[illegible] Nominations.

[illegible] taken by the Indianola Bulletin on the subject of a Democratic State Convention and nominations generally, meets with our hearty concurrence. The Bulletin thinks that, under existing circumstances, not only should the State Convention nominate all the State officers, but that District and County Conventions should be held to nominate the officers of each District and county. We are aware of the objections of many of our Democratic friends to conventions for the purpose of nominations, and the improper if not corrupt manner in which many conventions have been conducted, and that they do not always result in bringing forward the best men or the favorites even of the people. But what better can we do? It is the only way, bad as it may be, in which a party organization can be kept up. If everybody is allowed or encouraged to run for office, there never can be any certainty as to the result. A minority party will never run but one man, while there may be two, three or more of the majority in the field, and thus the candidate of the minority may be elected. All know that in Texas the Democracy are largely in the ascendency, as to numbers, talents and respectability, and that, if united and acting in concert, they could elect all the State officials, three-fourths of the members of both Houses, and nearly all the district and county officers down to constables. The Radicals understand this well, and their only hope is in our dissentions and division. But that only hope is a strong one with many of their shrewdest leaders, who were perfectly willing for a general election next December, believing that the Democratic party would be split into fragments by its very strength and futile quarrels and squabbles over railroad issues, and that thus they would be enabled to obtain possession of the State, or at least secure a large share of its profitable offices. Shall we be guilty of the folly of playing into their hands and aiding them in their designs of renewed power and plunder? Surely not. But how can we prevent this without conventions, declaring the sentiments of the Democracy and nominating candidates in accordance therewith, and pledging ourselves to sustain them? We can see no other mode of prevention, no other means of security.

It is evident already that the number of Democratic candidates for all the different offices will be unusually large. Even for Governor, the highest, the list is now almost appalling. Every section of the State is bringing out its candidate and urging his shorter claims and qualifications. If so many for Governor, how many more will there be for the other State offices, how many district and county candidates? There name will be legion. What can we do but hold conventions and settle the claims of the numerous aspirants, and put forward the best, and put them through by united action? Can any one point out a better plan than conventions? If not, we must have them and abide by them, if we desire the success of Democratic principles, which can only be maintained through Democratic officials. Let us then hold the conventions and make nominations for all the offices, from the highest to the lowest. Let the very best men of our party attend these conventions, and see that they are properly and honestly conducted, without fraud or bargain and sale, and that the right men, the strongest and truest, are nominated. If this is not done, as the Bulletin well observes, it will be the fault of the people themselves, through neglect of their duty, through supineness, inattention, or carelessness of their vital interests.

But there is one matter with regard to conventions, which the Bulletin has not touched, and to which we wish to call the serious attention of all Democrats throughout the State. It is the two-thirds rule, so often adopted, but, in our experience and judgment, so full of mischief. Half the aversion to conventions has arisen from this rule and its baneful results. It is a fruitful source of intrigue and bargain and corruption. It is not calculated to bring forward the strongest and most popular men for office, as its advocates contend, but to secure in the end, after long wrangling, often the very weakest and most unpopular of the party. Under its operation the little men combine against the big ones, and keep them down and under. This is all wrong and should be righted. The rule is not Democratic, nor is it founded on reason. If it is right that the majority of the whole people should rule, why not a majority of a party in making its nominations? For one, we say let this be done hereafter. Let the two-third's rule be abandoned. What say our brethren of the press? Let them speak out plainly before our conventions are called and our candidates nominated. Let this important matter be thought of and discussed freely. Unless we are much mistaken in the sentiments of the Democracy, a very large majority of them are in favor of the abolition of the two-third's rule. Again we say, let us hear from the Democratic press.

Yesterday a memorial was presented to the House from W. B. Johnson, Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate of the Twelfth Legislature, charging that members of that body received bribes from railroad lobbyists for their votes, upon certain questions brought before it. The memorial was read and referred to a special committee.

We know nothing in regard to the truth of these charges, except the general reports which have been rife throughout the State. The communication has been here, so we understand, for months, and it has been used in the meantime, so we are told by Dr. Gretcher, and others, to blackmail parties, falling in this, Johnson has sent his memorial for presentation to the Legislature. Dr. Stewart of this place has testified before the committee that Johnson expressed his intention to him, months since, of using it for blackmailing, and offered to divide with him if he would render assistance. His price for withholding the memorial was $30,000.

Johnson, we are told, claims to have a list of the bribed, and the amounts received. Among them he showed Dr. Stewart [illegible] which have never before been [illegible] and which the public would be [illegible] to see.

[illegible] believed that bribes were [illegible] Twelfth Legislature, but the [illegible] in this instance are [illegible] proved, and he has made [illegible] clearly refuse his purpose.

[illegible] Journals makes an attack upon the [illegible] for passing bill [illegible] will reduce [illegible] printing jobs awarded the [illegible] and in return we simply desire to call attention to the fact that yearly appropriations asked for the journal contain a number of its proprietors gas pipe [illegible] which we have asked for [illegible] work. Truly this [illegible] Health, $178,000 [illegible] to this session [illegible] have [illegible]

[illegible] sympathizes with our friend, John W. Archibald, Esq., of the Dallas Herald, on the death of his infant son, John [illegible]