The Beaver Argus.

J. WEYAND, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

Beaver, Pa., Sept. 18th, 1872.

GOVENOR Curtin's political status has been finally ascertained. He is a Liberal Republican, and has been placed before the voters of Pennsylvania as a candidate for Delegate at Large to the constitutional convention, by the Liberal Republican State Committee. An address to the people of the State, signed by the committee referred to, will be found in another column of the ARGUS. An additional article copied from Forney's *Press*, and headed "Curtin Against the Ring," is also copied and will be seen in another column. The Grant Republicans of Centre county had previously and unsolicited by him, conferred the nomination for Congress upon him. This nomination he has declined in a public letter; his acceptance as a Liberal Republican candidate for the Constitutional Convention, and his election is certain. It is understood that there is a vacancy, by resignation in the Democratic ticket for Delegate at Large to the Constitutional Convention.—Governor Curtin's name will doubtless fill this vacancy. This accession to the Liberal ranks will equal ten thous. and votes, and makes Hartranft's defeat doubly sure.

MAJ. GEN. J. B. SWEITZER, a gallant and accomplished soldier was some time ago appointed Chief Marshall of the Soldier's gathering to be held at Pittsburgh, this week. This appointment did not suit the Treasury Ring; hence they chopped off Sweitzer's head, and arranged the programme so that Hartranft would be in command. This is evidently intended to revive his waning prospects, but it will fail in its purpose, for the people have made up their minds that official corruption shall not be rewarded by higher honors.

WE wish every reader of the ARGUS to give the article on one of its inside pages this week, headed "Hartranft's guilt," a careful study. It is copied from Forney's *Press* the most effective Grant paper in Pennsylvania and gives the letters, figures and affidavits touching Hartranft's speculations with the State funds, in so direct a manner, that none will fail to understand them. The man who can vote for Hartranft after this expose would have no compunctions of conscience in voting for William M. Tweed for any office to which he might aspire.

HARTRANFT lobbied for the nine million bill, Harrison Allen voted for it, the Cameron ring, including the Harrisburg *Telegraph*, supported it, and Charles R. Buckalew opposed it. Yet the ring champions of Hartranft now have the brassiness of cheek to assert that the nine million bill will be revived by Mr. Buckalew's election. Such recklessness indicates a considerable panic in the camp of the THE Cameron [illegible] has been renominated for senator in spite of the most strenuous opposition of Naval Heistand and the entire ring. Burkholder and Mylin, both of whom are pledged to oppose the re-election of Senator Cameron and State Treasury Mackey, are nominated for the legislature. This is the most severe blow that the ring has received in this campaign. In Lancaster county they have hitherto, by cunning manipulation of the delegate elections and the free use of money, generally succeeded in securing members of the legislature in their interest. But this time they were compelled to confront a people who are thoroughly aroused, and every man who was suspected of a taint of Cameronism has been defeated. This delegate election in Lancaster county is one of the most significant and encouraging signs in Pennsylvania. It shows that the insolent power of the Cameron ring is fast melting under the indignation of a people who have become aroused to the defence of their true interests and their honor. —*Patriot*

We have yet to see any respectable newspaper in Pennsylvania, or hear any reputable orator, assume that Charles R. Buckalew is a dishonest or untruthful man. In fact both of these classes of public teachers tacitly admit that his private habits and public character are above reproach. Not only this, but his most violent political opponents are willing to agree that he is a liberal, able, experienced statesman, and a gentleman who would fill the Gubernatorial chair with wisdom, dignity, and benefit to the State.

On the other hand, General Hartranf, is regarded by at least three-fourths of the people of the State as loose in his official transactions. They believe that he was either a principal in the Evans fraud himself or too stupid to detect that villain and his confederates while they were prowling through the vaults of the State Treasury. They believe that while Auditor General of the State he either gambled with State stocks himself or permitted others to do so, and shared the profits with them. They do not know him to be an able man, and they have a hundred reasons for believing that he is not *honest* either.

With these two candidates before them and their public characters thus briefly stated, can money, party, or free dinners, induce a majority of the honest voters of the county to cast their ballots for the bad and against the good man? We will not believe they will until we see it.

We are told on good authority that in a speech made by Senator Rutan in Rochester a few evenings ago, he stated that "Senator Wallace, Mr. Buckalew and every democratic Senator voted for the bill continuing General Hartranft as Auditor General." He made this statement to show that Wallace and Buckalew and all the Democratic Senators had the utmost confidence in Hartranft up until the latter became a candidate against one of their number for Governor. That is Mr. Rutan's story; now look at Senator Wallace's. In a speech made in Greensburg, a few nights ago Senator Wallace said:

It is charged that I assented to and voted for the bill extending the official term of Gen. Hartranft as Auditor General. I neither voted for nor assented to it. It was passed on a Monday night—notoriously the hour at which all snakes in legislative circles are brought forth—and was passed through the Senate in the absence of both Mr. Buckalew and myself. He was absent in attendance on his duties on the M'Clure-Gray committee and I was at my home at court. If I had been present I would have voted against it, for I have always spoken and voted against the policy of extending the official term of any incumbent of an elective office. I have always regarded it as a wrong upon the people and fruitful of corrupt and demoralizing tendency.

