

Montgomery County Sentinel.

One Dollar and Fifty Cents, if paid in advance.

ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND, FRIDAY MORNING, MAY 25, 1860.

Two Dollars, if paid at the end of the year.

Vol. V.—No. 43.

By M. Fields.

COUNTY ADVERTISEMENTS.

WASHINGTON HOTEL

ROCKVILLE, Maryland.

PERRY TRAIL, Proprietor.

THIS undersigned having leased the above establishment, which is now undergoing thorough repair, would respectfully solicit continuance of the patronage heretofore so liberally bestowed upon it. It assures his friends and the public generally, that every effort, on his part, will be made to contribute to the ease and comfort of all who may favor him with their patronage.

THIS TABLE will always be supplied with the best of the market afforded, and at the best of prices. The choice of liquors and cigars will be found the choicest brands of Liquors and Cigars.

THE STABLES attached to the house is large and commodious, and as none but attentive drivers will be employed, persons stopping at this house may rely upon their horses being well attended to.

His charges will be very moderate.

JOHN A. T. KILGOUR.

GOOD EATING & CAPITAL DRINKING

KILGOUR'S SALOON,

Rockville, Md.

THE subscriber has his saloon open for the reception of his liberal patrons, and has secured the best of the market afforded, and at the best of prices. The choice of liquors and cigars will be found the choicest brands of Liquors and Cigars.

His charges will be very moderate.

JOHN A. T. KILGOUR.

SERVANTS WANTED.

THE subscriber wishes to purchase a number of MERVANTS, of both sexes, that are young, stout and healthy. The highest wages will be paid for those having no previous habits, and for those having previous habits, but who are willing to give up all such habits, and to devote themselves to the service of their masters.

Letters addressed to J. M. PRICE, Rockville, Md., will be promptly attended to.

NEGROES WANTED.

THE subscriber wishes to purchase a number of NEGROES, of both sexes, that are young, stout and healthy. The highest wages will be paid for those having no previous habits, and for those having previous habits, but who are willing to give up all such habits, and to devote themselves to the service of their masters.

Letters addressed to J. M. PRICE, Rockville, Md., will be promptly attended to.

CARPENTERS & UNDERTAKING.

THE citizens of Rockville and the public generally are informed that the undersigned will undertake the above business, at his old stand in Rockville, near the Methodist Church. He will attend to all work entrusted to him, and guarantee to do the best in the most economical manner, and on terms that cannot fail to please.

Having furnished himself with a new set of machinery, he is now prepared to undertake the above business, at his old stand in Rockville, near the Methodist Church. He will attend to all work entrusted to him, and guarantee to do the best in the most economical manner, and on terms that cannot fail to please.

WALLIS & CRIMES,

CONTRACTORS AND BUILDERS,

SENECA, Montgomery County, Md.

THE method of forming the citizens of Montgomery County, Md., is now prepared to do all kinds of work in their line, at the shortest notice, in the best possible manner, and on the most reasonable terms.

BUTCHERING.

THE subscriber having located himself about half a mile above Rockville, on the Frederick road, and erected a slaughter house, would inform the citizens of Rockville and the county, that he will at all times be prepared to furnish them with

Fresh Meats,

on very moderate terms. FOR CASH. He will bring meats into the village every Tuesday and Friday morning.

AUCTIONEERING.

W. M. Y. ALLEN, Auctioneer, will attend to sales in any portion of the county, and respectfully solicits a share of the public patronage. His charges are moderate. All orders left at the "Sentinel" office, or directed to him at Rockville, will be promptly attended to.

GROCERIES.

JUST RECEIVED a large supply of Fresh Groceries, which I am disposing of at the lowest prices. W. M. Y. ALLEN, 127 S. Baltimore Building, Rockville.

Historical.

FIRST JAPANESE VISIT TO A FOREIGN NATION.

The following is a translation from a volume by Mrs. Cuddeh, entitled "A History of the Missions in Japan and Paraguy," an account of a former embassy from Japan to the Pope.

It was brought about by Father Valigan, vicar-general of the missions of Japan and consisted of two young Princes, Mancho Ito, nephew and representative of the King of Bungo, and Michael (his new name as a convert), who was in the name and under the authority of the King of Arima and Oura. To these were subsequently added two other nobles, none of the age being more than sixteen years of age, but wise and prudent, as indeed their subsequent conduct proved, beyond all question.

