belonged, as to the choice they should make.

We do not profess to quote the language, but think we have correctly given the substance of his remarks, as they were poured forth with the rapidity of electricity, the vim of condensed steam, and the heat of molten lava.

When asked his opinion of the Massachusetts delegation, he said that if he owned a negro within 25 miles of the border he would be afraid he would be stolen by that delegation.

Presidential Candidates. There are now four regularly nominated Presidential tickets in the field, viz: Constitutional Union Ticket—John Bell, of Tennessee, for President, Edward Everett, of Massachusetts, for Vice President.

National Executive Committee. The National Executive Committee of the Democratic Party met in session.

Resolved, That if any State Committee should omit to take the proper steps for securing an electoral ticket, then the member of this Committee in that State is hereby authorized, with the assent of the Executive Committee, or by his own act, to take such action as he may deem necessary and proper for that purpose.

By the terms of the second resolution, John A. Harman, Esq., the member from this State, "may deem necessary and proper" for him "by his own act," in certain contingencies, to "take such action" as he may choose to secure the appointment of a Douglas Electoral ticket for Virginia.

The National Democratic Committee, of the Breckinridge wing of the party, is as follows: Isaac I. Stevens, of Oregon; Geo. W. Hughes, of Maryland; John W. Stevenson, of Kentucky; Wm. Finck, J. G. Barrett, Walter Lewis, Geo. W. Rigger, of Washington, D. C.; J. P. Davis, of Kansas; J. H. Brown, of Pennsylvania; J. R. Thompson, of New Jersey; Augustus Schell, of New York; A. B. Beck, of Alabama; J. D. Wright, of Indiana; and Robert Johnson, of Arkansas.

A Democratic Editor Sued by Whigs. Messrs. Keuper & Holbrook, the Proprietors of the Weekly Factory in Port-Republic, having presented the Editor of the "Rockingham Register" with a note of debt manufactured by them, the Editor, in acknowledging the bill, says: "Little did we expect, years ago, when leveling our batteries at the political errors and heresies of the Whig party in Rockingham, that that locality would ever lead the way in the matter of enterprise and true Southern independence."

"We point proudly to the example set by Port-Republic, in the establishment of her institutions of domestic industry, as an example worthy of imitation and all commendation, and we are glad to see that the Whig party, in its independence, however erroneous their political sentiments and opinions may be, are not so backward as they were in the matter of enterprise and true Southern independence."

The English Salutatory was read by Miss Julia A. Trone, and the Latin Salutatory by Miss Ginnie Rose.

Composition—"Justice," by Miss Allie Moore, White Sulphur, Va. "Our place and duties," by Miss Etta Hardy, Winchester—"Napoleon," by Miss E. Lowman, Harrisonburg—"What we live for," by Miss Kate V. Dauron, Allegheny—"What we study," by Miss Mattie E. Cooke, Augusta.

Essays—"La vie et ses changements," by Miss Julia A. Jacobs, Warren county, Va.—"Woman," by Miss Mattie Cooke, Staunton.

A dialogue—"The folly of devoting too much time to accomplishment," was read by the Misses L. Rose and B. Pennington.

The Valdivia ticket was delivered by Miss Bettie J. Gibbons, of Rockingham.

At the departure of the cars the next morning, with emotions of sorrow and separation from their schoolmates mingled with the joyful anticipation of soon seeing the "good old folks at home," with tears and smiles, they kissed each other, and uttered that "good old word, good bye."

Officers of the Junior High School. It affords us pleasure to publish the names of the officers of the "Junior High School," that interesting juvenile military company composed of boys between the ages of 10 and 15:

J. D. LILLEY, Captain, L. HANNA, 1st Lieut., R. F. PATTERSON, 2d, A. H. B. STUART, 3d, L. LIEUTENANT, J. W. BLACKBURN, 4th, C. W. TURNER, Ordinary Sergeant, J. O. LILLY, 2nd, J. H. WAYS, 3rd, E. BERKLEY, Ensign, E. BRIDGING, Surgeon, E. BROOK, Quartermaster, J. B. SCHERER, 1st Corporal, E. C. KINNEY, 2d, C. STAFFORD, 3d, J. SCHERER, 4th.