We thus leave Mr. Rutan just where his ill-considered statement puts him. Will a man who is so regardless of the truth make a faithful Senator? We think not.

THE returns from Maine now cover perhaps three-fourths of the vote.—From the remote regions to the north, the news comes slowly; but we may fairly estimate our yesterday's statement of the result as at any rate within a few hundred of the exact figures. It is possible that the majority may rise to a hundred or two above sixteen thousand;—it can hardly fall many hundreds below.—The reduction from the majority in 1868 may therefore be reckoned as about 3,500. That majority, as *The World* judiciously points out, was attained in defiance of the Administration hostility;—the present reduction has been accomplished in defiance of the most unscrupulous Administration support. If with the whole power of the National Government against it, the Grant ticket could get nearly 20,000 majority in 1868, and with the whole power of the National Government for it can only get 16,000 majority in 1872, it is plain enough that the drift against Grant is much more than the mere difference in the figures would indicate.—We must make allowance, besides, for the extreme difficulty with which men are brought to the polls in a contest known to be hopeless, and in the face of a proscriptive public sentiment among their old associates, only that other States may have the moral effect of their votes. Nor must it be forgotten that many have made the mistake of supposing that their vote now had nothing to do with the Presidency, and that there was no need for them to cut loose from the regular Republican organization till November. Yet, in spite of all these facts, the Grant managers, with Post-offices, Custom-houses, Navy-yard, Internal Revenue and all other Federal influence to back them, have fallen 3,500 short of what they were able to do *against* these same influences, four years ago.

After the North Carolina election, (which we fairly carried,) *The Tribune* pointed the Liberals to their next work, with the phrase which the Grant journals are recalling, "And now for Maine." We too are glad to recall the phrase. We hold up the results in Maine for inspiration and assurance, as we next turn with confidence now well nigh absolute, to Pennsylvania, Ohio and Indiana. Just consider the facts:

[illegible] count them at only the same precise percentage. The Pennsylvania election in October 1868, was carried for the Grant State ticket by 9,677 majority. A change of five thousand votes would have defeated Hartranft, then running for Auditor-General.—Five thousand votes are barely one-and-a-half per cent of the 331,416 Republican votes cast at that time. A change of less than one per cent would have defeated Gov. Geary in 1869, his majority being only 4,596. In other words;—with less than one-third the change in Pennsylvania which Monday's election shows in Maine, we shall sweep the Keystone State. Who doubts that the change will be greater instead of less?

The Indiana election in October, 1868, was carried by the Republicans by less than 1,000 majority for Gov. Baker. A change of one third of one per cent would have wiped out this majority. In 1870 the Democrats carried the State by 2,558 majority.

In New-York the last important election carried by the Republicans was in 1866, when Gov. Fenton was elected by 13,789 majority over Hoffman. A change of less than two per cent of the 366,615 votes cast for Fenton would have given the State to Hoffman.

We not do pursue the examination in detail. The same percentage will give us Alabama, California, and Connecticut, and these added to the solid Democratic column will carry us triumphantly through. Liberal Republicans!—let Maine be your inspiration. She shows that success is within your grasp. Will you permit it to escape you?—*N. Y. Tribune Sept. 12th.*

THE following figures about the Vermont election, given by the New York *Tribune*, upon a basis furnished by the New York *Times* doesn't look bad:—

Republican vote, 1868 - - -	44,167
Grant vote, 1872 - - - - -	43,186
Loss - - - - - - - - -	981
Democratic vote, 1868 - - -	12,045
Liberal and Dem. vote, 1872 -	17,635
Gain - - - - - - - - -	5,589

THE four prominent figures in our State contest this year are Cameron, Hartranft, Buckalew and Curtin. Cameron and Hartranft are on one side—Buckalew and Curtin on the other. The two former represent the worst elements in our politics; the two latter the best. Voters! of Beaver county! choose ye between these men and the principles they embody.

THOUSANDS upon thousands of dollars are annually paid out of the State Treasury to George Bergner of Harrisburg "for stationery," the man who publishes Cameron's organ at the State capital. Repeated efforts have been made recently to obtain access to his bills, but General Hartranft has ordered his clerks to not allow them to be seen by any person at the present time. From the fact that Bergner has recently became a millionare, together with this conduct of the Auditor General, the people are led to suppose that they have been bled in this "stationery" matter to an outrageous extent. Defrauded or not defrauded will the voters of the State elect a man for Governor, who refuses to let them see accounts in which they are personally interested, and which they are morally certain carry frauds upon their face?