It had been previously arranged that in order to facilitate their journey, and escape the observation of pirates, who abounded in these unpopulated seas, they should travel without any such train as would otherwise have attended their rank.

They were received (at Goa) by the Portuguese Viceroy of the Indies with all imaginable courtesy and kindness; and was this favorable feeling in their regard confined in its exhibition to the palace, for they were welcomed to the city by universal public rejoicings.

The archbishop showed them every fatherly attention in his power, and the Jesuit fathers in a deputation of their scholars to congratulate them on their arrival—a compliment with which the young ambassadors appear to have been particularly delighted.

The Viceroy himself selected the best and strongest vessel which sailed from Goa that year for their passage, and besides a magnificent gold chain and reliquary which he presented to each, he placed three thousand crowns (a magnificent outfit for that period) at their disposal for the expenses of their journey.

Their voyage to Europe proved as fortunate as that to the Indies had been; the contrary, and without any adventures worth recording they cast anchor in the Tagus on the 20th of February, 1581, just two years after their departure from Nangasaki.

Intelligence of their approach had already been conveyed by one of the fast sailing vessels of the Indian fleet, and Lisbon was prepared to receive them in the most magnificent manner. From motives of prudence, however, Father Maligian had forbidden any public demonstration in their honor at first; and when out by the fatigue of their long voyage, the Princes themselves were glad to take refuge from all ceremonial in the professed house of the Jesuits.

The morning after their arrival they waited on Cardinal Albert, the governor of the Kingdom, to whom they presented a cup of horn, fashioned in their own country, and richly set in silver. The few following days were spent in examining all that was most superb in the way of churches and palaces that the city could boast of, and then from Lisbon they went to Ebro, to visit the Archbishop. Immense multitudes flocked thither to behold them, and when they entered the sacred building the whole congregation burst into tears of joy to see them bow down before the altar, ambassadors as they were from a heathen nation; and sent hither in its name and at its bidding to acknowledge sovereignty of the one true God.

The next point of interest in their travels was Madrid. Philip II received them in the midst of his family, embracing them affectionately, and bidding his children do the same. By the King's orders, they were then taken to see everything most worthy of notice in Madrid and its environs, the Escorial, the arsenal, the treasury-chambers, with their incalculable wealth of jewels, &c.; and on their final departure for Italy Philip came in person to take leave of them at the College, his royal munificence following them even to the port from whence they were to sail; their journey through the rest of his dominions being made entire-

Political.

ADDRESS TO THE NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

The undersigned, members of the National Democratic party, supporters of its principles and deeply anxious by promoting its harmony to preserve unimpaired the integrity of our organization, desire to join in concert with their Democratic brethren throughout the United States.

The proceedings of the Convention recently assembled at Charleston have developed a divergence of opinion between the delegations of the different States in relation to the principles which form the basis of our Union. The National Democratic platform adopted at Cincinnati in 1856 met the cordial approval of all who believe these United States to be what their very name imports, a union of States equal, sovereign, and endowed in all respects with equal rights.

This approval was based on what seemed to be the plain meaning of the resolutions embodied in that platform.

During the four years, however, which have since intervened, it has become painfully apparent that the construction deemed by us so manifestly right is contended for by many members of our party; that other principles are supposed to find countenance in that platform—principles in our judgment, subversive of the true theory of the government and of the constitution to which our Union owes its birth, and of whose preservation its permanent existence depends.

What is the history of the recent Convention at Charleston?

Seventeen States, forming a majority of the whole, adopted with remarkable unanimity a platform of principles so worded as to avoid the possibility of misconstruction—principles deemed political axioms by all who uphold the equal rights of the States as the very basis of the Confederacy.

Many delegates from the remaining sixteen States concurred in opinion with this majority, conspicuous amongst whom were delegates from Pennsylvania and New Jersey.

The States which adopted this platform give electoral votes which are relied on with absolute certainty in favor of Democratic nominees, and will undoubtedly secure the election of a Democratic President.

