The Beaver Argus.

J. WEYAND, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

Beaver, Pa., May 27, 1868.

FOR PRESIDENT,

Ulysses S. Grant.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT,

Schuyler Colfax.

Republican State Ticket.

AUDITOR GENERAL.
GEN. JOHN F. HARTRANFT,
OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY.

SURVEYOR GENERAL.
GEN. JACOB M. CAMPBELL,
OF CAMBRIA COUNTY.

THE primary meetings of the Republican party of this county will be held on next Saturday. Every Republican in the county should make an effort to attend and take part in nominating the ticket that will solicit his vote in October.

IMPEACHMENT did some good. It compelled Johnson to "keep his hands off Reconstruction" the last three month. As a result most of the Rebel States are so far on the path to restoration that he will now hardly be able to keep them out. When admitted, and local government secured to them, they will be able to take care of the traitors in their midst, and hold fair elections, which will enable the Republicans to carry most of them. This will ensure Grant's election.

WE desire our Republican friends throughout the county to bear in mind on next Saturday, that they are called upon to vote either for or against the popular vote system of nominating candidates. The words "Popular Vote System," are printed on each ticket, and a blank left for the words "for" or "against." This blank is to be filled up by the Republican voter, and we would like to have the pleasure of announcing in our next issue that this conciliatory and just measure has been adopted by the people in whose behalf it is urged.

The Popular Vote System.

A great many earnest Republicans of this county are inclined to the belief that the adoption of the popular vote system here will not stimulate country Republicans to attend our primary meetings. To such as these we commend the following which appeared in the Philadelphia *Press* the morning succeeding the primary meetings in Lancaster county a few weeks ago. The Crawford county plan works well, and in both trials given the system in that county, it had the effect of bringing more Republicans to the primary meetings than ever attended before:

"Our special dispatch this morning from Lancaster county, giving the result of the delegate elections held there on Saturday, bears remarkable testimony to the practical working of what is popularly known as the Crawford county system. Under the rule of that system the election was conducted, and we have a return of 6,283 votes cast—almost seven thousand. In 1867 the Republican vote of Lancaster county cast at the general election for Judge Williams was 12,799; in 1866 for Governor Geary, 14,592; in 1865 for General Hartranft, 11,499; in 1864 for President Lincoln, 11,469. During the last four years, embracing a Presidential, gubernatorial judicial and general State election, the average Republican vote of the county polled at a general election has amounted to 13,302. On Saturday more than half that number of votes were brought out at a primary election. This speaks volumes for the system that elicited them. Those familiar with the ordinary working of the machinery of the government know how very rarely a primary or delegate vote approaches fifty or even twenty per cent. of the full strength of the party. Most generally, under the old system, twenty-five or thirty hacks, in the back room of a tavern, redolent with the fumes of bad whisky and worse tobacco, determine the whole matter for a ward or townships of from three to five hundred voters."

Under the delegate system of nominating, candidates make it a point to visit and consult only with the five or six leading men of each township. These same five or six persons are called upon by all of the candidates. They all take it for granted if the influence of these can be secured, they are "all right" in that township. The quiet, unobtrusive Republicans are thus not visited by candidates at all. They are left to be managed by the "leaders," and the result is they either stay away from the primary meetings entirely, or else they feel so little interested in the candidates as to vote for just such men as Mr. A. requests them to. The popular vote plan will work a reform in that particular. After its adoption every Republican in the county will know that his vote will count *one* for the men of his choice. Every candidate will know the same thing, and instead of all the candidates visiting only the same five or six prominent men in each township, they will make it a point to call upon all—the quiet, intelligent and unpretending, as well as upon the noisy and consequential. This state of things will bring about a better feeling among rural Republicans, they will take a lively interest in the respective candidates, attend the primary meetings, and do all they can for their favorites. Nor will the interest thus awakened, "die out" with the primary meetings. It will be kept up and be felt in the increased vote at the general election.

THE platform of the National Republican party for the present campaign will be found in another column. Lay it away for future reference. We have neither seen or heard tell of any Republican who is dissatisfied with anything the platform contains. On the other hand we are told that the cops are universally "down on it," not that it contains anything objectionable, but because they can find nothing in it to "carp" about. They are beat in our candidates, beat in the platform, and will be badly beaten at the election in November. They feel this in their "bones," and their attempts to hide it from the public prove wholly unsuccessful.

THE Constitutional *Union* of Washington D. C. the National organ of the Democratic party, has come out in favor of Chase for the Presidency, and urges the Democratic Convention at New York on the 4th of July, to adopt him as its candidate for that office. The *Union's* article urging this is said to have been inspired at the White House, and published with Mr. Chase's consent. So we go.

