The Columbian —AND— Bloomsburg Democrat.

BLOOMSBURG, PA.

FRIDAY MORNING, SEPT. 17, 1869.

☞ THE COLUMBIAN has the Largest Circulation of any paper published in Northern Pennsylvania, and is also a much larger sheet than any of its cotemporaries; and is therefore the best medium for advertising in this section of the State.

To the Voters of Columbia County.

The Democratic Standing Committee have made inquiry into the facts pertaining to the nomination of a Senatorial candidate by the Senatorial Conference at Northumberland, and upon a view of the whole subject have determined to submit to you a brief address. The Candidate presented to the Conference by this county received on the 210th, ballot the votes of all the six Conferees present in the Conference, representing the counties of Northumberland, Columbia and Sullivan. The Conferees from Montour county had withdrawn previously from the conference, as had one from this county whose place had been filled by our remaining Conferee under a resolution of the Conference. The Conference consisted then of six members, representing three counties out of four of the district, when the nomination was made, and their action was unanimous. Upon this statement, considered alone, there can be no doubt of the regularity of the nomination and of the consequent obligation of the counties represented in the Conference to support it. It has been endorsed by the Standing Committee of Northumberland county (22 out of 28 members present) and by this Committee in a resolution published herewith. It is known also that it is acceptable in Sullivan county and will there receive from our party friends unanimous support.

But it is opposed in Montour county by the candidate whose conferees seceded from the Conference and he has placed his own name in his newspaper in the place appropriate to that of a regular nominee. Shall his opposition be effectual and is it placed upon good grounds? These are the questions to be considered and an answer to the latter will be the main object of this address.

The single alleged reason for opposition to our candidate, of a legal character, the only one founded upon party laws or usages, is presented by the seceding conferees in a statement published by them of the proceedings of the conference. They say that on the 202d ballot in conference their candidate received 5 votes, (being a majority of the whole,) that the result was duly announced and that his nomination became complete. It this be so, and nothing further appears to countervail their statement, another nomination could not have been regularly or properly made on the 210th ballot without a reconsideration of the former vote.

The answer which is presented to this statement of the seceding conferees in the official report of the proceedings of the Conference and in papers from individual Conferees who constituted the majority, is however very full and complete. The alledged facts upon which the argument for a Montour nomination rests are by those papers disproved in the main and the futility of the argument based upon them made most evident. It is not true that a nomination was made complete on the 202d ballot. It is not true that a nomination was then announced by the chair. It is not true that the votes as first taken was announced by the chair or by any one else, but it is certain that as soon as the roll-call was concluded a recess was taken for 5 minutes, that upon reassembling a conferee asked to change his vote and was allowed to do so by a majority vote of the conference, that he changed his vote from the Montour candidate accordingly, and that then the result of the 202d ballot was reported for the first and only time and there was no nomination. It was indispensable to a nomination that a majority should make and complete it; that they should not withhold their assent from it before it was proclaimed by them or under their authority.

But further, the seceding conferees (or two of them) took a direct part in the proceedings when leave was given to change the vote, and they were all present as members of the Conference for some time afterwards. After the 206th vote one of them moved that the Conference adjourn to meet at Bloomsburg on the 15th of September, and his motion was voted upon and rejected. Two ballots further on, another asked leave to retire for fifteen minutes and was granted leave. Can Conferees who have acted as such be permitted to repudiate the proceedings in which they have taken part? Is it to be tolerated, for instance, that after voting on the question of allowing a member to change his vote—taking the chances of success in the decision to be made—they shall not be bound by what is done and concluded from questioning it as valid afterwards?

But this may be thought narrow ground, however clear in point of legality. We choose to put the question broadly upon the clear authority of the majority of the Conference to control its proceedings—to adopt and administer its rules within the generaral principles of parliamentary law—and to announce its eventual and deliberate choice of a candidate. There is no question that the correction of the vote on the 202d ballot, and the nomination of Mr. Buckalew on the 210th, were by a clear and fair majority of the Senatorial Conference.

We may go further and say that Mr Withington had an independent right to change his vote on the 202d ballot, a right of which the Conference could not justly deprive him. The general principle applicable to his case is well stated in Barclay's Digest, one of the most recent American works on parlimentarly law and practice and published under authority of the National House of Representatives. We quote:

"A MEMBER HAS THE RIGHT TO CHANGE HIS VOTE BEFORE THE DECISION OF THE QUESTION HAS BEEN FINALLY AND CONCLUSIVELY PRONOUNCED BY THE CHAIR." (*Barclay's Digest, p. 197, ed. 1865.*)

It is true that some legislative bodies have adopted rules which limit or regulate this right of changing a vote, but as none of their rules were adopted by the Conference it could not apply or enforce them. They are entirely inapplicable to the present question. Mr. Withington's right then was good without any vote of the Conference, but its resolution would have conferred that right if he had not possessed it before.