HERE are a few interrogations which the people of the State are called upon to investigate. Voters of Pennsylvania give them a patient and thorough investigation before depositing your ballot at the October election. Passing them by, or standing mute while realizing their import, will not only imperil your own interests, but your conduct may be the means of dealing the reputation of your State a blow from which it may not recover during your life time. These are the questions:

1. Is the practice of the Mackey-Ring legitimate of lending the cash assets of the Treasury—amounting to millions—to unknown bankers and brokers, some of which are bankrupt, and one of whom is a convict?

2. Do men of business—the faithful executors of public and private trusts—approve of the Auditor General and State Treasurer purchasing State securities at a depreciation and selling them to the Sinking Fund at an advance, they and their broker sharing the difference as their profits?

3. Did the State Treasurer, immediately before his election the second time, borrow for his private use from one of the State depositories $20,000, and afterward repay it by a Treasury draft on the public funds? If yes, is this approved or?

4. Is it not a badge of fraud that all the accounts between the broker (since convict) and financial officers of the State were kept either in fictitious names, or, what is equivalent, in reversed initials?

5. Is it consistent with the proper discharge of duty for accounting officers with small salaries to speculate to enormous amounts in stocks during their whole term of office—Mackey to the amount of $146,000 in two months, and Hartranft of $681,000 in less than two years?

6. Is it part of the function of a Controller or Auditor General to use official information for ends of private gain to claim taxation on corporate capital in order to depress the stock, and, that failing, to speculate on a rise, as Hartranft did in the case of the Oil Creek Railroad.

7. Was or was not the fraud on the City Treasury of which Marcer and Yerkes have been convicted facilitated, if not promoted, by the countenance given by the State authorities? and did it not result in a deficit in the State Treasury which, if at all, was made up from outside resources?

8. Did not Mackey and Hartranft recommend the pardon of Charles T. Yerkes, leaving the victim Marcer without intercession? and has not the pardon been thus far refused, while assassins of Revenue Collectors have been discharged without stint?

9. Is not the refusal of the Governor to pardon these parties a concessions to an aroused public opinion, which condemns the whole transaction and all the parties to it—principals and accessories—those convicted and those at liberty.

10. Will not the election of John F. Hartranft as Governor of Pennsylvania [illegible]

11. In conclusion, if in these questions there is an assumption of any matter of fact which either does not exist or is over-stated, the respondents are begged to point it out.

THAT was good hit made by General Thomas Ewing in a late speech, at St. Clairsville, Ohio. He said this campaign was an extraordinary one. We Democrats find ourselves in this campaign co-operating with Sumner, Trumbull, Schurz, Gratz Brown, General Brinkerhoff, General Banks, and supporting even Horace Greeley for president; while the Republicans are in close affiliation with Robert Toombs, Henry A. Wise, Blanton Duncan, the guerrilla Mosby, and Brick Pomeroy. The marked difference, however, between these new affiliations of the two parties, is that we are associated with the heads of the Republican party and they with the tails of ours. We are affiliating with their corps commanders, and they with our bummers.

A CORRESPONDENT of Forney's *Press* recently called at the Auditor General's office and endeavored to obtain a copy of the lists of banks, brokers, and other persons with whom the people's money is deposited, but was refused it. He was not even suffered to make a few memoranda from the tell-tale record, though the law requires that it shall be open for the inspection of the citizens. Is there not something wrong in the Auditor General's office?

HARTRANFT opposed the soldier's Homestead bill, which would have enabled our returned volunteers to transfer their land warrants. He wants the remainder of the public domain to be voted away in the land grants to railway corporations.

Senator Casserly's Views.

The Hon. Eugene Casserly, Senator from California, thus writes from Washington to a friend in San Francisco. The letter is published in the *Herald* of that city:

"WASHINGTON, August 9, 1872.

DEAR COLONEL: I see they have got you to the front once more, and for a great battle. This time I really think we will succeed. This is the judgment of our most judicious men all over the country. In eight States, no small ones either, the election is but a form—a mere question of the size of the majority. These are New York, Missouri, Virginia, Maryland, Kentucky, Texas, Tennessee, Georgia. These States will give majority for Greeley and Brown, ranging from 25,000 to 50,000 and upwards. It would puzzle any man to day to name as many States of the same or like magnitude that are certain for Grant. This gives us a capital of 110 electoral votes to start with, leaving us but fifty-two more to get to have the Electoral college. Where shall we get them? The following States I regard as being sufficiently certain for Greeley and Brown: West Virginia, Alabama, Delaware, Arkansas Connecticut, Indiana—43.

For the following States our chances are to-day twenty per cent. better than theirs: New Hamphire, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, North Carroline, Illinois—72.

