

E. B. HAWLEY & CO., Editors.

Wednesday, July 16, 1873.

The earnings of the Central Pacific railroad for the month of June, 1873 were \$8,313,700; for the month of June, 1872, \$1,133,262; increase \$1,755,518. Earnings first six months of 1873, \$6,320,686; earnings first six months of 1872, \$5,508,616; increase, \$812,161.

Information comes from Washington that Senator Conkling has been tendered the vacant chief justiceship but its acceptance is exceedingly doubtful. Senator Conkling, being an aspirant for the presidency, has probably been taught by recent events to distrust the supreme bench as a base of operations for a presidential campaign.

GEORGE COCHRAN, the chairman of the Lib-rals in New York, announces the meeting of the liberal state committee on the 30th inst. at Saratoga. It is probable that the democratic convention and the convention of the liberals, meeting simultaneously, will unite on a common ticket and platform. So thinks the Hartford Times.

SAYS THE BALTIMORE GAZETTE: Some of the Boston newspapers are earnestly advocating the teaching of the art of sewing to the girls in the public schools. Nothing could be more sensible or practical; and if the same course of study, coupled with instruction in the science of cookery, were adopted in those private schools where too often only fashionable poise is put on the female character, society would be much better and happier.

The latest dodge on the part of the Credit Mobilier party is to declare Jacob Thompson, Buchanan's Secretary of the Interior, a defaulter. It has required seventeen years labor in the Auditor's Department to reach these accounts and strike a balance. This is quite too thin to spread over the eyes of the voters of this country, who have seen millions upon millions stolen by the Indian ring since the Republican party came into power.

We are bound to acknowledge that the editor of the Montrose Republican has taken a stand upon "an important local issue." He says: "We are opposed to the nomination of General Grant for a third term, and do not believe either that the Republican party will nominate him, or that he desires to be nominated."

All right. We will just stick a pin exactly there. We have only one further question and that is, will the Republican support him if Mosby gets him nominated? It is one thing to claim to be righteous and another to show it by actions.

The Springfield Republican thus speaks editorially of Vice President Wilson's health: "The Vice President has passed into that stage of health, which Mr. Chase so long occupied, a paralytic invalid to whom life is of most uncertain duration. The nature of his disease may not utterly destroy his usefulness as a man and public servant, but it will undoubtedly limit his ambition and activity."

The old complaint evidently—Credit Mobilier. Ontario is unfortunate either in her Judges or in her laws. The Supreme Court of that State has decided that the school board can exclude the Bible in the public schools, if they choose, and now Judge Green, of Columbus, has decided that the laws for the observance of Sunday do not apply to those who conscientiously observe Saturday as the Sabbath; and that city and town ordinances prohibiting the sale of liquors on Sunday are void, which do not exempt from their operations those who sell to travelers or who conscientiously observe the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath.

GRANT'S candidate for Governor of Massachusetts, Salary Grabber Ben Butler, addressing a temperance meeting at Framingham on the Fourth, at the close of which he was called upon to state whether he is among the friends or opponents of the present liquor law in that State. The "hero of Fort Fisher" said "asking questions at a Fourth of July celebration is like whistling at a funeral." The question was put again and again, but Ben, who was always known to pull for the side that pays best, paid no attention thereto and quickly left the stand and the grove.

HON. DAVID WELLS sums up the results of the protective system for our country in the following suggestive passage: "With every possible advantage in its favor it has swept the commerce of the United States from the ocean, destroyed the export trade in respect to nearly all the manufactured products, harassed and vexed the entire mercantile community, impoverished the agriculturist, unequally affected the distribution of wealth, and by increasing the cost of all the tools and implements of production imposed a tax on the whole nation so grievous that its further continuance has become almost a matter of impossibility."

"Hoseach Thoe Torment Me Not."

The following prayer of the "unclean spirits" of Montrose, who read and torture the unhappy victims whom they get possession of, by their merciless demands for "a pound of flesh," was printed through the columns of the Montrose Republican, last week.