What we have said we believe answers fully the objection made against action of the Conference. But it remains to consider whether the McNinch vote given on the 202d ballot and which has furnished the only excuse for this controversy, was not false and fraudulent. For if it was, it ought to be rejected from account and held as if it had never been given. Fraud will vitiate any contract however solemn in form, and it ought to vitiate and destroy in popular estimation any vote given in a Conference.

The M'Ninch vote was given in violation of the instructions of our Convention. That body instructed our Conferees to use all fair and honorable means to secure the nomination of our candidate. It was not fair nor honorable to vote for another when his nomination was likely and in fact had just been promised by the Conferees who could make it. It was not fair nor honorable to give that vote without notice to the candidate betrayed or to any friend who could inform him. But it is said the sessions of the Conference had been prolonged and it was time to come to a result. Who had mainly caused delay and prevented a result before, but the very Conferee in question? It was the knowledge of his treacherous intentions that kept the Montour candidate confident and protracted the Conference. It was expected and believed that he would betray his county and her candidate as soon as a tolerable excuse could be founded on the lapse of time in Conference. He had been in private consultation with the Montour candidate and the latter knew perfectly his position and objects and counted upon his support. The circumstances which prove complicity and mutual understanding between our instructed conferee and the candidate of another county, are in fact numerous, though unsuited for detail in the present address. But this is not all. There is reason to add the imputation of corruption to that of treachery in the present case. A respectable gentleman of this county affirms to us that our seceding Conferee declared privately to him that there were $3,000 to be made in the Conference, and asked his opinion whether he should take it.

Now it is upon the McNinch vote that the Montour candidate stands; he has no pretense for bolting the nomination for Senator except the fact that that vote was, in some way, secured for him on the 202d ballot. It is a bad vote to stand on, and we believe it will be found a bad vote to run on before the honest voters of the 15th Senatorial district.

The claim of this county to the Senatorial nomination at this time is believed to be a reasonable and fair one. For she has not had a Senator in 12 years while Northumberland and Sullivan have each had recently. Mr. Buckalew resigned two years of a Senatorial term when he went abroad in 1858 and the vacancy was filled by Keller of Snyder county, since whom Northumberland has had two Senatorial terms (one filled by a Republican) and Sullivan one. As to Montour county, so far as we are concerned, compensation has been made to her for lack of direct representation in the Senate by an excess of representation in the House, and if the usage of two representative terms to each county alternately shall be kept up, she will have the Representative two out of the three years of the next Senatorial term. Now the Democratic vote of Montour last fall was 1697 while that of Columbia was 4022. The latter has therefore about two and a half times the vote of the former. Yet in the last 15 years (since local contests ended) Montour has had the representative 8 years and Columbia 7, and the former (as before stated) will have the Representative, under usage, two out of the next three years. Taking the whole time since Montour was erected (19 years) the case is not so strong, as this county carried Representatives several years upon local questions prior to 1854, though Mr. Jackson, in 1852, was the choice of Montour and not of this County and his nomination was coerced in Conference. Placing him on the Montour side, the account will stand eleven years to each county at the end of the coming Senatorial term, if the usage be kept up. We think the usage between the counties a good one on grounds of convenience and policy for it avoids controversy in nominations, but it is one of extreme liberality to Montour and can only be kept up by the exercise of discretion and forbearance in the making of district nominations. Giving as it does to Montour more than double her share of Representatives, it must be taken into account, in considering the Senatorial question with which it is connected. In regard to Senatorial representation it only remains to say that Col. Best was Senator when Montour was erected and for some time afterwards and Mr. Buckalew subsequently. The time of service of the latter was in the same proportion to the population of this county that that of Col. Best was to the population of Montour.

Upon the whole the point we make is this: That there is no such offense to the local claims of Montour in Mr. Buckalew's nomination as will justify or excuse any opposition to his election in that county, while it is for the common interest of both counties in their future relations with each other, that his nomination should be sustained.

BY ORDER OF THE COMMITTEE.

SENATORIAL.—It will be seen by our issue of this week, that we have placed the name of Hon. Charles R. Buckalew, at our mast head as the Candidate for State Senate of the 15th Senatorial District. Our friends in Sullivan county will rejoice with us, that while we have lost our own able Senator, Mr. Jackson, he should be replaced by his own most intimate personal friend, an able politician and pure patriot, and one who has been an universal favorite with our people, and who will honor and ennoble any position with which he may be entrusted. His name has ever been a watchword of strength and unity, with the Democracy of Northern Pennsylvania, and we do not doubt he will receive every Democratic vote in this county. We shall publish the proceedings of the conference in full in our next issue, and know that our friends will be gratified with the result of our action.—*Sullivan Democrat.*

THINK of it, laboring men! Five years after the close of the war, the premium on gold is 1.36. The greenbacks in which you are paid are worth but seventy cents on the dollar, and in addition you must bear the burden of taxation to help pay the bond holders, who receive double for an investment which costs them no labor.

The Senatorial Conference.