This I think a fair, indeed, rather an under statement of the contest, leaving out entirely the Pacific coast of which you are a better judge. It takes no account of States that are debatable, such as Louisiana, 7; Ohio, 22; Florida, 3 (which we carried for Lieutenant-Governor at the last election;) Wisconsin, 10; Nebraska, 3.

Constitutional Convention.

Governor Curtin Nominated by the Liberals.

To the People of Pennsylvania:

The Liberal Republican State Committee have formally nominated Hon. Andrew G. Curtin as a candidate for delegat at large to the Constitutional Convention. In doing so we need not present any elaborate commendation of the choice we have made. Had the preferences of the people prevailed with the political managers, who have long ruled the State for the attainment of selfish ends, his name would have been first on the list of nominations for the responsible position. He would have been presented, not as a partisan, but as a patriot who has shed the brightest lustre upon the annals of our Commonwealth.

A generation has passed away since our fundamental law has been revised by the sovereign power that created it, and our progress has been marked in all that contributes to prosperity and greatness. The rapid growth and advancement of our industry, its varied and multiplied channels of production, and the vast business interests reared upon the wealth it has developed have made us outgrow the Constitution of our fathers.

But to revise it in the interest of public integrity and permanent prosperity, the most experienced and faithful of our statesmen should be charged with the task. Among these, Andrew G. Curtin stands conspicuously eminent, and he would bring to the important work a measure of devotion to the people of the Commonwealth that few could equal and none surpass.

During six years of sorest trial to the State and Nation he filled our executive chair. He was met with responsibilities which severely tested his intelligence and his patriotism, but he met every public want, discharged every public duty, and retired with the unanimous approval of all parties for his enlightened and successful administration and beloved as the "soldiers' friend.

No man in our great State is more familiar with our people; with our diversified and growing interests; with the new necessities created by a life-time of progress; and none can bring to the amendment of our constitution more practical wisdom or greater fidelity.

Assured that the people of the State, without regard to political differences, desire his services, we present his name as a candidate, and we ask for him the earnest support of all who believe him most competent and deserving, with abiding confidence that he will be triumphantly chosen.

A. K. McClure, ch'n, Philadelphia.
Wm. J. Gillingham, Philadelphia.
Wm. H. Ruddiman, Philadelphia.
Lambert Thomas, Philadelphia.
H. Tiedman, Philadelphia.
Henry L. Wallace, Philadelphia.
E. T. Chase, Philadelphia.
George Wylie, Philadelphia.
Henry L. Cake, Philadelphia.
J. K. Moorhead, Allegheny.
James King, Allegheny.
G. W. Riddle, Allegheny.
Thomas M. Marshall, Allegheny.
N. Ralbor, Allegheny.
G. Stengle, Allegheny.
Frank Taylor, Allegheny.
J. Dutton Steele, Montgomery.
M. C. Boyer, Montgomery.
George Stout, Northampton,
J. George Seltzer, Berks.
E. H. Rauch, Lancaster.
N. Ellmaker, Lancaster.
Danl. Kalbfus, Carbon.
E. J. More, Lehigh,
Geo. Irvin, Dauphin.
Geo. Corny, Luzerne.
Gordon F. Mason, Bradford.
J. C. Delezenue, Wayne.
Thomas L. Jordan, Lycoming.
J. B. Earl, Cameron.
Isaac Benson, Potter.
Charles Hower, Snyder.
S. B. Row, Clearfield.
Geo. W. Zeigler, Franklin.
Jacob B. Busser, York.
D. S. Dunham, Blair.
Henry Pillow, Butler.
David Barclay, Armstrong.
Wm. Stewart, Mercer.
L. D. Davis, Venango.
Joshua Douglas, Crawford.
M. B. Lowry, Erie.
F. A. Shugert, Warren.

PHILADELPHIA, Sept. 12, 1872.

CURTIN TO THE FRONT.

The determination of the Liberals to disregard party preference to their nominations has nowhere been more significantly expressed than in Pennsylvania. Their nomination of Andrew G. Curtin, "The Soldier's Friend," as delegate-at-large to the Constitutional Convention, is just such an illustration of that spirit as we might expect. It is a choice of great wisdom, and its acceptance by ex-Gov. Curtin must be an assurance of the success of the ticket. Nowhere has the tyranny and corruption of this Administration been more severely felt than in Pennsylvania; and to no man in that State could the eyes of the people be more readily turned for relief and comfort than to Andrew G. Curtin, the blameless patriot and gratefully-remembered War Governor. With Buckalew at the head of the State ticket and Curtin leading the delegates to the Constitutional Convention, the Liberals of Pennsylvania have completed a list of nominations which will command the respect of the whole country, and will never know defeat. "Andy Curtin," as the Pennsylvanians love to call their favorite Governor, is a tower of strength to any party; all of the embassies which have gone over the seas to beg and implore his adhesion to the Grant combination have returned empty-handed. He could naturally go nowhere else than to the Liberal camp.