This platform was deliberately rejected by a combination composed of a small fraction of the delegates from the seventeen Democratic States and a very large majority of the delegates of the remaining sixteen States; and a resolution was adopted in its stead simply re-affirming the principles of the Cincinnati platform, without explanation or interpretation of its disputed meaning.

This was done with the openly avowed purpose of enabling the Democratic party to wage battle with some chance of success in certain Northern and Western States by presenting to the people as its doctrine principles openly and expressly repudiated by a majority of the Democratic State delegations, and by a majority of the electoral votes of the Union.

The delegations of eight States, together with a portion of that of Delaware, faithful adherents of our party and firm supporters of its principles, were thus, by sheer force of votes cast by delegates from States that will certainly vote for the republican candidate, compelled to withdraw from the Convention, because, in the language of a distinguished delegate, they felt "that it was a burning indignation upon the honor and patriotism of the party, that, claiming to be the national and claiming to have principles for its guide, it should acknowledge for its declaration of faith a creed upon which are placed two distinctly opposite interpretations by its own advocates."

We cannot refrain from expressing our admiration and approval of this lofty manifestation of adherence to principle, rising superior to all considerations of expediency, to all trammels of party, and looking with a single eye to the defence of the constitutional rights of the States.

The delegations of other Democratic States, however, (including a few delegates from the seceding States,) not less faithful in devotion to principles, were more hopeful of obtaining from their brethren some satisfactory recognition of sound principles, and decided on remaining in the Convention after distinctly declaring, however, their determination also to withdraw if their just expectations should be disappointed.

It is thus apparent that there was almost entire unanimity of principle in the delegations of the only States on which absolute reliance can be placed for Democratic electoral votes, whilst there existed diversity of opinion as to the line of policy best calculated to secure the triumph of those principles. Nor is it matter of surprise that in a conjuncture so unexpected and anomalous, when, in the enumeration of Democratic principles, the voice of Virginia was overborne by that of Ohio, Louisiana and Arkansas were forced to succumb to Vermont and Michigan, there should be excited feelings, divided councils, and discordant action.

In the subsequent proceeding of the Convention, however, we think that distinct intimations may be discerned of a disposition on the part of the Convention to recede from its determination, and to afford, either by an amendment of the

Political.

ADDRESS TO THE NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

The undersigned, members of the National Democratic party, supporters of its principles and deeply anxious by promoting its harmony to preserve unimpaired the integrity of our organization, desire to join in concert with their Democratic brethren throughout the United States.

The proceedings of the Convention recently assembled at Charleston have developed a divergence of opinion between the delegations of the different States in relation to the principles which form the basis of our Union. The National Democratic platform adopted at Cincinnati in 1856 met the cordial approval of all who believe these United States to be what their very name imports, a union of States equal, sovereign, and endowed in all respects with equal rights.

This approval was based on what seemed to be the plain meaning of the resolutions embodied in that platform.

During the four years, however, which have since intervened, it has become painfully apparent that the construction deemed by us so manifestly right is contended for by many members of our party; that other principles are supposed to find countenance in that platform—principles in our judgment, subversive of the true theory of the government and of the constitution to which our Union owes its birth, and of whose preservation its permanent existence depends.

What is the history of the recent Convention at Charleston?

Seventeen States, forming a majority of the whole, adopted with remarkable unanimity a platform of principles so worded as to avoid the possibility of misconstruction—principles deemed political axioms by all who uphold the equal rights of the States as the very basis of the Confederacy.

Many delegates from the remaining sixteen States concurred in opinion with this majority, conspicuous amongst whom were delegates from Pennsylvania and New Jersey.

The States which adopted this platform give electoral votes which are relied on with absolute certainty in favor of Democratic nominees, and will undoubtedly secure the election of a Democratic President.

This platform was deliberately rejected by a combination composed of a small fraction of the delegates from the seventeen Democratic States and a very large majority of the delegates of the remaining sixteen States; and a resolution was adopted in its stead simply re-affirming the principles of the Cincinnati platform, without explanation or interpretation of its disputed meaning.

This was done with the openly avowed purpose of enabling the Democratic party to wage battle with some chance of success in certain Northern and Western States by presenting to the people as its doctrine principles openly and expressly repudiated by a majority of the Democratic State delegations, and by a majority of the electoral votes of the Union.