THE CASE MADE UP AND THE ACTION OF THE MAJORITY FULLY VINDICATED.

The several papers published herewith fully explain the proceedings of the late Senatorial Conference and answer in a most effectual manner the misstatements of the seceders from the Conference. The proposed bolt in Montour County is by them stripped of all pretext or excuse and presented before the people of the district in its true colors as a simple act of insubordination to party laws and an open defiance of the principle that the majority shall rule. For nothing can be more certain than that the majority of the Conference had complete control over their own proceedings and had a right to fix and announce their deliberate and final choice of a candidate, in spite of the opposition, protest, or secession of the minority. It is not denied that a clear majority of the Conference nominated Mr. Buckalew and in due form announced his nomination to the people. It is not denied that when the tricky and base vote of McNinch was given in Conference, the apparent majority for Chalfant produced by it was unreal and false, not representing in fact the intention, will and purpose of a majority of the Conferees. Nor is it denied that a majority of the Conference deliberately resolved by a formal vote that one of their number should be authorized to change his vote and thus prevent a fraudulent result from being consummated. Now these points being conceded, no question regarding the validity of Mr. Buckalew's nomination remains for dispute. Whether all the proceedings upon the 202d ballot were exactly regular or not becomes an unimportant question, and therefore if every thing asserted by the seceding Conferees as occurring on the 202d ballot were true it would not effect the nomination made on the 210th. Even if the majority reached a just result in an irregular manner—if they made a mistake upon a question of order by changing a vote instead of reconsidering it—still, as it was competent for them to control the final result of the nomination, their action would be valid and could not now be called in question. A mistake of means when the end was right and proper, would not be a fatal or important objection.

But this view of the case is unnecessary. For the papers now published show conclusively, (in confirmation of the official report of the Conference,) that the result of the 202d ballot was not announced nor a nomination declared, when Mr. Withington changed his vote. The action taken was therefore entirely regular and in order. He had a right to change his vote as the Conference had adopted no rules which excluded or limited such right. Besides, the vote of the Conference would have given him the right if he had not otherwise possessed it.

From our point of view the differences of statement between the majority and minority of the Conference are not important in forming an opinion upon the general question of the nomination. But we must say in regard to those differences that the seceders are very thoroughly contradicted. The strong weight of direct evidence and all the probabilities of the case are against them. Each one of the five (original) majority conferees contradicts them; Mr. Meylert in the official report drawn by him and the four others in the supplemental papers now published. And all fair presumptions run with the majority. They are all fair, intelligent and honorable men who will appear to very great advantage when compared with M'Ninch and will not suffer when contrasted with Billmeyer and Miles. Their statements drawn up at different times and places are consistent in all material respects, and bear the impress of truth upon their face. Besides, it is more likely that the official report of the proceedings of the Conference drawn up when the facts were fresh at the adjournment and approved by the majority present, should be correct and reliable, than a statement concocted by the seceders sometime afterwards to justify their conduct.

The nomination finally made by the Conference was a fair one and it has all the sanctions of regularity and usage. It is now effectually vindicated against misrepresentation and will, we doubt not, be triumphantly sustained by the people.

Meeting of the Standing Committee.

A meeting of the Standing Committee of Columbia county was called by the Chairman for Saturday last, but on account of the unavoidable absence of the Chairman, was postponed until Monday last when the meeting was held. There were present E. G. Ricketts, Orange; C. G. Barkley, Bloom; W. H. Shoemaker, Hemlock; Rohr M'Henry, Benton; J. B. Knittle, Catawissa; Jesse Hoffman, Centre; and C. B. Brockway Chairman. Absent U. J. Campbell, Maine, and Richard Thornton, Conyngham.

On motion of E. G. Ricketts, seconded by Rohr M'Henry, it was unanimously

Resolved, THAT THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF COLUMBIA COUNTY HAVING ATTENTIVELY EXAMINED THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE SENATORIAL CONFERENCE, AND THE INDIVIDUAL STATEMENTS OF THE DIFFERENT CONFEREES, ARE STRONGLY OF THE OPINION THAT THE HON. CHARLES R. BUCKALEW IS THE REGULAR NOMINEE OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY FOR THE XVth SENATORIAL DISTRICT, AND AS SUCH PLEDGE HIM THEIR HEARTY SUPPORT, AND EARNESTLY COMMEND HIM TO THE FULL AND EARNEST SUPPORT OF THE DEMOCRACY OF THIS COUNTY.

Resolved, That the Chairman be authorized and requested to prepare an address to the people of the County giving our reasons for this action, accompanied by such documents as bear on the subject.

Other business in reference to the campaign was transacted, and Vigilance Committees for the different townships appointed, a list of which will be found in another column.

Northumberland in Line!