The address of the Pennsylvania Liberals, which is signed by some of the best names in Pennsylvania politics, is a stirring document. Taken with the nomination of Curtin, it alarms the souls of the Grant leaders. Even *The Press*, a devoted Grant organ, which publishes the document in full, is compelled to say that the selection of Curtin by the Liberals aggravates the misfortunes of the Republicans; and that the Liberal Address is signed by men whom the Republican party cannot afford to lose. Its brief biographical sketches of the signers of the address are like a lamentation over lost riches. If we needed any testimony to the dignity and strength of the Liberal movement in Pennsylvania, we should find it in the comments of *The Press*, the editor of which knows the men to whose value he so reluctantly testifies.

And now, citizens of "the State prayer-founded!" you have the tickets, and the men that make them, before you. On one side stand foremost Simon Cameron and J. F. Hartranft; on the other Charles R. Buckalew and Andrew G. Curtin. Choose ye now whom you will honor and trust!—*N. Y. Tribune.*

CURTIN AGAINST THE RING.

From Forney's Press, (Grant).

Elsewhere will be found the address of the Liberal Republican State Committee of Pennsylvania, nominating Hon. Andrew G. Curtin as the candidate for Delegate-at-large to the Constitutional Convention, and from the tone of this address we assume that his acceptance of this important post is assured. Had the wishes of the people of our great State prevailed in the Republican State Convention which forced the offensive nominations of Hartranft and Allen, Governor Curtin would have been nominated to the post for which the Liberal Republican State Committee has now formally named him; but the despotic dictates of Simon Cameron prevailed, and the Republicans lost the great opportunity. Had the wishes of the good men of that convention been consulted, Andrew G. Curtin would now be at the head of our State ticket, and the people would have regarded it as a tribute due alike to his own great services during the war and to themselves. This nomination of the Liberal Republican State Committee must be accepted in no sense as a party preference. Its significance may be better understood by reference to the signers of the address. They are a remarkable indication of the great strength of the movement in this State against that portion of the State ticket which has been forced upon the Republican people of Pennsylvania. Among the names honored and known in the Republican party, we desire especially to enumerate Alexander K. McClure, one of the earliest and ablest of the Republican leaders; William J. Gillingham, one of the most intrepid and honest men in Philadelphia; William H. Ruddiman, a lawyer accepted as among the best members of the Philadelphia bar; Henry L. Cake, a Representative in Congress for two terms from the Schuylkill and Lebanon district, who did more to reverse the Democratic majority in that section than any other man of his age; Lambert Thomas, a leading Republican merchant; H. Tiedeman, a prominent German Republican; Henry E. Wallace, editor of the *Legal Intelligencer*; Edwin T. Chase, an influential member of the Philadelphia bar; George Wilie, who served his constituents in the Legislature from this county with singular ability and integrity; J. Kennedy Moorhead, of Alleghany, five times elected to Congress from the Western Republican counties in this State; Dr. James King, Surgeon General during the war; Thomas M. Marshall, the eloquent leader of the young Republicans of the West; Nathaniel Ellmaker, of Lancaster, a leading Republican member of the bar of that great county; E. J. More, well-known in Lehigh county for his talents and ability; George Doray, of Luzerne, elected by a large majority to the Legislature from his county; Gordon F. Mason, former State Senator from Bradford county, and known for his adherence to Republican doctrines; General Thomas L. Jordan, of Lycoming county, known for his devoted patriotism; Hon. Isaac Benson, of Potter, long the leader of the Republican party in that county, who voted for Simon Cameron in 1857 for United States Senator; William Lewis, of Huntingdon, the able leader of the War Democrats in that county, now editor of the *Globe*; David Barclay, of Armstrong, ex-Republican member of Congress, William Stewart, of Mercer, ex-Republican member of Congress; and Hon. Morrow B. Lowry, of Erie, one of the earliest and most active of Republicans.

These are representative men on the list. It will show that the Liberal Republican party of Pennsylvania is composed of men that we cannot afford to despise or to underrate, and their precentation of the name of Governor Curtin for the post of delegate-at-large to the constitutional Convention must produce a profound impression upon the public mind.

Another Nut for Hartranft.

The act of 1811 requires the auditor general to report:

"The auditor general shall annually report to the legislature a list of the accounts which remain unsettled, and the reason therefore."—*Act of 30th March, 1811, section 50th.*

In the Evans case we have seen that Hartranft openly disregarded this law by concealing from the legislature for three years the fact that Evans had collected several thousand dollars belonging to the State.

But more conspicuous still is the fact that for six years he has allowed the corporation of this state to retain millions of dollars belonging to the commonwealth in the shape of taxes and never has reported the facts to the legislature. A committee at the last session of the legislature, composed of three republicans and two Democrats, recommended arrest upon whatever of taxes due the state, and that the auditor general's office had no information as to the amount due.