Washington, June 25.—The President has signed the Civil Appropriation bill, but objected to the clause appropriating Capt. Meigs Disbursing Agent of the appropriation for the Washington Aqueduct, but that bill is now in the hands of the service department and his presence elsewhere, he would have no objection in removing him from the position assigned him by Congress.

The President sent in another communication protesting against the action of the Covode committee. His grounds of objection are, principally, that the committee have not only violated the rights of the Executive branch of the Government, and established a dangerous precedent, leading to degrade the Presidential office, and render it unworthy the acceptance of any honorable man.

Washington, June 25.—The President has signed the Civil Appropriation bill, but objected to the clause appropriating Capt. Meigs Disbursing Agent of the appropriation for the Washington Aqueduct, but that bill is now in the hands of the service department and his presence elsewhere, he would have no objection in removing him from the position assigned him by Congress.

The President sent in another communication protesting against the action of the Covode committee. His grounds of objection are, principally, that the committee have not only violated the rights of the Executive branch of the Government, and established a dangerous precedent, leading to degrade the Presidential office, and render it unworthy the acceptance of any honorable man.

Washington, June 25.—The President has signed the Civil Appropriation bill, but objected to the clause appropriating Capt. Meigs Disbursing Agent of the appropriation for the Washington Aqueduct, but that bill is now in the hands of the service department and his presence elsewhere, he would have no objection in removing him from the position assigned him by Congress.

What the Democrats say of each other. The "Independent Democrat" published in Staunton, Va., in its issue of the 25th of June, says some very hard things about Douglas and his supporters.

"The evidence is palpable, too plain to be denied, that Douglas and his friends, as at Charleston, went to Baltimore to nominate him or break up, if they could, the Democratic party. They went there to ruin, they went there to overthrow and overturn everything and everybody who stood in the way of their object—they went there to ruin Douglas and his friends, to break up the party, if they could be, by any means, and to put every ally of the party, both true Democrats and with all the other appliances of outside pressure to force Douglas upon the party. They were not, thank God, by men who could not be forced, called out or intimidated—they went there to ruin Douglas and his friends, to break up the party, if they could be, by any means, and to put every ally of the party, both true Democrats and with all the other appliances of outside pressure to force Douglas upon the party."

"The 'politicians,' the 'faro-dealers,' the 'demagogues' are none other than this same man Douglas and his friends. He and they and nobody else, are the ones who have created the issues that now divide and distract the Democratic party. To ruin Douglas and his friends, to break up the party, if they could be, by any means, and to put every ally of the party, both true Democrats and with all the other appliances of outside pressure to force Douglas upon the party."

He (the Editor of the "Spirit of Jefferson," a Democratic paper published in the same town) would have his readers believe that it is some one else, any and every one else, rather than Douglas or his friends—and why, because he says that he is not in favor of Douglas, and that he is in favor of the claims of Douglas to the nomination is to that extent a party to these high-handed outrages against the peace and integrity of the Democratic party.

The Editor of the "Winchester Virginian," a Democratic paper, has written from Baltimore, a long letter to his paper, from which we extract the following: "The nomination of Mr. Douglas was opposed for more reasons than one. He did not agree with us on an important principle. In his effort to gain Northern votes he sacrificed a principle of vital importance to the South. He was not in favor of the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court, and has long been a bitter opponent of Mr. Buchanan's administration—an administration that has been true to the South—true to all parts of the Union, and worthy of the cordial support of all its friends. The nomination of Mr. Douglas was not only a betrayal of the South, but it was a betrayal of the Union. It was a betrayal of the principles of the Democratic party, and it was a betrayal of the peace and integrity of the Democratic party."

The Editor of the "Winchester Virginian," a Democratic paper, has written from Baltimore, a long letter to his paper, from which we extract the following: "The nomination of Mr. Douglas was opposed for more reasons than one. He did not agree with us on an important principle. In his effort to gain Northern votes he sacrificed a principle of vital importance to the South. He was not in favor of the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court, and has long been a bitter opponent of Mr. Buchanan's administration—an administration that has been true to the South—true to all parts of the Union, and worthy of the cordial support of all its friends. The nomination of Mr. Douglas was not only a betrayal of the South, but it was a betrayal of the Union. It was a betrayal of the principles of the Democratic party, and it was a betrayal of the peace and integrity of the Democratic party."