WE trust no one will conclude from what we have already said or from what we will now say against the delegate system and in favor of the popular vote plan of nominating candidates for county offices, that we believe the delegate system to be working worse in this county than it does elsewhere. Nor do we wish to be understood as charging dishonesty, "trickery and fraud" upon the great body of delegates that annually attend our county conventions. On the contrary we know that *most of these* are honest, faithful men, and intent on carrying out the will of the people as they understand it; but while this is true of a large majority, it is equally true that a small minority generally find their way into county conventions who are more anxious about *themselves* than they are about the will of their constituents or their party's success. They look over the field after they get to the county seat, "they are seen" by professional "log-rollers" or scheming politicians, and talked to in this way: "You can vote for the men for whom you are instructed the first time, but if they are not successful then give Mr. So & So a lift after that. He and his friends will remember the kindness, and when you are a candidate they will repay it." Whether these promises are made in good faith or not, they have their effect, and it very frequently happens that when delegates are casting their first vote in accordance with their home instructions, their influence is in another direction, and they are doing all in their power to nominate candidates who received no votes in the townships they represent. Hence it is that the singular spectacle is often presented to us of a candidate coming into a convention with the greatest number of delegates instructed for him, and yet going out of it without a nomination. And who among us cannot recall a number of instances of a candidate coming into our county conventions with scarcely any delegates at all to back him, and yet coming off "more than victor" before the convention adjourned? If disposed to do so, we could point our readers to many cases of this character. In all of these instances combinations were formed among the delegates, scheming politicians were the "go-betweens," they knew their men, and by promising to do this thing and that thing for this delegate and that delegate at some future time, they were enabled to defeat just who they pleased and nominate almost any man they desired. The whole thing was done on the principle "if you tickle me I'll tickle you," and the people as a general thing were left in blissful ignorance as to how it was brought about.—"One of the People" professes to believe that all delegates are honest and faithful, and that nothing of this character takes place, but upon what other hypothesis can he explain the stubborn facts that in two cases out of three the candidates having the highest number of delegates are defeated and the one's having the lowest number are frequently nominated?

The drift of his argument is intended to show that power may *always* be entrusted to representatives of the people. Our observation goes to show that power is *safer* in the hands of the people themselves. Let us illustrate this: A few weeks ago the Democrats of this county instructed their representatives to nominate either J. M. Hartford or S. T. Hamilton as their candidate for the Legislature. These representatives threw their instructions back into the faces of their constituents, after coming to Beaver, and nominated John White, a gentleman who had not received a single vote from the people for that position. The people in this instance were brazenly betrayed, and the power conferred upon their representatives was abused. A month or two ago the Republican State Convention instructed the Pennsylvania delegates to vote as a unit in the Chicago Convention for A. G. Curtin for Vice President. Three or four of the representatives of the party violated these instructions, and not only voted against Mr. Curtin at Chicago, but labored night and day to compass his defeat. If the people of the United States had voted ten days ago on the question of convicting the President of high crimes and misdemeanors, he would have been adjudged guilty, but the people's representatives in the Senate pronounced him innocent, and thus gave a new lease of power to the greatest usurper and criminal of our times. These instances are sufficient to show that power is not always safe in the hands of representatives and rarely abused while held by the *people*.

The opportunities for committing frauds are no better under the popular vote system than under the present one. In both cases the voting is done by ballot. Three men are chosen to receive the ballots, count the vote and announce the result. If these three would band together, and commit moral perjury under the popular vote plan and declare an untrue result, would they not do the same under the delegate system? Their obligations are the same under either plan, and if they were disposed to swindle their party they could do it as stealthily and as efficiently under one system as under the other! The restraints of one are thrown around both, and as an additional check upon frauds, a registry is provided and must be kept under the Crawford system, of all who take part in the meetings.

Our correspondent still insists that the popular vote plan was tried in Philadelphia and Pittsburgh and abandoned. We think he is mistaken. Some other plan was tried in these cities, as is evident from the fact that the Philadelphia *Press* and Pittsburgh *Commercial* have and are still urging the Republicans of their respective counties to adopt the Crawford county plan. If it was tried once and found defective these papers would not now be clamoring to have it tried again.

"Suppose we have next year ten candidates for Sheriff. Nine of the ten receive two hundred votes each, and the tenth receives two hundred and one. The last would be the nominee, notwithstanding he may be the last choice of all those who voted for the other nine. In that case 1799 would not equal 201. —"*One of the People.*"

That is an extreme case and one that is not likely to occur in a lifetime. But suppose it would happen frequently, in what respect would it be worse than the delegate system? In Beaver say we have 200 Republican voters. 49 of these go for Mr. A., 49 for Mr. B., 49 go for Mr. C. and 53 go for Mr. D. for Register & Recorder. Under the present system Mr. D gets the delegates and *all* the political power of the borough. The other candidates are not heard of in the convention, yet they had 147 votes while he had but 53! In this instance nearly three-fourths of all the voters of Beaver are disfranchised. Take another instance: In Brighton township there are say 81 Republican voters. Let there be ten candidates for Sheriff next year. Nine of the ten receive eight votes each, and the tenth receives nine votes. Under the delegate system the last would get the vote of all the delegates from the township, and the nine others though having seventy-two of the eighty-one votes, would be thrust aside and treated as if they had not received a single vote from the people. "In that case" seventy-two "votes would not equal" nine! By a multiplication of candidates a similar result may be reached in every township of the county, and a candidate given us who "may be the last choice of all those who voted for the other nine." But why expose his sophistry any further?