In one instance the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western railroad owed the state over $23,000 as a tax on a dividend of $1,100,000 in the Morris and Essex road, yet it was not known at the auditor general's office that such tax was due, although the fact of the dividend having been declared was published in the auditor general's report of the year before.

This amount was promptly paid by the company, the day after the Legislative investigating committee called attention to the subject with the excuse that the blank form for furnishing the report had not been supplied by the auditor general, although it had been demanded. The auditor of the company testified that the amount stood to the credit of the state treasury, and was ready to be paid at any time, and that the return of the tax due had been regularly made to the state treasury.

A few facts will illustrate the immense loss of revenue to the state from the tax on corporations, since General Hartranft took possession of the auditor general's office.

We quote from the report of the sub-committee of last winter, which examined this subject, and that the D. L. and W. R. R., as an example, 1866, Tax on capital stock $198,951.12
1871, Tax on capital stock - 54,641.11

Loss to the state - - - - 144,270.01
1866, Tax on gross receipts - 3,728.72
1871, Tax on gross receipts - 1,698.39

Loss to the state - - - - - 2,030.33

This loss, too, occurred in the face of the fact that in 1866 the receipts of the company were $8,252,416.73, whereas in 1871 they were $11,709,146.97. In a word, the revenue of the company had increased three and a half millions of dollars, and the taxes of the state were increased more than one half

1867, (no report for 1866) Tonnage tax - - - $8,177 90
1871, Tonnage tax - - - 1,685 84

Loss to the state - - - - 6,492.06

The above facts illustrate why the ring desire the continuance of Hartranft and Allen in office, and why Cameron & Co. are endeavoring to prevent a full and fair investigation. The people are being mercilessly robbed, and they now demand honest officers and a full investigation of the books at Harrisburg.

New York settled its Tammany—it is time we commenced at once.

Honest men should have no doubt as to which way they should decide. —*Bloomsburg Columbian.*

Resolution of Respect.

WHEREAS: It has pleased our heavenly Father, in his mysterious Providence to cause affliction to come to the household of one of our beloved Brothers of our Temple, by the drowning of a beloved son of said Brother, David R. Blaine. And in this affliction we recognize the uncertainty of life and the mutability of human affairs, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, as members of King Solomon's Temple of Honor and Temperance, No. 33; in view of the noble principles of the Order, do sincerely sympathize with him, and we bow in humble submission with him and his bereaved family to the divine will of the Grand Worthy Chief Templar of the Universe, feeling that he doeth all things well.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be presented to the afflicted parents of the deceased, and also a copy to the several papers of our county with a request that they be published.

Wm. A. Smith, }
Chas. L. Reno, } *Committee.*
H. B. Beisel, }

GENTS' Furnishing Goods at Bert & Walsh's Clothing House, Broadway, New Brighton.

HARTRANFT'S GUILT.

Incontrovertible Proof of His Corruption.—A Plain, Unvarnished Collection of Evidence Convicting John F. Hartranft of Complicity with Mackey and Yerkes in a Scandalous Misuse of the People's Money —Stock Gambling with State Money as a Margin—How the Loan has been Redeemed—Dividens of Mackey and Hartranft.

From The Philadelphia Press (Grant).

The following affidavits, statements, letters, &c., comprise some of the documentary evidence of Gen. Hartranft's malfeasance. We have thus brought them together and marked each with a letter for the greater convenience of referring to them editorially and for the benefit of each of our readers as desire to investigate impartially the charges against the Ring candidate for Governor:

[A.]

Yerke's Affidavit, Regarding Hartranft's Stock Speculations and Profits on Purchase of Loans of the Commonwealth.

Charles T. Yerkes, jr., of the City of Philadelphia, being duly sworn according to law, doth depose and say: That for some years past he has been acquainted with J. F. Hartranft, Auditor-General of the State of Pennsylvania. That he has at various times purchased and sold stocks of different kinds, and carried the same with money belonging to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which the said J. F. Hartranft has caused to be deposited with the deponent by the State Treasurer. That this deponent did pay to J. F. Hartranft, Auditor-General, on the 10th day of December, 1870, the sum of $2,700, which sum was derived from profits on purchases of loans of the Commonwealth and sales of the same to the Sinking Fund, which sale was made on the 29th day of April, 1870. That said deponent has also paid to said J. F. Hartranft various amounts of money for profits arising from stock speculations with money deposited with this deponent by the State Treasurer at the instance of the said J. F. Hartranft.

C. T. YERKES, jr.

Sworn and subscribed before me this 23d day of December, A. D. 1871.
[Seal.] W. W. DOUGHERTY, Ald.

The extent of these operations will be seen by the following statement of his account with Yerkes for one year—the year preceding Yerke's failure. It will be noticed that the account is kept under initials:

[B.]