At a meeting of the Standing Committee of Northumberland county held in the Court House in Sunbury September 7th 1869. The following resolution was unanimously adopted:

Resolved.—THAT WE FULLY APPROVE OF THE NOMINATION OF THE HON. CHARLES R. BUCKALEW, OF COLUMBIA COUNTY, AS OUR CANDIDATE FOR THE STATE SENATE, AND WE HEARTILY COMMEND HIM TO THE DEMOCRACY OF NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY, FOR THEIR UNDIVIDED SUPPORT.

Statement and Answer of Messrs. Clark and Withington, Conferees.

We have read the statement of the seceding conferees from the late Senatorial conference at Northumberland; and also the circular of James S. McNinch, contained in an extra of the *Berwick Gazette*, issued at Danville. And we think it proper to state in reply to those documents certain particulars which do not fully appear in the official report of the proceedings of the conference. At an early stage in the proceedings it was agreed at the suggestion of Mr. Meylert that until a nomination should be effected the votes upon each balloting might be simply reported by the Secretaries without being formally announced by the Chairman. This course was followed uniformly throughout; Mr. Meylert, the senior Secretary, always reporting the vote when present. There was no agreement dispensing with the right or duty of the Chairman to announce a final result and proclaim the nomination when made.

When the 202d ballot was reached the counties were called in their order under the rule of the conference, commencing with Montour and ending with Columbia. Upon that ballot the Northumberland conferees gave what were well understood to be complimentary votes to Mr. Chalfant; and when Columbia was reached Mr. McNinch gave an unexpected vote for the same candidate. Whereupon Mr. Miles, one of the Secretaries, said that Mr. Chalfant had five votes. Mr. Clark, the Chairman, then asked if his name was not to be called? It was called, and he voted for Mr. Buckalew. Then, without any report or announcement of the vote by either of the Secretaries or the Chairman, the conference, on motion of Judge Deegan, and without dissent, adjourned for five minutes. Immediately after reassembling, Mr. Meylert stated that Mr. Withington desired to change his vote. The Chairman decided that he had a right to change his vote, the result not having been announced; but objection being made by one of the Montour conferees, Mr. Reber moved that his colleague be permitted to change his vote. This motion was submitted to the conference, and was agreed to by a vote of six to one, Mr. Billmeyer not voting, and Mr. Miles voting against it. We desire to state distinctly that Mr. McNinch voted for this motion, and had announced his intention of doing so previously. Mr. Withington's name was then called by one of the Secretaries and he voted for William P. Withington, as stated in the official report. The result of the ballot was then reported and there was no nomination.

The subsequent proceedings of the conference appear in the official report.

Mr. McNinch and the Montour conferees did not withdraw from the conference immediately after the 202d ballot as is stated by him. They remained for a number of ballots; Mr. Miles, of Montour, offering a motion after the 206th ballot, "That the conference adjourn to meet at Bloomsburg, on the 15th of September," which was rejected; and Mr. McNinch asking leave of the conference after the 208th ballot, to retire for the space of fifteen minutes, which was granted. Mr. Chalfant was also admitted upon two occasions and made remarks to the conference.

We have said that Mr. McNinch's vote was unexpected in view of the fact that he had voted under his instructions for nearly two hundred times for Mr. Buckalew, while a nomination could not be effected, and that he was well informed just before that vote was given that Mr. Buckalew could and would be nominated during that session by the votes of the Northumberland conferees. This information was conveyed to him by Mr. Clark when the conference met to take the 201st ballot. He was informed by Mr. Clark that he had just learned from Mr. M. J. D. Withington, conferee, that his brother Mr. W. P. Withington, the candidate, had become convinced that his nomination was impossible, and that inasmuch as he believed that Mr. Buckalew was the second choice of Northumberland county, he desired that his conferees should vote for him, and that they would presently do so, and make the nomination. When therefore upon the second vote thereafter, and when Columbia county voted last, McNinch broke his instructions and voted for Mr. Chalfant, there was just cause for that indignation which was openly expressed before the conference by his colleague.

ROBERT F. CLARK,
M. J. D. WITHINGTON.
September 11, 1869.

The Seceders' Statement.

The Seceding Conferees have put forth an extraordinary statement of the proceedings of the Conference. The first part, obviously compiled from the above official report, it is unnecessary to republish. We give however the conclusion of their statement in full, simply remarking here that it is without date and was no doubt made up at Danville some time after the conference.

* * * * * * * * *

The 202d vote was called for, which resulted as follows: Buckalew, 1; Chalfant, 5; Withington, 0; Jackson, 2. After all the Conferees had voted including Mr. Clark, the Chairman, and considerable time had elapsed waiting for the Chairman to announce the vote, Secretary Miles arose in his place and read from his tally list the 202 vote viz: Chalfant, 5; Buckalew, 1: Withington, 0; Jackson, 2. Whereupon Mr. Clark Chairman, announced that on the 202d vote as before stated by the Secretary, Chalfant had 5 votes. Mr. Miles then moved to make the nomination of Thos. Chalfant unanimous. After which a motion was made to adjourn for five minutes, which having the preference, Conference adjourned for five minutes. The five votes cast for Chalfant on this vote were Billmeyer and Miles from Montour, Withington and Reber, from Northumberland, and M'Ninch from Columbia. On reassembling, Mr. Mylert asked leave of Conference that Mr. M. J. D. Withington, who on the last vote had voted for Thomas Chalfant, be permitted to change his vote. This was objected to by Miles and others on the ground that inasmuch as the last vote had been announced by both the Secretary and Chairman of the Conference and an adjournment had intervened between the announcement of the vote and the request for leave to change his vote the application was too late. After some discussion the motion carried. Whereupon part of the Conferees withdrew including the conferees from Montour and J. S. M'Ninch one of the Conferees from Columbia county, said Conferees regarding their work as finished so far as related to the selection of a candidate.