"I would now ask where it (the popular vote system) has worked well," says our correspondent. We answer wherever it has been fairly tried. In Westmoreland, in Venango, in Armstrong, in Mercer, Butler, Crawford, Erie, Warren and other counties it has been tested, and the longer it has been in use the more highly is it commended. The remark if it is once adopted here, and proves unsatisfactory, it will take "ten years" to repeal it, sounds like a reflection upon the intelligence of the Republican voters of the county. A free people may be tardy in adopting reforms but they are never slow in correcting palpable abuses. If the Crawford county system is adopted this season, and works badly next, it will be abandoned the following year without resistance.

The question of adopting the popular vote system in *this Congressional district or throughout the State*, is not now before the people.—When it is it can be discussed. Until then we shall let it rest.

Finally! Let us look upon the measure as an experiment, adopt it as such and give it a fair trial. To do so will work no harm to private individuals nor to the public generally. We owe this much to that large number of sturdy Republicans in the county who are dissatisfied with our present system. They have talked in favor of a change for years but a change has never been given to them. They have therefore kept aloof from the primary meetings of their party. The adoption of the Crawford system now will revive them politically. They will again take hold, gather under their party banner, help us to nominate our tickets, and aid us in fighting our "common enemy."

The National Republican Convention met at Chicago on the 20th, and adjourned on Thursday evening the 22d. The ticket nominated will be found at the head of our editorial column. It is a strong one and its success is a foregone conclusion. The names of Grant and Colfax are known all over the country, and none know them but to honor them. The nomination of these two distinguished individuals is received all over the country with the wildest enthusiasm, and we will be disappointed if they do not receive more electoral votes than were ever given to any two candidates before since the Government was established.

The convention was presided over temporarily by Gen. Carl Schurz, of Missouri. Ex-Governor Hawley of Connecticut was afterwards selected as permanent President of the Convention. When the nomination of a candidate for President of the United States was in order, Gen. John A. Logan of Illinois nominated Gen. Grant. No other name was announced for that office. The roll of the States was then called, and every one voted unanimously for that greatest of living soldiers, Gen. U. S. Grant of Illinois.

Some five or six candidates were then put in nomination for Vice President. These were supported by short, neat speeches from the chairmen of the respective State delegations. The first vote stood as follows: Wade 149; Fenton 132; Wilson 119; Colfax 118; Curtin 52; Hamlin 20. Remainder scattering. On the 5th ballot Colfax was nominated, Pennsylvania deciding the contest by voting for Colfax. The following is the platform adopted by the Convention:

The National Republican party of the United States, assembled in National Convention in the city of Chicago, on the 20th day of May, 1868, make the following declaration of principles:

1st. We congratulate the country on the assured success of the reconstruction policy of Congress, as evinced by the adoption in a majority of the States lately in rebellion of constitutions securing equal civil and political rights to all, and regard it as the duty of the Government to sustain those institutions and to prevent the people of such States from being remitted to a state of anarchy. [Cheers.]

Second. The guarantee by Congress of equal suffrage to all loyal men at the South was demanded by every consideration of public safety, of gratitude and of justice and must be maintained; while the question of suffrage in all the loyal States properly belongs to the people of those States. [Cheers.]

Third. We denounce all forms of repudiation as a National crime, [prolonged cheers.] and National honor requires the payment of the public indebtedness in the utmost good faith to all creditors at home and abroad, not only according to the letter but the spirit of the laws under which it was contracted.—[Applause.]

Fourth. It is due to the labor of the nation that taxation should be equalized and reduced as rapidly as the National faith will permit.

Fifth. The National debt, contracted as it has been for the preservation of the Union, for all time to come, should be extended over a fair period for redemption, and it is the duty of Congress to reduce the rate of interest thereon whenever it can honestly be done.

Sixth. That the best policy to diminish our burden of debt is to so improve our credit that capital will seek to loan money at lower rates of interest than we now pay and must continue to pay so long as repudiation, partial or total, open or covert, is threatened or suspected.

Seventh. The Government of the United States should be administered with the strictest economy, and the corruptions which have been so shamefully nursed and fostered by Andrew Johnson call loudly for radical reform.

Eighth. We profoundly deplore the untimely and tragic death of Abraham Lincoln, and regret the accession of Andrew Johnson to the Presidency, who has acted treacherously to the people who elected him and the cause he was placed in support; has usurped high legislative and judicial functions; has refused to execute the laws; has used his high office to induce other officers to ignore and violate the laws; has employed his executive powers to render insecure the property, peace, liberty, and life of the citizen; has abused the pardoning power, has denounced the National Legislature as unconstitutional; has persistently and corruptly resisted by every measure in his power every proper attempt at the reconstruction of the States lately in rebellion; has perverted the public patronage into an engine of wholesale corruption, and has been justly impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors, and properly pronounced guilty thereof by the vote of thirty-five senators.