The delegations of eight States, together with a portion of that of Delaware, faithful adherents of our party and firm supporters of its principles, were thus, by sheer force of votes cast by delegates from States that will certainly vote for the republican candidate, compelled to withdraw from the Convention, because, in the language of a distinguished delegate, they felt "that it was a burning indignation upon the honor and patriotism of the party, that, claiming to be the national and claiming to have principles for its guide, it should acknowledge for its declaration of faith a creed upon which are placed two distinctly opposite interpretations by its own advocates."

We cannot refrain from expressing our admiration and approval of this lofty manifestation of adherence to principle, rising superior to all considerations of expediency, to all trammels of party, and looking with a single eye to the defence of the constitutional rights of the States.

The delegations of other Democratic States, however, (including a few delegates from the seceding States,) not less faithful in devotion to principles, were more hopeful of obtaining from their brethren some satisfactory recognition of sound principles, and decided on remaining in the Convention after distinctly declaring, however, their determination also to withdraw if their just expectations should be disappointed.

It is thus apparent that there was almost entire unanimity of principle in the delegations of the only States on which absolute reliance can be placed for Democratic electoral votes, whilst there existed diversity of opinion as to the line of policy best calculated to secure the triumph of those principles. Nor is it matter of surprise that in a conjuncture so unexpected and anomalous, when, in the enumeration of Democratic principles, the voice of Virginia was overborne by that of Ohio, Louisiana and Arkansas were forced to succumb to Vermont and Michigan, there should be excited feelings, divided councils, and discordant action.

In the subsequent proceeding of the Convention, however, we think that distinct intimations may be discerned of a disposition on the part of the Convention to recede from its determination, and to afford, either by an amendment of the

Political.

ADDRESS TO THE NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

The undersigned, members of the National Democratic party, supporters of its principles and deeply anxious by promoting its harmony to preserve unimpaired the integrity of our organization, desire to join in concert with their Democratic brethren throughout the United States.

The proceedings of the Convention recently assembled at Charleston have developed a divergence of opinion between the delegations of the different States in relation to the principles which form the basis of our Union. The National Democratic platform adopted at Cincinnati in 1856 met the cordial approval of all who believe these United States to be what their very name imports, a union of States equal, sovereign, and endowed in all respects with equal rights.

This approval was based on what seemed to be the plain meaning of the resolutions embodied in that platform.

During the four years, however, which have since intervened, it has become painfully apparent that the construction deemed by us so manifestly right is contended for by many members of our party; that other principles are supposed to find countenance in that platform—principles in our judgment, subversive of the true theory of the government and of the constitution to which our Union owes its birth, and of whose preservation its permanent existence depends.

What is the history of the recent Convention at Charleston?

Seventeen States, forming a majority of the whole, adopted with remarkable unanimity a platform of principles so worded as to avoid the possibility of misconstruction—principles deemed political axioms by all who uphold the equal rights of the States as the very basis of the Confederacy.

Many delegates from the remaining sixteen States concurred in opinion with this majority, conspicuous amongst whom were delegates from Pennsylvania and New Jersey.

The States which adopted this platform give electoral votes which are relied on with absolute certainty in favor of Democratic nominees, and will undoubtedly secure the election of a Democratic President.

This platform was deliberately rejected by a combination composed of a small fraction of the delegates from the seventeen Democratic States and a very large majority of the delegates of the remaining sixteen States; and a resolution was adopted in its stead simply re-affirming the principles of the Cincinnati platform, without explanation or interpretation of its disputed meaning.

This was done with the openly avowed purpose of enabling the Democratic party to wage battle with some chance of success in certain Northern and Western States by presenting to the people as its doctrine principles openly and expressly repudiated by a majority of the Democratic State delegations, and by a majority of the electoral votes of the Union.

The delegations of eight States, together with a portion of that of Delaware, faithful adherents of our party and firm supporters of its principles, were thus, by sheer force of votes cast by delegates from States that will certainly vote for the republican candidate, compelled to withdraw from the Convention, because, in the language of a distinguished delegate, they felt "that it was a burning indignation upon the honor and patriotism of the party, that, claiming to be the national and claiming to have principles for its guide, it should acknowledge for its declaration of faith a creed upon which are placed two distinctly opposite interpretations by its own advocates."