The Editor of the "Winchester Virginian," a Democratic paper, has written from Baltimore, a long letter to his paper, from which we extract the following: "The nomination of Mr. Douglas was opposed for more reasons than one. He did not agree with us on an important principle. In his effort to gain Northern votes he sacrificed a principle of vital importance to the South. He was not in favor of the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court, and has long been a bitter opponent of Mr. Buchanan's administration—an administration that has been true to the South—true to all parts of the Union, and worthy of the cordial support of all its friends. The nomination of Mr. Douglas was not only a betrayal of the South, but it was a betrayal of the Union. It was a betrayal of the principles of the Democratic party, and it was a betrayal of the peace and integrity of the Democratic party."

The Editor of the "Winchester Virginian," a Democratic paper, has written from Baltimore, a long letter to his paper, from which we extract the following: "The nomination of Mr. Douglas was opposed for more reasons than one. He did not agree with us on an important principle. In his effort to gain Northern votes he sacrificed a principle of vital importance to the South. He was not in favor of the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court, and has long been a bitter opponent of Mr. Buchanan's administration—an administration that has been true to the South—true to all parts of the Union, and worthy of the cordial support of all its friends. The nomination of Mr. Douglas was not only a betrayal of the South, but it was a betrayal of the Union. It was a betrayal of the principles of the Democratic party, and it was a betrayal of the peace and integrity of the Democratic party."

The Editor of the "Winchester Virginian," a Democratic paper, has written from Baltimore, a long letter to his paper, from which we extract the following: "The nomination of Mr. Douglas was opposed for more reasons than one. He did not agree with us on an important principle. In his effort to gain Northern votes he sacrificed a principle of vital importance to the South. He was not in favor of the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court, and has long been a bitter opponent of Mr. Buchanan's administration—an administration that has been true to the South—true to all parts of the Union, and worthy of the cordial support of all its friends. The nomination of Mr. Douglas was not only a betrayal of the South, but it was a betrayal of the Union. It was a betrayal of the principles of the Democratic party, and it was a betrayal of the peace and integrity of the Democratic party."

The Editor of the "Winchester Virginian," a Democratic paper, has written from Baltimore, a long letter to his paper, from which we extract the following: "The nomination of Mr. Douglas was opposed for more reasons than one. He did not agree with us on an important principle. In his effort to gain Northern votes he sacrificed a principle of vital importance to the South. He was not in favor of the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court, and has long been a bitter opponent of Mr. Buchanan's administration—an administration that has been true to the South—true to all parts of the Union, and worthy of the cordial support of all its friends. The nomination of Mr. Douglas was not only a betrayal of the South, but it was a betrayal of the Union. It was a betrayal of the principles of the Democratic party, and it was a betrayal of the peace and integrity of the Democratic party."

The Editor of the "Winchester Virginian," a Democratic paper, has written from Baltimore, a long letter to his paper, from which we extract the following: "The nomination of Mr. Douglas was opposed for more reasons than one. He did not agree with us on an important principle. In his effort to gain Northern votes he sacrificed a principle of vital importance to the South. He was not in favor of the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court, and has long been a bitter opponent of Mr. Buchanan's administration—an administration that has been true to the South—true to all parts of the Union, and worthy of the cordial support of all its friends. The nomination of Mr. Douglas was not only a betrayal of the South, but it was a betrayal of the Union. It was a betrayal of the principles of the Democratic party, and it was a betrayal of the peace and integrity of the Democratic party."

The Editor of the "Winchester Virginian," a Democratic paper, has written from Baltimore, a long letter to his paper, from which we extract the following: "The nomination of Mr. Douglas was opposed for more reasons than one. He did not agree with us on an important principle. In his effort to gain Northern votes he sacrificed a principle of vital importance to the South. He was not in favor of the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court, and has long been a bitter opponent of Mr. Buchanan's administration—an administration that has been true to the South—true to all parts of the Union, and worthy of the cordial support of all its friends. The nomination of Mr. Douglas was not only a betrayal of the South, but it was a betrayal of the Union. It was a betrayal of the principles of the Democratic party, and it was a betrayal of the peace and integrity of the Democratic party."