Ninth. The doctrine of Great Britain and other European powers that because a man is once a subject he is always so, must be resisted at every hazard by the United States as a relic of the feudal times not authorized by the law of nations, and at war with our national honor and independence. Naturalized citizens are entitled to be protected in all their rights of citizenship, as though they were native born, and no citizen of the United States, native or naturalized, must be liable to arrest and imprisonment by any foreign power for acts done or words spoken in this country, and if so arrested and imprisoned it is the duty of the Government to interfere in his behalf.

Tenth. Of all who were faithful in the trials of the late war there are none entitled to more especial honor than the brave soldiers and seamen who endured the hardships of campaign and cruise, and imperilled their lives in the service of the country. The bounties and pensions provided by law for these brave defenders of the nation are obligations never to be forgotten. The widows and orphans of the gallant dead are the wards of the people, a sacred legacy bequeathed to the nation's protecting care.

Eleventh. Foreign emigration, which in the past has added so much to the wealth, development of resources and increase of power to this nation, the asylum of the oppressed of all nations, should be fostered and encouraged by a liberal and just policy.

Twelfth. This convention declares its sympathy with all the oppressed people which are struggling for their rights.

Mr. Thompson, Chairman from the Committee on Resolutions, reported the following additional resolution:

Resolved, That the adjournment of this Convention shall not work a dissolution of the same, but it shall remain as organized, subject to be called together again at any time and place that the National Republican Executive Committee shall designate.

Adopted.

General Schurz—I will now read what I intended to ask the Convention to adopt as an independent resolution:

Resolved, That we highly commend the spirit of magnanimity and forgiveness with which men who have served the rebellion, but now frankly and honestly co-operate with us in restoring the peace of the country, and reconstructing the Southern State governments upon the basis of impartial justice and equal rights, are received back into the communion of the loyal people, and we favor the removal of the disqualifications and restrictions imposed upon the late rebels in the same measure as the spirit of disloyalty will direct, and as may be consistent with the safety of the loyal people. [Cries "Good, good."]

That is my first amendment. It seems to me that the platform of the Republican party ought to contain at least a recognition of the great charter of our rights and liberties, the Declaration of Independence. I would, therefore, move that the following resolutions be added to those already reported by the Committee:

Resolved, That we recognize the great principles laid down in the immortal declaration of Independence as the true foundation of democratic government, and we hail with gladness every effort toward making these principles a living reality on every inch of American soil.

Mr. McClure, by the unanimous vote of the Pennsylvania delegation, seconded the motion for the adoption of these resolutions.

Mr. Gooch, of Massachusetts—I ask, Mr. President, that these resolutions by unanimous consent, may be made part of the platform which has just been adopted.

Mr. Warner, of Alabama—As a soldier of the Republic, who fought four years to subdue the rebellion, and now as an Alabama Republican, I desire to third these resolutions as expressing the sentiments of the Republicans of the unreconstructed States.

The resolutions were then adopted.

POPULAR VOTE AGAIN.

EDITOR ARGUS: After reading the last number of your paper, it is quite probable a large number of your readers will decline to pursue the popular vote argument further. I confess my article, and your rejoinder, look very formidable in print, and occupy space enough to discuss one question pretty thoroughly.

As you replied to my communication, at length, I am entitled to a re-butter, and feel I should reply briefly lest my position might be misunderstood, and lest it be thought I have been driven from the field and entirely routed.

Your whole argument is based upon the assertion that the delegate system is more liable to abuse, trickery and fraud than the popular vote system. This is the chief argument of all who favor a change. This assumes that delegates will not act honestly. That election districts will not elect honest men to represent them in county conventions.

This is an assumption no one has a right to make. They are to be presumed to act honestly, until the contrary appears. You, Mr. Editor, have no right to presume that delegates to a county convention will misrepresent their constituents. The country Republicans of Beaver county are noted for their honesty and intelligence. Nowhere else is dishonesty more improbable. Dishonesty and trickery cannot thrive in such a soil.—Neither is this presumption warranted by our past experience. The instances of delegates violating their instructions are very rare. One or two cases of dishonorable men doing so may be pointed out, but certainly none in the past five years. It has been frequently remarked, that in this county delegates stick too closely or too long. Last year, it seemed for some time, as if no candidate would be nominated for Assembly, because delegates would not quit voting for the candidates for whom they were instructed, although it was evident that some of them were not entitled, and had no chance of a nomination. When delegates violate their instructions they are generally not returned. They vote publicly. Every one knows of their treachery, and their condemnation is certain. The best men of the Townships are generally found in the conventions—intelligent and up-right men, who do not, and who cannot be pursuaded to swerve from the discharge of their bounden duty—men who cannot be controlled by cliques or cabals, as some unscrupulous politicians of the *coppery stripe pretend* to think.