GEO. W. MILES, Sec'y.

We, two of the Senatorial Conferees do certify that the foregoing report of the doings of the Conference is correct and a true and full report of the proceedings of said conference.

J. S. M'NINCH, Columbia.
DANIEL BILLMEYER, Montour.

Letter from Hon. James Deegan, Conferee from Sullivan County.

DUSHORE, Sept. 11, 1869.

EDITOR COLUMBIAN: DEAR SIR:—In addition to the enclosed paper, which you may publish if you think proper, I desire to say a few words in regard to the Conference lately held in which I served as a member. This I do because I see that what was done has been misrepresented.

The official report of the proceedings of the Conference was written out or finished by Mr. Meylert as soon as he could do it upon the adjournment of the Conference, and the report was then read over by him to all the six Conferees present and approved by them and signed at the time, as was the notification to Mr. Buckalew of his nomination. The facts were all fresh in our minds and we knew that the report was correct and true. The report says, that Mr. Withington changed his vote by leave of the Conference before the result of the 202d ballot was announced by the chair; and this was the honest truth. For as soon as the majority of the Conference saw the trick of the M'Ninch vote, which was immediately, they felt no desire to carry it into effect and the proceeding was stopped. I moved the five minute adjournment at once to prevent any report or announcement of the vote and it was agreed to without dissent. Then when we all came together again, Mr. Withington's vote was changed upon full authority and the intended fraud prevented. After all this for the first and only time, was there a report and announcement of the vote upon that ballot. It had not before been announced by the chair or by any one else. It is true that before the ballot was concluded when taken first, that is before the Chairman (who was always called last) voted, Mr. Miles said that Mr. Chalfant had 5 votes; but this was no report of the vote as the ballot was not concluded and besides he had no authority to announce a nomination. It is true also that about the same instant that I moved the 5 minute adjournment (which was as soon as the ballot was ended) Mr. Miles tried to introduce a motion to declare Mr. Chalfant the candidate. But he was not recognized by the chair, and his attempt therefore was no part of the official proceedings. And his motion if he had been allowed to make it, I suppose would have been irregular at that time. In point of fact I was recognized by the chair instead of him and made my motion for the recess of 5 minutes which was agreed to as before stated without opposition.

The attempt of the minority of three Conferees out of eight to overrule their colleagues and force upon them a final result to which they were opposed, is absurd upon its face. Even if they could have kept Mr. Withington from changing his vote (which they could not) and have forced an announcement of the vote, the majority could at once have *reconsidered* the vote and have made any nomination they pleased afterwards. The 202d ballot was not reconsidered by us only because when announced and accepted by the Conference, it did *not* show a nomination produced by a fraudulent vote.

Respectfully Yours,

JAMES DEEGAN.

Reply of Mr. Reber, one of the Conferees from Northumberland.

The statement signed by J. S. M'Ninch of Columbia and Daniel Billmeyer and Geo. W. Miles of Montour, in relation to proceedings of Conference of the 15th Senatorial District, at North'd., on Saturday Sept. 4th 1869, is incorrect in certain particulars. On the 202d Ballot five votes were polled, as stated, for Thos. Chalfant. The Secretary had neglected to call for the vote of Mr. Clark the Chairman. Mr. Clark's name was then called, when he voted for Mr. Buckalew. Immediately thereafter, James Deegan of Sullivan county moved to adjourn for five minutes, which was carried unanimously. No result of the vote had been reported by Mr. Meylert the Secretary, (who had reported the result of all previous ballots when he was present) nor was it announced by Mr. Clark the Chairman. Upon reassembling, Mr. Meylert the Secretary stated that Mr. Withington of North'd., desired to change his vote. It was then moved by me that leave be so granted him. The question was at once put by the Chairman, and was decided in the affirmative with but one dissenting vote, namely Mr. Miles of Montour. No question was raised by Mr. Miles, or by any other Conferee as to the propriety of taking that vote and no objection was made to putting the vote, by any member of the Conference.

Mr. Withington then cast his vote for W. P. Withington of North'd., and the result being announced the conference proceeded to the next ballot. After several ballots had been taken (Messrs. Miles and Billmeyer of Montour and Mr. M'Ninch of Columbia not voting) Mr. Miles moved that the Convention adjourn to meet at Bloomsburg on the 15th Sept. This motion was not carried. The conferees of Montour and Mr. M'Ninch of Columbia afterwards retired from the conference.