We cannot refrain from expressing our admiration and approval of this lofty manifestation of adherence to principle, rising superior to all considerations of expediency, to all trammels of party, and looking with a single eye to the defence of the constitutional rights of the States.

The delegations of other Democratic States, however, (including a few delegates from the seceding States,) not less faithful in devotion to principles, were more hopeful of obtaining from their brethren some satisfactory recognition of sound principles, and decided on remaining in the Convention after distinctly declaring, however, their determination also to withdraw if their just expectations should be disappointed.

It is thus apparent that there was almost entire unanimity of principle in the delegations of the only States on which absolute reliance can be placed for Democratic electoral votes, whilst there existed diversity of opinion as to the line of policy best calculated to secure the triumph of those principles. Nor is it matter of surprise that in a conjuncture so unexpected and anomalous, when, in the enumeration of Democratic principles, the voice of Virginia was overborne by that of Ohio, Louisiana and Arkansas were forced to succumb to Vermont and Michigan, there should be excited feelings, divided councils, and discordant action.

In the subsequent proceeding of the Convention, however, we think that distinct intimations may be discerned of a disposition on the part of the Convention to recede from its determination, and to afford, either by an amendment of the

Political.

ADDRESS TO THE NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

The undersigned, members of the National Democratic party, supporters of its principles and deeply anxious by promoting its harmony to preserve unimpaired the integrity of our organization, desire to join in concert with their Democratic brethren throughout the United States.

The proceedings of the Convention recently assembled at Charleston have developed a divergence of opinion between the delegations of the different States in relation to the principles which form the basis of our Union. The National Democratic platform adopted at Cincinnati in 1856 met the cordial approval of all who believe these United States to be what their very name imports, a union of States equal, sovereign, and endowed in all respects with equal rights.

This approval was based on what seemed to be the plain meaning of the resolutions embodied in that platform.

During the four years, however, which have since intervened, it has become painfully apparent that the construction deemed by us so manifestly right is contended for by many members of our party; that other principles are supposed to find countenance in that platform—principles in our judgment, subversive of the true theory of the government and of the constitution to which our Union owes its birth, and of whose preservation its permanent existence depends.

What is the history of the recent Convention at Charleston?

Seventeen States, forming a majority of the whole, adopted with remarkable unanimity a platform of principles so worded as to avoid the possibility of misconstruction—principles deemed political axioms by all who uphold the equal rights of the States as the very basis of the Confederacy.

Many delegates from the remaining sixteen States concurred in opinion with this majority, conspicuous amongst whom were delegates from Pennsylvania and New Jersey.

The States which adopted this platform give electoral votes which are relied on with absolute certainty in favor of Democratic nominees, and will undoubtedly secure the election of a Democratic President.

This platform was deliberately rejected by a combination composed of a small fraction of the delegates from the seventeen Democratic States and a very large majority of the delegates of the remaining sixteen States; and a resolution was adopted in its stead simply re-affirming the principles of the Cincinnati platform, without explanation or interpretation of its disputed meaning.

This was done with the openly avowed purpose of enabling the Democratic party to wage battle with some chance of success in certain Northern and Western States by presenting to the people as its doctrine principles openly and expressly repudiated by a majority of the Democratic State delegations, and by a majority of the electoral votes of the Union.

The delegations of eight States, together with a portion of that of Delaware, faithful adherents of our party and firm supporters of its principles, were thus, by sheer force of votes cast by delegates from States that will certainly vote for the republican candidate, compelled to withdraw from the Convention, because, in the language of a distinguished delegate, they felt "that it was a burning indignation upon the honor and patriotism of the party, that, claiming to be the national and claiming to have principles for its guide, it should acknowledge for its declaration of faith a creed upon which are placed two distinctly opposite interpretations by its own advocates."

We cannot refrain from expressing our admiration and approval of this lofty manifestation of adherence to principle, rising superior to all considerations of expediency, to all trammels of party, and looking with a single eye to the defence of the constitutional rights of the States.

The delegations of other Democratic States, however, (including a few delegates from the seceding States,) not less faithful in devotion to principles, were more hopeful of obtaining from their brethren some satisfactory recognition of sound principles, and decided on remaining in the Convention after distinctly declaring, however, their determination also to withdraw if their just expectations should be disappointed.