We used to think that a former editor of the Springfield Journal excelled in the invention of falsehoods against the people of Montrose, but it is doubtful whether the Democrat editor cannot claim pre-eminence in that respect. We know of no one who has read the Democrat for a year or more, who has not read that paper, ignorant of the real character of the people of this borough, would not infer from the prominence given in its columns to the operations of the "curstions brokers" that preying upon the poor and unfortunate was the principal business of our people. We say that such is the case. We believe that the great majority of the people of Montrose make their living as honestly as the people of other places. And we think it is no more than fair that the Democrat after its reported charges against denouncing some of our citizens, without defining who or which, as "cowardly thieves"—should be called upon to make its charges specific, so that the people may be able to discriminate between the innocent and the guilty. What proportion of our citizens, we have a right to ask, are comprised under the opprobrious title of "cowardly thieves"? Who are these men who, after having taken a man's claim for collection, conspire to rob him? If they are lawyers, let the Court promptly discharge every one who thus disgraces the profession. If they are church members, let the Church expel those who have so dishonored themselves by associating with those who offend. But if there are no such offenders among us, then let the editor of the Montrose Democrat bear the odium of having invented and published the odious charges against the people of this borough, and let the editor of the Democrat bear the odium of having published them. We are informed by men who have no occasion to be partial, that the editor of the Democrat has a personal (not political) quarrel. And we also understand that these men deny the charges so made, and challenge the Democrat to publish them, and to show that they are true. We submit if the above wail is not palpable in its appeal, to that made by the "Legion of Devils" who besought the Great Teacher of mankind not to torment them. The question "what is thy name," may be answered by them, in the same manner "my name is Legion, for we are many." Yes, and the simile may be continued farther, that the true Christian people of Montrose, who have a desire for the salvation of its moral and temporal interests, are willing not only to suffer them, but are desiring that they should enter into the herd of swine and run violently down some steep place into the lake and be choked. It is to bring about this relief that we have brought the powers that be, to "cast them out," for by this means alone can it be done, notwithstanding we are charged in the above article, with blasphemy to the good name of Montrose, and as "inventing falsehood" and "publishing slanders about our neighbors." This is a bet stronger proof of our simile, as there were the same class of Pharisees and Publicans eighteen hundred years ago, who clothed themselves with the name of holiness, but were in the innermost of their hearts full of hypocrisy and extortion. It is not a pleasant task to be forced to acknowledge such base transactions to have taken place in our midst, as we from time to time have been alluding to, but like a deep festering sore, the only remedy to save the patient is to apply the lance. And we have acted upon that principle, as regards relieving our community of the infamous "Shylocks" that infest it. We are prepared to risk our reputation as a doctor of the true interests of our community, both financial and moral, entirely upon this line of practice. The above symptoms from the columns of the Republican, clearly indicate its good effect. Snead and milk politicians as that paper allows in its columns, may soothe the troubled consciences of these "Curbstone" Christians, but it will never bring their base corruption to a head.

It is evident from the tone of the above article that some one is touched. The appeal to the pride of the people of Montrose, and the effort to indict us before them, for an attempt to fish from them the high and exalted moral position they assume to occupy among the nations of the world, may be lawyer-like in its acuteness, but it is very weak in its foundation. It may be policy for some to cloak iniquity, but it is not true Christianity nor the proper way to eradicate the evil. There are most certainly a goodly number of excellent people in Montrose, but its high physical elevation makes it no nearer Heaven than many other places, and the miserable hypocrites in its courts, its churches, and its society, who pray in the Sanctuary on Sunday to be forgiven of their debts as they forgive their debtors, and prey all the rest of the week upon the misfortunes of their neighbors, are worthy of the name of "cowardly thieves" as they not only rob the indigent and unfortunate of their hard earnings, but they rob the church of its good influence and example, they rob the Bar of its professional honor, and inflict a common and blighting curse upon the community in which they operate. We are asked by the writer of the above article, to give names and not to be general in our charges, and then he makes a grand flourish with his "curstions" truncheon that we cannot, and that we have invented and published these charges to injure certain men with whom we have a personal quarrel. This may be another lawyer-like movement and may seem very bold and defiant at sight, but we are well aware, undoubtedly, as the gentleman who wrote it, that by the laws of our State, the greater the truth of the assertion made, the greater is the libel and we are not willing to gratify these sharks by giving them an opportunity to arraign us before the courts, gagged by law from proving the truth of our assertions in mitigation. This would furnish them

Amending the National Constitution.

(From Senator Thurman's Fourth of July Oration at Chillicothe, Ohio.) In respect to the election of President and vice president there is urgent need for an amendment. I do not allude to the proposition to dispense with the electoral colleges and permit the people to vote directly for these officers, although I think that might be done without in the slightest degree disturbing the relative weight of the several states in the election, as it now exists. But the necessity to which I refer relates to the mode of verifying and declaring the election. The constitution, after providing how the votes of the electors shall be certified and returned, proceeds as follows: "The president of the senate shall, in the presence of the senate and house of representatives, open all the certificates, and the votes shall then be counted." The person having the greatest number of votes for President shall be President, if such number be a majority; if the whole number of electors appointed.