Mr. Lowenberg of Columbia was chosen by Mr. Clark of Columbia, at the request of the conference as conferee *vice* Mr. M'Ninch. On the 210th ballot Mr. Buckalew received all the votes, (two from Sullivan, two from Northumberland and two from Columbia,) six, and was declared the unanimous nominee of the conference.

E. L. REBER.

Sept. 9, 1869.

A Contradiction by Judge Deegan.

I have seen the statement of J. S. McNinch, (without date) in regard to the Senatorial nomination at Northumberland. His statement of a conversation in Mr. Buckalew's room on the evening of the nomination, so far as he refers to me, I pronounce on my honor as a gentleman, to be wholly and absolutely false. I never at that or any other time heard such a proposition from Mr. Buckalew. He never conceded that all confidence in Mr. Withington's making the nomination was lost; nor did he submit any calculation and propose that the conference adjourn without making a nomination and he would run as an independent candidate.

Instead of Mr. Buckalew speaking in the manner represented by Mr. McNinch, he expressed more confidence than I then felt in regard to making a nomination that evening in conference, and said, he thought we could reach a nomination and should go on.

I am sorry Mr. McNinch should seek to cover up his treachery by referring to me for a corroboration of his false statements; but since he has done so the only course for me is to pronounce them as I now do, so far as I am referred to, as false from the beginning to the end.

JAMES DEEGAN.

DUSHORE, Pa., Sept. 11, 1869.

A Brief View of the Senatorial Nomination.

TO ROBERT F. CLARK, ESQ. CHAIRMAN OF THE LATE SENATORIAL CONFERENCE.

SIR:—Some people have a strange perversity of mind. They are forever trying mentally, to look round a corner. Whatever is fair, straight, and regular has no charm for them. To their imagination the curved line is the line of beauty. This peculiarity of mental vision is very well illustrated by certain critics upon the late Northumberland Senatorial Conference.

In that Conference four counties were represented by eight Conferees. In looking over the proceedings, it is apparent that there were but *three* men in the Conference who desired the nomination of Mr. Chalfant; while *five* desired the nomination of Mr. Buckalew. Notwithstanding the vote cast on the 202d ballot, not a single member of the Conference regarded a nomination as having been made; which is proved, *First*, by the consent of the Conference that Mr. Withington of Northumberland should be permittted to change his vote; *Second*, by the subsequent motion of Mr. Miles of Montour, That the Conference do now adjourn to meet at Bloomsburg on the 15th of September; and *Third*, that upon that motion being lost, a minority of the Conferees withdrew, leaving a majority still in session.

Now a majority never retires from a Convention or a Conference. Having the power in its own hands, it can dictate terms and make nominations. It is the dissatisfied and defeated minority which retires from the contest, and attempts to infect the outside body with its own spleen and discord. As it was the business of the Conference to make a nomination, so no nomination was made, until a majority had consented to announce some gentleman as the recipient of their votes. The *official* proceedings announce the nomination of Mr. Buckalew, and are signed by *six* conferees out of *eight;* the Conference having filled the place of the retiring member from Columbia; while Mr. Chalfant is declared nominated by *three* out of *eight*.

Hence the perversity of mental vision which cannot see the regularity of Mr. Buckalew's nomination is something wonderful; and argues an imperfection of intellect not a little surprising. If the majority is to rule, there is no question left for debate. Yours Truly,

F.

Senatorial Conference.

WEDNESDAY, Aug. 25, 1869.

At a meeting of the conferees of the counties composing the Fifteenth Senatorial District, at the Vankirk House, in Northumberland, present from

Columbia County—Robert F. Clark, J. S. McNinch.

Montour County—Daniel Billmeyer, G. W. Miles.

Northumberland County—M. J. D. Withington, John P. Pursel.

Sullivan County—James Deegan, Michael Meylert.

Robert F. Clark, of Columbia county, was elected chairman.

Geo. W. Miles and Michael Meylert were elected Secretaries.

Nominations being in order,

James Deegan nominated George D. Jackson, of Sullivan County.

John P. Pursel nominated William P. Withington, of Northumberland county.

Geo. W. Miles nominated Thomas Chalfant, of Montour County.

J. S. McNinch nominated Charles R. Buckalew, of Columbia County.

Moved and seconded that the nominations now close, which was carried.

It was moved and seconded that when the ballots are taken they shall commence alphabetically with the counties, and then take the names of counties next in order first, and continue in that way through all of the ballots to be taken.

It was then agreed to proceed to ballot. Six ballots were taken giving at each balloting each of the candidates two votes.

When on motion adjourned until one o'clock p. m.

After voting the 19th ballot and no nomination, on motion of Jas. Deegan seconded by Michael Meylert, that this conference do now adjourn to meet at Laporte, on the first Monday of September; decided negatively.