JOHN F. HARTRANFT'S Account with YERKES.
J. F. H. ——in account with——C. T. YERKES Jr. & Co.
Dr. Cr.
1870.

July 11, To balance as pr ac't rendered	$12,651 25	
On hand, 9,000 P & E Tr., 8,000 St. Louis Water bonds, 500 shs Oil Creek		229 29
Aug. 9, To cash to W B Hart		229 29
Aug. 22, To 10,000 S. Carolina, 6's and coupons	7,175 00	
Aug. 24, To cash, J. F. H	1,000 00	
Aug. 24, To 5,000 S. Car'a, 6's & com.	3,062 50	
Oct. 20, To 10,000 Reading, 38½ and com.	9,725 00	
Oct. 26, To 15,000 S. Car'a, 6's & com.	10,312 50	
Oct. 29, To cash, J. F. H	500 00	
Nov. 18, To cash, J. F. H	175 00	
Nov. 29, To 300 Lehigh, 35 and com.	6,021 00	
Nov. 29, To 600 Lehigh, 34 and com.	9,957 50	
1871		
Jan. 10, To 500 Reading, 36-100 & com.	18,853 75	
Jan. 11, To 600 Reading, 49, 49¼ & com.	29,835 50	
Jan. 30, To interest	1,523 33	
Total	$133,628 34	
1871.		
Jan. 23, To balance down	$88,828 44	
Jan. 26, To 300 Union Pacific, 31¼ co	9,562 50	
Jan. 27, To 500 Oil Creek—200 at 9 & 200 at 9¼	2,950 00	
Feb. 8, To 200 Oil Creek, 10½	2,021 00	
Feb. 10, To 500 Pennsylvania, 56¼ com.	28,312 50	
Mar. 2, To 1,000 Union Pacific—300 at 29⅞, 100 at 29⅞, 600 at 29	29,900 00	
Mar. 6, To 1,000 Union Pacific—200 at 29¼, 300 at 29⅛, 200 at 29⅛, and 300 at 29⅛	29,175 00	
Mar. 20, To 20,000 Government 5's of 64, 2,000 at 64, 3,000 at 64, 10,000 at 65	12,955 00	
Apr. 15, To 200 Reading—Apr. 17, 500; Apr. 18, 1,500 34½	103,270 00	
Apr. 22, To cash	500 00	
Apr. 25, To 10 Lake Shore, 129½	1,295 00	
Nov. 1, To 1,000 Reading, 35½	355 00	
May 3, To 300 Reading—200 at 35½, 100 at 35½	11,140 00	
May 3, To 500 Lake Shore, 109	54,500 00	
May 6, To cash	2,000 00	
May 7, To 400 Reading, 35½	5,740 00	
May 16, To 7,500 South Carolina, 62½	4,656 87	
June 2, To 500 Reading	20,950 00	
June 3, To 300 Reading	17,512 50	
June 6, To 2,000 S Carolina—64	1,578 13	
June 16, To 500 Lehigh	19,250 00	
June 21, To 8 shares Pennsylvania railroad, 50, forwarded, amount paid for To interest to Nov. 1, 1871	400 00	4,701 33
Balance		707 43
Total	$461,230 54	
1870.		Cr
July 12—By 200 Reading, 51¾		$10,347 97
Jan. 2—By coupons of 9,000 P and E. Tr.		315 00
Oct. 10—By dividend on 200 Oil Creek		250 00
Oct. 31—By dividend on 500 Oil Creek		2,500 00
June 20—By deposit		125 00
1871		1,500 00
Jan. 5—By coupons off 9,000 P and E Tr.		315 00
Jan. 5—By dividend on 200 Oil Creek		625 00
Jan. 13—By coupon off South Carolina 6000 gone		18,555 80
Jan. 14—By 21,000 new South Carolina—3,000 at 64½, 21,000 at 64½, 1,000 at 64¾		994 50
Jan. 16—By coupon off St Louis water bond		18,000 00
By balance down		25,500
On hand, 9,000 P and E Tr., 8,000 St Louis water bonds, 500 shares Oil Creek, 1,000 shares Reading		62,231 41
Total	$461,230 54	
1871.		
Mar. 1—By 300 Union Pacific 26	$ 7,561 72	
Mar. 1—By 200 Reading, 50	10,240 00	
Mar. 10—By 1,000 Reading 50½	50,750 00	
Apr. 15—By 1,000 Union Pacific—9,000 at 100 15th—31¼	31,621 88	
Apr. 19—By 1,000 Union Pacific, 31¼	31,621 88	
Apr. 5—By dividend, 1,200 Oil Creek	600 00	
May 1—By 500 Lake Shore, 110	54,972 60	
May 6—By 500 Lake Shore, 110	54,972 60	
May 17—By 500 Lake Shore, 109½	55,382 60	
May 29—By 1,200 Oil Creek—1,100 at 32 but at 32½	36,184 00	
June 3—By 500 Reading—400 at 36½, 200 at 36	22,275 00	
June 16—By 200 Lehigh	19,250 00	
June 25—By dividend of Pennsylvania	1,250 00	
June 30—By coupons off South Carolina	1,075 00	
July 1—By coupons off P and E Tr.	315 00	
July 17—By dividend on 1,000 Reading	2,500 00	
July 18—By coupons off St Louis water bonds	360 00	
Aug. 31—By 800 Oil creek	10,000 00	
Sept. 2—By 1,000 Reading, 57¾	57,875 00	
Oct. 16—By $20,000 South Carolina—1,000 at 65, 19,000 at 65½	12,661 61	
Oct. 20—By 200 Pennsylvania Railroad, 56½, 100 Pennsylvania Railroad, 57, 199 Pennsylvania Railroad 57¼, 384 Pennsylvania Railroad 56¾	31,889 68	
Oct. 27—By $9,950 P and E Tr. 80		
Oct. 21—By 8,000 St Louis water bonds, 97, 94	7,626 71	
	7,811 22	
Total	$461,230 54	
Nov. 1—By balance	707 43	