The Editor of the "Winchester Virginian," a Democratic paper, has written from Baltimore, a long letter to his paper, from which we extract the following: "The nomination of Mr. Douglas was opposed for more reasons than one. He did not agree with us on an important principle. In his effort to gain Northern votes he sacrificed a principle of vital importance to the South. He was not in favor of the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court, and has long been a bitter opponent of Mr. Buchanan's administration—an administration that has been true to the South—true to all parts of the Union, and worthy of the cordial support of all its friends. The nomination of Mr. Douglas was not only a betrayal of the South, but it was a betrayal of the Union. It was a betrayal of the principles of the Democratic party, and it was a betrayal of the peace and integrity of the Democratic party."

The Editor of the "Winchester Virginian," a Democratic paper, has written from Baltimore, a long letter to his paper, from which we extract the following: "The nomination of Mr. Douglas was opposed for more reasons than one. He did not agree with us on an important principle. In his effort to gain Northern votes he sacrificed a principle of vital importance to the South. He was not in favor of the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court, and has long been a bitter opponent of Mr. Buchanan's administration—an administration that has been true to the South—true to all parts of the Union, and worthy of the cordial support of all its friends. The nomination of Mr. Douglas was not only a betrayal of the South, but it was a betrayal of the Union. It was a betrayal of the principles of the Democratic party, and it was a betrayal of the peace and integrity of the Democratic party."

The Editor of the "Winchester Virginian," a Democratic paper, has written from Baltimore, a long letter to his paper, from which we extract the following: "The nomination of Mr. Douglas was opposed for more reasons than one. He did not agree with us on an important principle. In his effort to gain Northern votes he sacrificed a principle of vital importance to the South. He was not in favor of the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court, and has long been a bitter opponent of Mr. Buchanan's administration—an administration that has been true to the South—true to all parts of the Union, and worthy of the cordial support of all its friends. The nomination of Mr. Douglas was not only a betrayal of the South, but it was a betrayal of the Union. It was a betrayal of the principles of the Democratic party, and it was a betrayal of the peace and integrity of the Democratic party."

The Editor of the "Winchester Virginian," a Democratic paper, has written from Baltimore, a long letter to his paper, from which we extract the following: "The nomination of Mr. Douglas was opposed for more reasons than one. He did not agree with us on an important principle. In his effort to gain Northern votes he sacrificed a principle of vital importance to the South. He was not in favor of the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court, and has long been a bitter opponent of Mr. Buchanan's administration—an administration that has been true to the South—true to all parts of the Union, and worthy of the cordial support of all its friends. The nomination of Mr. Douglas was not only a betrayal of the South, but it was a betrayal of the Union. It was a betrayal of the principles of the Democratic party, and it was a betrayal of the peace and integrity of the Democratic party."

The Editor of the "Winchester Virginian," a Democratic paper, has written from Baltimore, a long letter to his paper, from which we extract the following: "The nomination of Mr. Douglas was opposed for more reasons than one. He did not agree with us on an important principle. In his effort to gain Northern votes he sacrificed a principle of vital importance to the South. He was not in favor of the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court, and has long been a bitter opponent of Mr. Buchanan's administration—an administration that has been true to the South—true to all parts of the Union, and worthy of the cordial support of all its friends. The nomination of Mr. Douglas was not only a betrayal of the South, but it was a betrayal of the Union. It was a betrayal of the principles of the Democratic party, and it was a betrayal of the peace and integrity of the Democratic party."

The Editor of the "Winchester Virginian," a Democratic paper, has written from Baltimore, a long letter to his paper, from which we extract the following: "The nomination of Mr. Douglas was opposed for more reasons than one. He did not agree with us on an important principle. In his effort to gain Northern votes he sacrificed a principle of vital importance to the South. He was not in favor of the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court, and has long been a bitter opponent of Mr. Buchanan's administration—an administration that has been true to the South—true to all parts of the Union, and worthy of the cordial support of all its friends. The nomination of Mr. Douglas was not only a betrayal of the South, but it was a betrayal of the Union. It was a betrayal of the principles of the Democratic party, and it was a betrayal of the peace and integrity of the Democratic party."