After the 24th ballot with no nomination, the conference took a recess of fifteen minutes. Several further adjournments and ballots having been taken; after the 145th ballot had been taken with no result,

On motion of Mr. Meylert, it was

Resolved, That after six o'clock on the morning of the 27th instant, that his colleague, James Deegan, be permitted to cast the vote of Sullivan County in this conference until Meylert return to said conference or the arrival of his substitute,

Which was adopted unanimously.

Adjourned to meet at Vankirk House, September 4th, at half-past nine o'clock a. m.

[In the night session above, Mr. Pursell, of Northumberland, being indisposed and desiring to leave, E. L. Reber was substituted in his place to act as a conferee from Northumberland county.]

SATURDAY, Sept. 4, 1869.

Conference met pursuant to adjournment. Present, Robert F. Clark, Chairman; Geo. W. Miles, Secretary; J. S. McNinch, Daniel Billmeyer, M. J. D. Withington, E. L. Reber, and James Deegan, conferees.

Mr. Meylert having been delayed, it was

Resolved, That James Deegan be permitted to act Mr. Meylert's vote until his return, and also act as Secretary *pro. tem.*

After the 155th ballot, adjourned until half-past two p. m.

Reassembled, and after 170th ballot adjourned until half-past six o'clock p. m. Half past six o'clock, met pursuant to adjournment; Mr. Meylert having returned took his position as secretary and member of the conference.

After taking the 181st ballot, adjourned until half past seven this afternoon.

Met and voted up to and including the 200th ballot, and adjourned until half past eight.

After reassembling and on taken the 202nd ballot Mr. Withington having first voted for Thomas Chalfant, before the vote was announced by the chair, to the conference, desired to change his vote, and on the motion to that effect being put he was granted leave, with but one dissenting vote. He then voted for Wm. P. Withington.

Having proceeded to the 206th ballot without result Mr. Miles from Montour moved to adjourn to meet at Bloomsburg on 15th September, which motion having been put was decided in the negative.

After taking the 208th ballot Mr. McNinch not participating, on his request to do so was allowed to retire for fifteen minutes, on returning Mr. McNinch having declined to vote, and having withdrawn from the conference, (the conference declining to excuse him,) it was moved that his colleague have the privilege of substituting a conferee in his place, which was unanimously agreed to.

Mr. Clark then substituted David Lowenberg as conferee from Columbia county.

The conference then proceeded to take the 210th Ballot and the Montour conferees having previously withdrawn, Mr. Buckalew received the unanimous nomination of the conference by the ballots of Columbia, Northumberland and Sullivan counties, as Senatorial Candidate for the 15th Senatorial District.

The Chairman, Mr. Clark having been requested by the conference, informed Mr. Buckalew of his unanimous nomination, which being done, Mr. Buckalew thanked the conference and accepted the nomination.

Messrs Jackson and Withington being present accepted their positions of defeated candidates in a few appropriate remarks and pledged Mr. Buckalew a cordial support.

ROBERT F. CLARK,
Chairman.

MICHAEL MEYLERT,
Secretary.

NOTICE OF NOMINATION.

HON. CHARLES R. BUCKALEW,

Dear Sir:—By the unanimous action of the conferees of Columbia, Northumberland and Sullivan Counties, you are declared the Candidate of the 15th Senatorial District for the State Senate.

ROBERT F. CLARK,
Chairman.

JAMES DEEGAN,
DAVID LOWENBERG,
M. J. D. WITHINGTON,
E. L. REBER,
} Conferees.

MICHAEL MEYLERT,
Secretary.

NEW ADVERTISEMENTS.

GENERAL ELECTION PROCLAMATION

WHEREAS, by the laws of this Commonwealth it is made the duty of the Sheriff of every county to give notice of the general Election, by publication in one or more newspapers in the county, at least twenty days before the election, and to enumerate therein the officers to be elected, and to designate the places at which the election is to be held.

Therefore I, MORDECAI MILLARD, High Sheriff of Columbia county, do hereby make known and proclaim to the qualified electors of Columbia county, that a general Election will be held on TUESDAY, THE TWENTY-FIRST DAY OF OCTOBER, 1869, (being the first Tuesday in said month,) at the several districts within the county, to wit:

Beaver township, at the public house of Benj. F. Zarr.

Benton township, at the public house of Andrew T. Heler, in the town of Benton.

Bloom township, at the Court House, in Bloomsburg.

Borough Berwick at the Town House, in the borough of Berwick.

Borough Centralia, at the public house of H. A. Weidensaul.

Briarcreek township, at the public school house near Evansville.

Catawissa township, at the public house of Samuel Koser, Rinemder, in the town of Catawissa.

Centre township, at the school house near Lafayette Creasey's.

North Conyngham District at the school house near the colliery of John Andrews & Co.

South Conyngham District at the house of Thomas Kilker, lately fixed by a vote of the citizens of that township.

Fishingcreek township, at the public house of Emanuel Unangst.

Franklin township at the Lawrance school house.