[C.]

Yerke's Affidavit Respecting Mackey—How the Profits were Divided—the Accounts kept Obscurely.

"Charles T. Yerkes, jr., of Philadelphia, being duly sworn according to law, doth depose and say that he has been acquainted with Robert W. Mackey, Treasurer of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, for a number of years past; that he has had stock and other transactions for account of said R. W. Mackey during that time; that said R. W. Mackey has placed money of the Commonwealth in deponent's hands, and it has been understood that interest at the rate of six per cent. per annum should be paid to the said R. W. Mackey for the use of the same. He has also been an understanding between deponent and said R W Mackey that certain portions of this money were to be used in buying up the loans of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for the purpose of selling to the Sinking Fund of the Commonwealth at a considerable advance above the price paid for the same, and dividing the profits between deponent, R. W. Mackey, and J. F. Hartranft, Auditor General. That this deponent did, on the 29th of April 1870, sell to the Sinking Fund of the Commonwealth $123,000 of the five per cent. loan of the Commonwealth, and $31,000 of the six per ct. loan. That he did, on the 18th day of May, 1870, pay to the said R. W. Mackey, $2,043 42, being his share of the profits arising from the foregoing transactions. That this deponent did, on the 25th of Aug., 1869, pay $677.56 as interest on money deposited with him for account of Commonwealth; on Feb. 9th, 1870, $332 50 for the same reason, and on May 16, 1870, $347.50, making in all $1,357.50, all of which was on account of interest for money of the Commonwealth deposited with this deponent. And this deponent further says that on Oct. 5, 1871, he sent, per Adam's express, $5,000 to said R. W. Mackey, to be delivered to him at Harrisburg, which money was for account of interest on State moneys and profit on stocks which said deponent had purchased and sold for said R. W. Mackey. That the said deponent has also from time to time been particularly cautioned to keep the accounts of money paid said R. W. Mackey for interest and profits on purchase and sale of loans of the Commonwealth in so obscure a manner that it would be difficult, in case of an investigation, for it to be detected. C. T. YERKES, jr.

Sworn and subscribed before me, this 23d day of December A.D. 1871.
[Seal.] W. W. DOUGHERTY, Ald.

[D.]

Testimony before a Legislative Committee, of E. M. Lewis, President of Farmers' and Mechanics' Bank Philadelphia.

Q. Are you a financial agent of the State of Pennsylvania? A. Yes, Sir.

Q. And were at the time of the purchase of the Pennsylvania loans? A. Yes, Sir: in 1870.

Q. How were they purchased? A. Immediately after the passage of the acts of the 13th and 14th of April, Gen. Hartranft came into the bank and communicated to me his instructions from the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund, and conferred with me as to the proper way of investing $250,000 in the loans; that amount was afterwards raised to half a million; the total purchases were $459,000, but the total purchases were stopped by the new Treasurer, Gen. Irwin; I had a very full conference with Gen. Hartranft as to the method of making these purchases; the whole matter was committed to my charge: we made special application to the holders of the loans; we had their names for all the registered loans on the books; we were the payers of the interest and issuers of the State loan; but the larger corporations and holders refused to part with their loans; and it became necessary to employ a broker, and I employed Mr. Charles T. Yerkes, jr., as the most competent man, in my judgment, to effect the transaction and purchases, and the one most likely to succeed.

Q. Was he a broker in good standing at that time?

A. Very good; such good standing that since then my bank has loaned him $200,000; in the spring of 1871 he owed us in loans $150,000; I sent for him and asked him to take $50,000 more for six months, which, after some negotiation, he agreed to do; but when we came to draw it in it was drawn for forty-nine thousand and some odd dollars, to keep within the limits of the law; we always found him promp