And so of the vice President. Now, it has been contended that under this provision the whole power of counting and deciding upon the returns is vested in the president of the senate, and that the two houses of congress are present as mere witnesses, and that the president of the senate has a tremendous power to be intrusted to one man, as we shall presently see, when we come to mention some of the questions to which the count gives rise. But congress has very properly acted this construction, and it has never at any time prevailed. On the contrary, the votes are counted by tellers of the two houses, and the president of the senate presides at the question is decided by the votes separately and without debate. If both houses vote to receive it, it is received and counted. If either house vote to reject it, it is rejected.

Now, upon the counting, the gravest questions have arisen and may again arise. In 1869, a question was raised in the state of Georgia as to whether the vote of that state was entitled to a vote at all, and the startling decision was announced by the president of the senate that under the legislation of congress his vote should be counted, provided it did not change result, but that if it would change the result it should be rejected. In point of fact, the result did not depend upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Amending the National Constitution.

(From Senator Thurman's Fourth of July Oration at Chillicothe, Ohio.) In respect to the election of President and vice president there is urgent need for an amendment. I do not allude to the proposition to dispense with the electoral colleges and permit the people to vote directly for these officers, although I think that might be done without in the slightest degree disturbing the relative weight of the several states in the election, as it now exists. But the necessity to which I refer relates to the mode of verifying and declaring the election. The constitution, after providing how the votes of the electors shall be certified and returned, proceeds as follows: "The president of the senate shall, in the presence of the senate and house of representatives, open all the certificates, and the votes shall then be counted." The person having the greatest number of votes for President shall be President, if such number be a majority; if the whole number of electors appointed.

And so of the vice President. Now, it has been contended that under this provision the whole power of counting and deciding upon the returns is vested in the president of the senate, and that the two houses of congress are present as mere witnesses, and that the president of the senate has a tremendous power to be intrusted to one man, as we shall presently see, when we come to mention some of the questions to which the count gives rise. But congress has very properly acted this construction, and it has never at any time prevailed. On the contrary, the votes are counted by tellers of the two houses, and the president of the senate presides at the question is decided by the votes separately and without debate. If both houses vote to receive it, it is received and counted. If either house vote to reject it, it is rejected.

Now, upon the counting, the gravest questions have arisen and may again arise. In 1869, a question was raised in the state of Georgia as to whether the vote of that state was entitled to a vote at all, and the startling decision was announced by the president of the senate that under the legislation of congress his vote should be counted, provided it did not change result, but that if it would change the result it should be rejected. In point of fact, the result did not depend upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Amending the National Constitution.

(From Senator Thurman's Fourth of July Oration at Chillicothe, Ohio.) In respect to the election of President and vice president there is urgent need for an amendment. I do not allude to the proposition to dispense with the electoral colleges and permit the people to vote directly for these officers, although I think that might be done without in the slightest degree disturbing the relative weight of the several states in the election, as it now exists. But the necessity to which I refer relates to the mode of verifying and declaring the election. The constitution, after providing how the votes of the electors shall be certified and returned, proceeds as follows: "The president of the senate shall, in the presence of the senate and house of representatives, open all the certificates, and the votes shall then be counted." The person having the greatest number of votes for President shall be President, if such number be a majority; if the whole number of electors appointed.

And so of the vice President. Now, it has been contended that under this provision the whole power of counting and deciding upon the returns is vested in the president of the senate, and that the two houses of congress are present as mere witnesses, and that the president of the senate has a tremendous power to be intrusted to one man, as we shall presently see, when we come to mention some of the questions to which the count gives rise. But congress has very properly acted this construction, and it has never at any time prevailed. On the contrary, the votes are counted by tellers of the two houses, and the president of the senate presides at the question is decided by the votes separately and without debate. If both houses vote to receive it, it is received and counted. If either house vote to reject it, it is rejected.

Now, upon the counting, the gravest questions have arisen and may again arise. In 1869, a question was raised in the state of Georgia as to whether the vote of that state was entitled to a vote at all, and the startling decision was announced by the president of the senate that under the legislation of congress his vote should be counted, provided it did not change result, but that if it would change the result it should be rejected. In point of fact, the result did not depend upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.

Now, fortunately for the peace of the country, the votes of these three states would not, if counted, have changed the result; but had the case been otherwise, the result would have depended upon her vote, but it did depend upon the vote being rejected, who can tell what common and trouble might have followed? Again, upon the count last February, there were the returns from two sets of electors of the state of Louisiana—one set voting for Grant and the other for Greeley—and both were rejected, and the result was left to the vote of the other states—Arkansas and Missouri—which were rejected on technical exceptions to the election returns, and they also lost their votes.