The Editor of the "Winchester Virginian," a Democratic paper, has written from Baltimore, a long letter to his paper, from which we extract the following: "The nomination of Mr. Douglas was opposed for more reasons than one. He did not agree with us on an important principle. In his effort to gain Northern votes he sacrificed a principle of vital importance to the South. He was not in favor of the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court, and has long been a bitter opponent of Mr. Buchanan's administration—an administration that has been true to the South—true to all parts of the Union, and worthy of the cordial support of all its friends. The nomination of Mr. Douglas was not only a betrayal of the South, but it was a betrayal of the Union. It was a betrayal of the principles of the Democratic party, and it was a betrayal of the peace and integrity of the Democratic party."

As to the general, but yet unexpressed feeling in the North, the "Independent Democrat" published in Staunton, Va., in its issue of the 25th of June, says some very hard things about Douglas and his supporters.

"The evidence is palpable, too plain to be denied, that Douglas and his friends, as at Charleston, went to Baltimore to nominate him or break up, if they could, the Democratic party. They went there to ruin, they went there to overthrow and overturn everything and everybody who stood in the way of their object—they went there to ruin Douglas and his friends, to break up the party, if they could be, by any means, and to put every ally of the party, both true Democrats and with all the other appliances of outside pressure to force Douglas upon the party."

"The 'politicians,' the 'faro-dealers,' the 'demagogues' are none other than this same man Douglas and his friends. He and they and nobody else, are the ones who have created the issues that now divide and distract the Democratic party. To ruin Douglas and his friends, to break up the party, if they could be, by any means, and to put every ally of the party, both true Democrats and with all the other appliances of outside pressure to force Douglas upon the party."

He (the Editor of the "Spirit of Jefferson," a Democratic paper published in the same town) would have his readers believe that it is some one else, any and every one else, rather than Douglas or his friends—and why, because he says that he is not in favor of Douglas, and that he is in favor of the claims of Douglas to the nomination is to that extent a party to these high-handed outrages against the peace and integrity of the Democratic party.

The Editor of the "Winchester Virginian," a Democratic paper, has written from Baltimore, a long letter to his paper, from which we extract the following: "The nomination of Mr. Douglas was opposed for more reasons than one. He did not agree with us on an important principle. In his effort to gain Northern votes he sacrificed a principle of vital importance to the South. He was not in favor of the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court, and has long been a bitter opponent of Mr. Buchanan's administration—an administration that has been true to the South—true to all parts of the Union, and worthy of the cordial support of all its friends. The nomination of Mr. Douglas was not only a betrayal of the South, but it was a betrayal of the Union. It was a betrayal of the principles of the Democratic party, and it was a betrayal of the peace and integrity of the Democratic party."

The Editor of the "Winchester Virginian," a Democratic paper, has written from Baltimore, a long letter to his paper, from which we extract the following: "The nomination of Mr. Douglas was opposed for more reasons than one. He did not agree with us on an important principle. In his effort to gain Northern votes he sacrificed a principle of vital importance to the South. He was not in favor of the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court, and has long been a bitter opponent of Mr. Buchanan's administration—an administration that has been true to the South—true to all parts of the Union, and worthy of the cordial support of all its friends. The nomination of Mr. Douglas was not only a betrayal of the South, but it was a betrayal of the Union. It was a betrayal of the principles of the Democratic party, and it was a betrayal of the peace and integrity of the Democratic party."

The Editor of the "Winchester Virginian," a Democratic paper, has written from Baltimore, a long letter to his paper, from which we extract the following: "The nomination of Mr. Douglas was opposed for more reasons than one. He did not agree with us on an important principle. In his effort to gain Northern votes he sacrificed a principle of vital importance to the South. He was not in favor of the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court, and has long been a bitter opponent of Mr. Buchanan's administration—an administration that has been true to the South—true to all parts of the Union, and worthy of the cordial support of all its friends. The nomination of Mr. Douglas was not only a betrayal of the South, but it was a betrayal of the Union. It was a betrayal of the principles of the Democratic party, and it was a betrayal of the peace and integrity of the Democratic party."