It is thus apparent that there was almost entire unanimity of principle in the delegations of the only States on which absolute reliance can be placed for Democratic electoral votes, whilst there existed diversity of opinion as to the line of policy best calculated to secure the triumph of those principles. Nor is it matter of surprise that in a conjuncture so unexpected and anomalous, when, in the enumeration of Democratic principles, the voice of Virginia was overborne by that of Ohio, Louisiana and Arkansas were forced to succumb to Vermont and Michigan, there should be excited feelings, divided councils, and discordant action.

In the subsequent proceeding of the Convention, however, we think that distinct intimations may be discerned of a disposition on the part of the Convention to recede from its determination, and to afford, either by an amendment of the

Political.

ADDRESS TO THE NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

The undersigned, members of the National Democratic party, supporters of its principles and deeply anxious by promoting its harmony to preserve unimpaired the integrity of our organization, desire to join in concert with their Democratic brethren throughout the United States.

The proceedings of the Convention recently assembled at Charleston have developed a divergence of opinion between the delegations of the different States in relation to the principles which form the basis of our Union. The National Democratic platform adopted at Cincinnati in 1856 met the cordial approval of all who believe these United States to be what their very name imports, a union of States equal, sovereign, and endowed in all respects with equal rights.

This approval was based on what seemed to be the plain meaning of the resolutions embodied in that platform.

During the four years, however, which have since intervened, it has become painfully apparent that the construction deemed by us so manifestly right is contended for by many members of our party; that other principles are supposed to find countenance in that platform—principles in our judgment, subversive of the true theory of the government and of the constitution to which our Union owes its birth, and of whose preservation its permanent existence depends.

What is the history of the recent Convention at Charleston?

Seventeen States, forming a majority of the whole, adopted with remarkable unanimity a platform of principles so worded as to avoid the possibility of misconstruction—principles deemed political axioms by all who uphold the equal rights of the States as the very basis of the Confederacy.

Many delegates from the remaining sixteen States concurred in opinion with this majority, conspicuous amongst whom were delegates from Pennsylvania and New Jersey.

The States which adopted this platform give electoral votes which are relied on with absolute certainty in favor of Democratic nominees, and will undoubtedly secure the election of a Democratic President.

This platform was deliberately rejected by a combination composed of a small fraction of the delegates from the seventeen Democratic States and a very large majority of the delegates of the remaining sixteen States; and a resolution was adopted in its stead simply re-affirming the principles of the Cincinnati platform, without explanation or interpretation of its disputed meaning.

This was done with the openly avowed purpose of enabling the Democratic party to wage battle with some chance of success in certain Northern and Western States by presenting to the people as its doctrine principles openly and expressly repudiated by a majority of the Democratic State delegations, and by a majority of the electoral votes of the Union.

The delegations of eight States, together with a portion of that of Delaware, faithful adherents of our party and firm supporters of its principles, were thus, by sheer force of votes cast by delegates from States that will certainly vote for the republican candidate, compelled to withdraw from the Convention, because, in the language of a distinguished delegate, they felt "that it was a burning indignation upon the honor and patriotism of the party, that, claiming to be the national and claiming to have principles for its guide, it should acknowledge for its declaration of faith a creed upon which are placed two distinctly opposite interpretations by its own advocates."

We cannot refrain from expressing our admiration and approval of this lofty manifestation of adherence to principle, rising superior to all considerations of expediency, to all trammels of party, and looking with a single eye to the defence of the constitutional rights of the States.

The delegations of other Democratic States, however, (including a few delegates from the seceding States,) not less faithful in devotion to principles, were more hopeful of obtaining from their brethren some satisfactory recognition of sound principles, and decided on remaining in the Convention after distinctly declaring, however, their determination also to withdraw if their just expectations should be disappointed.

It is thus apparent that there was almost entire unanimity of principle in the delegations of the only States on which absolute reliance can be placed for Democratic electoral votes, whilst there existed diversity of opinion as to the line of policy best calculated to secure the triumph of those principles. Nor is it matter of surprise that in a conjuncture so unexpected and anomalous, when, in the enumeration of Democratic principles, the voice of Virginia was overborne by that of Ohio, Louisiana and Arkansas were forced to succumb to Vermont and Michigan, there should be excited feelings, divided councils, and discordant action.