Greenwood township, at the house of Joseph R. Patton.

Hemlock township, at the public house of Chas. H. Dietterich in the town of Buck Horn.

Jackson township at the house of Ezekiel Cole.

Locust township, at the public house of David Yeager in Slabtown.

Mifflin township, at the public house of Aaron Hess, in the town of Mifflinville.

Madison township, at the public house of Samuel Rimby, in Jerseytown.

Mt. Pleasant township, at the house of H. W. Mellick.

Montour township, at the house of Wm. Hollingshead.

Maine township, at the public house of Abraham K. Shuman.

Roaringcreek township, at the house formerly occupied by Geo. W. Dreisbach.

Orange township, at the public house of Clinton W. Vapie in Orangeville.

Pine township, at the Centre School House lately fixed by a vote of the citizens of said township.

Sugarloaf township at the house of Allinas Cole

Scott township, at the public house of Wm. Petrikin Jr.

At which time and places the qualified electors will elect by ballot the following State and County officers, viz:

One person for Governor of Pa. one person for Judge of the Supreme Court, of Pa. one person for State Senate, one person for Representative one person for Associate Judge, one person for Prothonotary one person for Register and Recorder, one person for County Treasurer, one person for County Commissioner, one person for County Auditor, and one person for Coroner.

It is further directed that the election polls of the several districts shall be opened between the hours of six and seven o'clock in the forenoon, and shall continue open without interruption and adjournment until seven o'clock in the evening when the polls shall be closed.

Pursuant to the provisions contained in the 76th section of the act first aforesaid, the judges of the aforesaid districts shall respectively take charge of the certificates of return of the election of their respective districts, and produce them at a meeting of one judge from each district at the court house, Bloomsburg, on the third day after the day of the election, being on Friday, the 15th day of October, 1869, at 10 o'clock a. m., then and there to do and perform the duties required by law of said judges.

Also, that where a Judge, by sickness or unavoidable accident, is unable to attend such meeting of judges, then the certificate or return shall be taken charge of by one of the inspectors or clerks of the election of the district, who shall do and perform the duties required of said judge unable to attend.

The return Judges of the Representative District, composed of the counties of Columbia and Montour, shall meet at the Court House, in Bloomsburg, on Tuesday the nineteenth day of October, next, to make out the returns for member of Assembly.

The return judges of the Senatorial district composed of the counties of Columbia, Montour, Northumberland and Sullivan, shall meet at the court house, in Danville, Montour county, on Tuesday the nineteenth day of October next, to make out the return for the member of the Senate.

The following Act of Assembly, regulating the mode of voting in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, was passed March 16th, 1866, and reads thus:

SECTION 1. Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in General Assembly met, and it is hereby enacted by the authority of the same that the qualified voters of the several districts in the several counties of this commonwealth, at all general, township, borough and special elections, are hereby hereafter authorized and required to vote by tickets, printed, written, or partly printed and partly written, severally classified as follows: One ticket shall embrace the names of all Judges of Courts voted for, and to be labelled, "Judiciary;" one ticket shall embrace the names of all the State officers voted for, and be labelled "State;" one ticket shall embrace the names of all county officers voted for, including the office of Senator, Member and Members of Assembly, if voted for by more than one county, if voted for, and be labelled "County;" one ticket shall embrace the names of all township officers voted for and be labelled, "Township;" one ticket shall embrace the names of all borough offices voted for, and be labelled, "Borough;"

SECTION 2. That it shall be the duty of the Sheriff in the several counties of this Commonwealth to insert in their election proclamations, hereafter issued, the first section of this act.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN.

That every person excepting Justices of the Peace who shall hold any office or appointment of profit or trust under the United States, or of this state, any city or corporated district, whether a commissioned officer or otherwise, a subordinate officer or agent who is or shall be employed under the Legislature, executive or Judiciary Department of this State, or of any city or of any incorporated district, and also, that every member of Congress and of the State Legislature, and of the select or common council of any city, or commissioners of any incorporated district, is by law incapable of holding exercising at the time the office or appointment of Judge, Inspector or Clerk of any election of this Commonwealth, and that no Inspector Judge or other officer of such election shall be eligible to be then voted for.

The Inspectors and Judge of the elections shall meet at their respective places appointed for holding the election in the district to which they respectively belong, before seven o'clock in the morning, and each of said inspectors shall appoint one clerk, who shall be a qualified voter of such district.

In case the person who shall receive the second highest number of votes for inspector shall not attend on the day of any election, then the person who shall have received the second highest number of votes for judge at the next preceding election shall act as inspector in his place. And in case the person who shall have received the highest number of votes for inspector shall not attend, the person elected judge shall appoint an inspector in his place—and in case the person elected judge shall not attend, then the inspector who received the highest number of votes shall appoint a judge in his place. And if any vacancy shall continue in the board for the space of one hour after the time fixed by law for the opening of the election, the qualified voters of the township, ward, or district for which such officers shall have