The Editor of the "Winchester Virginian," a Democratic paper, has written from Baltimore, a long letter to his paper, from which we extract the following: "The nomination of Mr. Douglas was opposed for more reasons than one. He did not agree with us on an important principle. In his effort to gain Northern votes he sacrificed a principle of vital importance to the South. He was not in favor of the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court, and has long been a bitter opponent of Mr. Buchanan's administration—an administration that has been true to the South—true to all parts of the Union, and worthy of the cordial support of all its friends. The nomination of Mr. Douglas was not only a betrayal of the South, but it was a betrayal of the Union. It was a betrayal of the principles of the Democratic party, and it was a betrayal of the peace and integrity of the Democratic party."

The Editor of the "Winchester Virginian," a Democratic paper, has written from Baltimore, a long letter to his paper, from which we extract the following: "The nomination of Mr. Douglas was opposed for more reasons than one. He did not agree with us on an important principle. In his effort to gain Northern votes he sacrificed a principle of vital importance to the South. He was not in favor of the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court, and has long been a bitter opponent of Mr. Buchanan's administration—an administration that has been true to the South—true to all parts of the Union, and worthy of the cordial support of all its friends. The nomination of Mr. Douglas was not only a betrayal of the South, but it was a betrayal of the Union. It was a betrayal of the principles of the Democratic party, and it was a betrayal of the peace and integrity of the Democratic party."

The Editor of the "Winchester Virginian," a Democratic paper, has written from Baltimore, a long letter to his paper, from which we extract the following: "The nomination of Mr. Douglas was opposed for more reasons than one. He did not agree with us on an important principle. In his effort to gain Northern votes he sacrificed a principle of vital importance to the South. He was not in favor of the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court, and has long been a bitter opponent of Mr. Buchanan's administration—an administration that has been true to the South—true to all parts of the Union, and worthy of the cordial support of all its friends. The nomination of Mr. Douglas was not only a betrayal of the South, but it was a betrayal of the Union. It was a betrayal of the principles of the Democratic party, and it was a betrayal of the peace and integrity of the Democratic party."

The Editor of the "Winchester Virginian," a Democratic paper, has written from Baltimore, a long letter to his paper, from which we extract the following: "The nomination of Mr. Douglas was opposed for more reasons than one. He did not agree with us on an important principle. In his effort to gain Northern votes he sacrificed a principle of vital importance to the South. He was not in favor of the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court, and has long been a bitter opponent of Mr. Buchanan's administration—an administration that has been true to the South—true to all parts of the Union, and worthy of the cordial support of all its friends. The nomination of Mr. Douglas was not only a betrayal of the South, but it was a betrayal of the Union. It was a betrayal of the principles of the Democratic party, and it was a betrayal of the peace and integrity of the Democratic party."

The Editor of the "Winchester Virginian," a Democratic paper, has written from Baltimore, a long letter to his paper, from which we extract the following: "The nomination of Mr. Douglas was opposed for more reasons than one. He did not agree with us on an important principle. In his effort to gain Northern votes he sacrificed a principle of vital importance to the South. He was not in favor of the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court, and has long been a bitter opponent of Mr. Buchanan's administration—an administration that has been true to the South—true to all parts of the Union, and worthy of the cordial support of all its friends. The nomination of Mr. Douglas was not only a betrayal of the South, but it was a betrayal of the Union. It was a betrayal of the principles of the Democratic party, and it was a betrayal of the peace and integrity of the Democratic party."

The Editor of the "Winchester Virginian," a Democratic paper, has written from Baltimore, a long letter to his paper, from which we extract the following: "The nomination of Mr. Douglas was opposed for more reasons than one. He did not agree with us on an important principle. In his effort to gain Northern votes he sacrificed a principle of vital importance to the South. He was not in favor of the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court, and has long been a bitter opponent of Mr. Buchanan's administration—an administration that has been true to the South—true to all parts of the Union, and worthy of the cordial support of all its friends. The nomination of Mr. Douglas was not only a betrayal of the South, but it was a betrayal of the Union. It was a betrayal of the principles