In the subsequent proceeding of the Convention, however, we think that distinct intimations may be discerned of a disposition on the part of the Convention to recede from its determination, and to afford, either by an amendment of the

Political.

ADDRESS TO THE NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

The undersigned, members of the National Democratic party, supporters of its principles and deeply anxious by promoting its harmony to preserve unimpaired the integrity of our organization, desire to join in concert with their Democratic brethren throughout the United States.

The proceedings of the Convention recently assembled at Charleston have developed a divergence of opinion between the delegations of the different States in relation to the principles which form the basis of our Union. The National Democratic platform adopted at Cincinnati in 1856 met the cordial approval of all who believe these United States to be what their very name imports, a union of States equal, sovereign, and endowed in all respects with equal rights.

This approval was based on what seemed to be the plain meaning of the resolutions embodied in that platform.

During the four years, however, which have since intervened, it has become painfully apparent that the construction deemed by us so manifestly right is contended for by many members of our party; that other principles are supposed to find countenance in that platform—principles in our judgment, subversive of the true theory of the government and of the constitution to which our Union owes its birth, and of whose preservation its permanent existence depends.

What is the history of the recent Convention at Charleston?

Seventeen States, forming a majority of the whole, adopted with remarkable unanimity a platform of principles so worded as to avoid the possibility of misconstruction—principles deemed political axioms by all who uphold the equal rights of the States as the very basis of the Confederacy.

Many delegates from the remaining sixteen States concurred in opinion with this majority, conspicuous amongst whom were delegates from Pennsylvania and New Jersey.

The States which adopted this platform give electoral votes which are relied on with absolute certainty in favor of Democratic nominees, and will undoubtedly secure the election of a Democratic President.

This platform was deliberately rejected by a combination composed of a small fraction of the delegates from the seventeen Democratic States and a very large majority of the delegates of the remaining sixteen States; and a resolution was adopted in its stead simply re-affirming the principles of the Cincinnati platform, without explanation or interpretation of its disputed meaning.

This was done with the openly avowed purpose of enabling the Democratic party to wage battle with some chance of success in certain Northern and Western States by presenting to the people as its doctrine principles openly and expressly repudiated by a majority of the Democratic State delegations, and by a majority of the electoral votes of the Union.

The delegations of eight States, together with a portion of that of Delaware, faithful adherents of our party and firm supporters of its principles, were thus, by sheer force of votes cast by delegates from States that will certainly vote for the republican candidate, compelled to withdraw from the Convention, because, in the language of a distinguished delegate, they felt "that it was a burning indignation upon the honor and patriotism of the party, that, claiming to be the national and claiming to have principles for its guide, it should acknowledge for its declaration of faith a creed upon which are placed two distinctly opposite interpretations by its own advocates."

We cannot refrain from expressing our admiration and approval of this lofty manifestation of adherence to principle, rising superior to all considerations of expediency, to all trammels of party, and looking with a single eye to the defence of the constitutional rights of the States.

The delegations of other Democratic States, however, (including a few delegates from the seceding States,) not less faithful in devotion to principles, were more hopeful of obtaining from their brethren some satisfactory recognition of sound principles, and decided on remaining in the Convention after distinctly declaring, however, their determination also to withdraw if their just expectations should be disappointed.

It is thus apparent that there was almost entire unanimity of principle in the delegations of the only States on which absolute reliance can be placed for Democratic electoral votes, whilst there existed diversity of opinion as to the line of policy best calculated to secure the triumph of those principles. Nor is it matter of surprise that in a conjuncture so unexpected and anomalous, when, in the enumeration of Democratic principles, the voice of Virginia was overborne by that of Ohio, Louisiana and Arkansas were forced to succumb to Vermont and Michigan, there should be excited feelings, divided councils, and discordant action.

In the subsequent proceeding of the Convention, however, we think that distinct intimations may be discerned of a disposition on the part of the Convention to recede from its determination, and to afford, either by an amendment of the

platform or in some other manner equally satisfactory, such recognition of principles as would effectually obviate misconstruction and secure the harmonious action of the party, and that it was only because of these intimations that the delegations of the remaining Democratic States