Every year more care is manifested in the selection of delegates. Under our present system there has seldom been any just ground of complaint, and none since the *ballot* has taken the place of *marking*. No plan ever has or ever can be adopted that is entirely free from objections, and I do not undertake to claim perfection for the present mode, but only contend that it is better than the one proposed. If fraud may be perpetrated now I contend that if the change is made the temptation will be the greater, and the opportunities better. The election officers, not being sworn, how easy it is for the friends of a particular candidate to secure the appointment of men favorable to their candidate. When the election is over, they can and may change the result. The doors are closed for the count. Different tickets may be substituted for those voted, and a different result secured. The men who would betray their constituents, in convention, would not hesitate and could more effectually betray them in this way. No one could certainly detect the fraud, because no one would go to each voter, to find how they voted, and if they did it is easy to suppose a mistake was made in selecting a ticket.

This system was adopted in Pittsburgh and abandoned, because the stuffing of the ballot-box was so notorious it came very near defeating the party. After a trial they were forced to return to the delegate system. In Philadelphia the same result followed the adoption of the popular vote system. Even admitting that politicians may influence delegates to some extent, there is a wider field opened up to them by the popular vote system. Men are more apt to resort to fraud when it can be done in secret than in the open public mode.

The present way of nominating seems not only the best but fairest in my opinion. We vote directly for candidates, and the one receiving the most votes in the township receives the votes of the delegates. In case his nomination then fails, the delegates may vote for the next strongest man, in the township, if he has any chance of nomination. A majority of delegates is required to nominate, and this requires a majority of the popular vote.

Delegates but express the declared will of their constituents. Under the popular vote system a plurality nominates. Suppose we have next year ten candidates for Sheriff.—Nine of the ten receives two hundred votes each, and the tenth receives two hundred and one. The last would be the nominee, notwithstanding he may be the last choice of all those who voted for the other nine. In that case, 1799 votes, would not equal 201. Local sympathies may secure the nominee this vote at home, and of all the candidates he is the most unfit. This will often happen. There is no second choice. One vote may nominate, when if submitted to the people he would receive no more than he had, and either of the others would, as against him, receive all the balance. There is no justice nor safety in such a mode. Weak and incompetent men will be thrust on the party, and the result prove disastrous. If twenty candidates were in the field one hundred and one votes might nominate. This being the case a shrewd man would have the candidates multiplied that he might secure his own nomination. This, to me, is an irresistable argument against the proposed system.

It may be urged that this is so in elections. True, but there men differ from principle and there can be no other mode of determining the result. In the case stated it is among friends, of the same party, where there is a better method of arriving at the result. It is wrong then in principle. A small minority has no right to control a large majority, as they may and will do. This is a government based on majorities. It is wrong in policy, because it will distract the party and create a prejudice between country and town. It opens the door wider for fraud. I have recited Pittsburg and Philadelphia as instances. Crawford county I referred too last week. It divided the party there at the time referred too, and nearly destroyed it. It was charged by both parties that the ballot-boxes had been stuffed, and perhaps it was true of both. I would now ask where it has "worked well? But we are told it does not work well it can be abandoned. This is a mistake. Once adopted and a change will be as difficult as its adoption. We have been ten years in effecting the change, and the boroughs will take care that it shall take as long to repeal.

But if this system is so commendable why not extend its operations? If it is good for a county it is god for a district. Let us have it in Assembly Judicial, Congressional and even in Gubernatorial nominations. Adopt it in the State and Philadelphia would always have the Governor; adopt it in the district and Washington county will absorb and retain all the power of the district. That county could then at all times, nominate the Judge, all the members of Assembly, of the Senate and Congress! Are the citizens of Beaver county prepared for this? What Philadelphia would be to the State, Washington county to the district, a large township would be to the smaller ones, and the boroughs would be to the townships. I think I have presented this matter fairly and honestly, and will not dwell longer. If the people think a small minority should rule so be it.

No matter where live, the question is am I right. If so, I am justifiable in what I have written on this subjet. I write on the suggestion and solicitation of country Republicans. I can bear testimony, that the Beaver politicians, or those gentlemen *entitled* "the clique," are opposed to my views, on this question, and advocte the popular vote system. If a "clique" discovered, with which I can be identified, every member of it will be found to be again me in this matter. I do not desire to cree or stir up prejudice, but only to point out the danger. The boroughs can rule, and will. When this is demonstrated, and the country districts complain. I can say I warned them in time. If they do not heed the warning, it is their own fault. As for myself I am not a candidate for office and never intend to be, and personally care not which system is adopted; but I feel a deep interest in the success of the party that crushed the rebellion, and saved the country; and want to see the system prevail which will insure the most harmony and prosperity. The plan proposed, I believe will be destruction of both, and for that reason alone I oppose it.

ONE OF THE PEOPLE.

MR. EDITOR: In a short time the Primary meetings of the several Districts will be held preparatory to the county Convention which will meet on the first of June.

It will be seen by the call of the Chairman of the County Committee, that the people are requested in obedience to a resolution passed at the last annual Convention, to instruct their delegates, in regard to the adoption or not—of the *Popular System* of choosing candidates, for the various offices to be filled at the general election in October next.

The present system of nominating candidates, is not satisfactory, and I suppose would have been discarded long since, but for the fear on the part of many judicious men, that the popular system (so-called), would prove to be almost, if not quite as objectionable as that now in use.

There are certainly some serious objections to its being adopted. It would give to the boroughs and towns an undue advantage in the selection of candidates over the large and thinly populated districts. On occasions the whole vote of the boroughs might be got together to secure the nomination of a favorite candidate, while it is unreasonable to expect that such townships as Hanover or New Sewickley, can at any time get out over half of their voters to a primary meeting. Another objection is, that under the popular system there would be temptations to commit little frauds under cover of voting by proxy, &c., &c., at any rate disappointed candidates and their friends, would suspect, and charge frauds where there had been nothing at all unfair. We all know that candidates when canvassing the county previous to the primary meetings, *are led to expect more support than they can possibly obtain*. Again, the number of candidates is so large that the returns would be troublesome to count, and where the contest was a close one, the footings would have to be run up two or three times to make sure that no errors had been made.

I beg leave to offer for the consideration of the electors of the county, a plan which in my judgment, is free from most of the objections urged against both the present and popular system.

Let the number of delegates from each Election district as apportioned by the county committee, remain as at present; and for all purposes of organizing the convention, passing resolutions &c., &c., let the vote be taken as we have been accustomed to have it taken, but in the selection of candidates for office let each district cast as many votes as the whole number of Republican votes cast at the previous general election *divided by ten*,—thus a district containing fifty republican voters would be entitled to five votes in convention. A district of one hundred voters ten votes, for fractions, of five or over, one additional vote.

With such a system as this, every district in the county would have a nominating power exactly equal to its elective strength. Can the smaller districts reasonably ask for more? Can it be expected that the larger districts will be satisfied with anything less?

Respectfully yours,

BENJ. WILDE.

New Brighton, May 18, 1868.

The Capitol—Our Candidates Serenaded—Grant Makes a Speech—His Past Action his Guarantee for the Future—Speech of Speaker Colfax.

Special Dispatch to the Commercial.

WASHINGTON, 11:30 P. M., May 22, 1868.

The Republicans of this city gave General Grant and Speaker Colfax a serenade this evening, and thus opened the campaign of 1868. Two or three thousand persons were out, among them being many ladies, and the affair passed off in the most delightful manner. The crowd assembled at the Baltimore depot and from that point, led by two bands, proceeded to the residence of General Grant, where about one thousand individuals were gathered. The General, in response to calls, appeared in the door of his house, surrounded by a large number of friends, among whom were several members of Congress. The introduction to the serenaders was made by Governor Boutwell, who briefly and eloquently alluded to the General's military career and his high qualities of wisdom and patriotism. He told him he would have to meet in the coming contest the same classes, with some honorable exceptions, that opposed him during the war for the Union, and congratulated the country on having chosen a leader of such high character and sound judgment. The General was evidently much embarrassed when it came his turn to speak, but the words he said were apt and characteristic, and when he modestly closed with the idea that his action in the past must be his guarantee for the future, there was a hearty and unanimous cheer of "That's right," with much shouting, clapping of hands and expressions of confidence and good feeling.

The doors of the General's parlor were then thrown open, and everybody went in to pay his personal respects to the next President and his wife.

From General Grant's the serenading party went to the residence of Speaker Colfax, a mile or more away, and that gentleman, in response to the cry of "Three cheers for Schuyler Colfax, our next Vice President," came to his door and was introduced to the gathering by Congressman Pike, of Maine, in a few properly chosen words. His response was of about five minutes length, and is characterized as one of the finest speeches ever made in Washington on such an occasion. The crowd applauded him loudly at many points, and every body seemed much impressed with his feeling and earnestness. Here, as at General Grant's, the doors were thrown open, and men and woman passed in and shook hands with Mr. Colfax.

The proceedings of the evening closed at eleven o'clock, everything having been carried through with heartiness and enthusiasm.

SPEECH OF GEN. GRANT.

Gen. Grant said:—Gentleman, being entirely unaccustomed to public speaking and without a desire to cultivate that power, [laughter] it is impossible for me to find appropriate language to thank you for this demonstration. All that I can say is this, that to whatever position I may be called by your will, I shall endeavor to discharge its duties with fidelity and honesty of purpose and rectitude. Of the performance of public duties you will have to judge for yourselves by my record before you.

Three cheers were then given for General Grant. Hundreds of the crowd then entered the house and congratulated the General.

The procession then moved to the residence of Speaker Colfax. Calls having been made for him, he appeared at the door of his residence, in company with representative Pike, of Maine, who in a few remarks introduced Mr. Colfax. The latter said:

SPEECH OF MR. COLFAX.

My friends, I thank you with all the emotions of a grateful heart for this flattering manifestation of your confidence and regard. I congratulate you on the auspicious opening of the eventful campaign on which we are entering. In the Chicago Convention, representing the entire continental area of the Republic, every State, every territory every district and every delegate from ocean to ocean, declares that our first and only choice for President was Ulysses S. Grant. [Great applause.] Brave and yet unassuming, reticent and yet who if necessary is firm as the eternal hills [applause]; with every thought and hope and aspiration for his country; with modesty only equalled by his merits, it is not extravagant for me to say that he is to-day the man of all other men in the land—first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen [Great applause.] His name is the very synonym of victory, and he will lead the Union posts to triumph at the polls as he led the Union armies to triumph in the field. But greater even than the conqueror of Vicksburg and the destroyer of the rebellion, is the glorious inspiration of our noble principles. Animated by the sublime truths of the Declaration of Independence, our banner bears an inscription more magnetic than the names of its standard bearers, which the whole world can see as it floats to the breeze—liberty and loyalty, justice and public safety. Defying all prejudices, we are for uplifting the lowly and protecting the oppressed. [Applause.] History records to the immortal honor of our organization, that it saved the nation and emancipated a race. We struck the fetters from the limbs of the slave, and lifted millions up to the glorious sunlight of Liberty. We placed the emancipated slave on his feet as a man, and put into his right hand the ballot to protect his manhood and rights. We staked our political existence on the reconstruction of the revolted States on the sure and eternal corner stone of loyalty, and we shall triumph. I know there is no holiday contest before us, but with energy and zeal, with principles that humanity will prove, and I believe that God will bless, we shall go through the contest, conquering and to conquer, and on the fourth day of March next the people's champion will be borne by the people's votes to yonder White House, that I regret to say is now dishonered by its unworthy occupant. Then, with peace and confidence, we may expect our beloved country to enter upon a career of prosperity which shall eclipse the most brilliant annals of the past. I bid you God-speed in this work, and now good night.

Applause followed the conclusion of Mr. Colfax's speech, and the band played an appropriate air. Many persons in the crowd entered the dwelling and extended their congratulations.

New Advertisements.

STRAY COLT.

CAME TO THE PREMISES OF THE SUBSCRIBER, in Brighton township, Beaver county, on the 9th of May, an iron gray mare colt, about 2 years old. The owner is requested to come forward, prove property, pay charges and take away.

may27'68:4t. HAYS HURFORD.

Oil Tools, Engine, Boiler, &c., For Sale.

ON SATURDAY, JUNE 6TH, 1868, AT 2 O'CLOCK P. M., at Unionville; being the property of the BRITISH CREEK OIL COMPANY. Terms made known on day of sale

By order of the President.
JOHN BOREN, Sec'y.
(*Local* copy.)

my27'68:2t

Richard W. Reisinger vs. Robert Clark. } IN THE COURT OF COMMON Pleas of Beaver county No. 110, Sept. Term, 1862. Foreign attachment, assumpsit, plaintiffs claim founded on note of defendant, dated August 26, 1861, for $1018 00. April 26, 1865, judgment against defendant on default. May 25, 1865, rule for Prothonotary to assess damages, &c.

Notice is hereby given that the Prothonotary of said Court will assess plaintiff's damages, at his office, in Beaver, on Friday the 10th day of July, 1868, at 10 o'clock, A. M. JOHN CAUGHEY, Pro'y.

may27'68:tf.

A. McFarland vs. David Daniels. } IN THE COURT OF COMMON Pleas of Beaver county, No. 26 of Mar. T, 1865, Foreign Attachment case.

Plaintiff's claim founded on Book account against defendant for $125 52. Emily Campbell summoned as garnishee. Nov 25, 1865, judgment against defendant on default. May 23, 1868, Rule for Prothonotary to assess damages.

Notice is hereby given that the Prothonotary of said court will assess plaintiff's damages at his office, in Beaver, on Friday the 10th day of July, 1868, at 10 o'clock, A. M. JOHN CAUGHEY, Pro'y.

may27'68:tf.

J. S. WINANS,

DEALER IN

Hardware,

Iron, Nails, Glass, and Agricultural Implements.

BUILDER'S HARDWARE, MECHANIC'S TOOLS, always kept on hand.

Also, agent for the **WORLD'S REAPER AND MOWER, OHIO MOWER** and the **TORNADO THRESHER.**

☞ East side Broadway, New Brighton, Pa.

may27'68.

Beaver Drug Store,

THOS. A. ANDERSON.

DRUGGIST!

Corner 3d St. and Diamond,

BEAVER, PA.

INVITES THE ATTENTION OF THE PUBLIC generally to a full assortment of

Drugs, Medicines,

PAINTS,

OILS, VARNISHES.

Putty, Window Glass, &c.

In fact everything usually kept in a well appointed *Drug and Chemical Store*, all of which will be sold at the lowest possible figures consistent with a due regard for quality.

We hope by strict and careful attention to business to merit and receive a continuance of the patronage so liberally bestowed upon us.

THOS. A. ANDERSON.

may27'68:tf.

WALL PAPER!
WALL PAPER!
WALL PAPER!

Oil Cloths!
Oil Cloths!
Oil Cloths!

CARPETS!
CARPETS!
CARPETS!

TWENTY-FIVE THOUSAND ROLLS OF WALL PAPER just received, and will be sold lower than can be purchased elsewhere, at

B. MULHEIM'S,

Bridgewater, Pa.,

Direct from England, bearing the original packages. Also, Window Shades, Satchels, Trunks, Stereoscopic Views of all places of interest in the country and upon the continent.

I respectfully give notice to all to call and see the large and well selected Stock of general VARIETY GOODS.

Included in above, we have Looking Glasses, Carpets, Rugs, Oil Cloths, &c., of beautiful design and pattern.

B. MULHEIM.

mar11'68:1y

NOTICE.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT BOOKS FOR public subscription to the Stock of the Beaver Falls Gas Company will be and remain open at the Huron House, in New Brighton, Penna., from 10 o'clock A. M., until 2 o'clock P. M., daily, during Five days from, and inclusive of, Tuesday, June 2d, 1868.

By order of the Commissioners.
EDWARD BINNS, Sec'y.

my20'68.

PROPOSALS.

PROPOSALS ARE INVITED FOR PUTTING ON a shingle or slate roof on the Beaver "Seminary & Institute." Bidders to do the necessary brick work, and furnish all materials, which are to be of first quality. A suitable cornice will be required. Proposals will be received till the 1st of June. Any information can be had of Prof. Taylor.

J. F. DRAVO,
Chairman of Com.

my20'68:2.

REGISTER'S NOTICE.

ALL PERSONS INTERESTED IN THE FOLLOWING Administration and Guardian Accounts which have been passed and filed in the Register's office, of Beaver county, Pa., will take notice that the same will be presented to the Orphans' Court, to be held at Beaver, on Wednesday the 10th day of June, A. D., 1868, for confirmation and allowance.

The first and final account of Geo. Arbuckle, Adm'r, of the estate of James Arbuckle, dec'd.

The account of Jordon C. Nye, Guardian of Samuel Mace, Jr., minor children of Samuel Mace, Sr., dec'd.

Final account of Adam Freshkun, Guardian of Adam Rember, minor son of Geo. Rember, dec'd.

First and final account of Thos. Hays, Executor of the last will of Sarah A. Alexander, dec'd.

Account of J. Swearingen, Guardian of Mary M. Reed, minor daughter of Samuel Reed, dec'd.

The final account of Thos. Todd and Wm. M. Dodds, Executors of the last will of John Dodds, dec'd.

The final account of Elizabeth Burns, Executrix of the last will of Jas. Burns, dec'd., who was Guardian of the estate of Joseph M. McCrae.

The final account of A. D. Gilliland, Adm'r. of the estate of O. M. Stewart, dec'd.

The partial account of Joseph Brittain, Executor of the last will of William Brittain, dec'd.

The first and final account of John Mizke, Executor of the last will of Jos. Billmeyer, dec'd.

The final account of A. D. Gilliland, Adm'r. of the estate of M. Gilliland, dec'd.

The first and final account of Samuel Shafer, Adm'r. of the estate of Mary Shafer, dec'd.

The final account of R. S. Hall and Jas. Orr, Administrators of the estate of John B. Hall, dec'd.

The final account of John Reeves and Wm. Henry, Executors of the last will of James Scott, dec'd.

The final account of Abram Thomas, Administrator of the estate of Andrew Thomas, dec'd.

The first and final account of R. Steinfeld, Adm'r. of the estate of Solomon Hirsberg, dec'd.

The final account of J. C. Nye, Administrator of the estate of Martha Mace, dec'd.

The account of Fergus McClelland, Guardian of David M. Clark, minor son of John Clark, dec'd.

The accounts of Amos Knight, Guardian of Elizabeth and Almira Knight, minor children of David Knight, dec'd.

The final account of Isaac Riley and A. P. Smith, Executors of the last will of Jas. Livezey, dec'd.

The final account of Geo. W. Hamilton and John Allison, Administrators of the estate of John R. Shannon, dec'd.

The first and final account of Geo. S. Barker, Administrator of the estate of David Hoover, dec'd.

The account of Jesse Metlanick and Andrew Metlanick, surviving Executors of the last will and testament of Benj. Metlanick, dec'd.

The final account of Nathan Eakin, Admr. of the estate of James Murray, dec'd.

D. SINGLETON,
Register.

my13'68.

TO BRIDGE CONTRACTORS.

COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, BEAVER, May 12th, 68.

SEALED PROPOSALS WILL BE RECEIVED at this office by the Board of County Commissioners until, Friday, June 5th, 1868, 12 M

For the superstructure (wrought or wrought and cast iron) for a bridge, 120 feet 6 inches in