THE MURDER OF PINKSTON.

HIS WIFE'S HORRIBLE NARRATIVE.

PINKSTON'S CONDUCT AT A REPUBLICAN MEETING OFFENSIVE TO THE WHITES—THE MEN WHO FORCED THEIR WAY INTO HIS CABIN—STABBED AND SHOT TO DEATH—HIS CHILD'S THROAT CUT—THE WITNESS SHOT.

[FROM A STAFF CORRESPONDENT OF THE TRIBUNE.]

NEW-ORLEANS, Nov. 28.—Five days ago I saw an affidavit sworn to at Monroe, Ouachita Parish, in this State, on the 21st of this month, and purporting to be signed by Mrs. Eliza Pinkston, which gave a brief account of an outrage which in its horrible details surpassed anything I had ever heard of since the Ku-Klux investigation. I refused to believe that the story it contained could be true. The crimes enumerated were so revolting in their character, so inconsistent with the spirit of modern civilization and so discreditable to human nature itself, that it seemed to me incredible that they could have been committed. The date of the affidavit was then so recent that I supposed it impossible for it to have reached New-Orleans by the time when it was shown to me, and I at once set about an investigation for the purpose of learning what foundation there was, if any, for the report. I first discovered that the affidavit had actually been received by mail and that it was posted at Monroe on the day of its date. None of the Republicans at the Custom-house knew anything about the case except what they had learned from that paper.

I then inquired of prominent white Democrats from Ouachita Parish if they had heard of the case, and they replied that they had, but that they did not believe the outrage to have been committed by the Democrats. The woman, they said, was a notorious Democrat herself, and they believed that the Radical negroes had "bulldozed" the family on that account. But they admitted that Henry Pinkston and the infant child had been killed and Eliza Pinkston severely wounded. After this I referred to the case guardedly in a dispatch and also in a letter to THE TRIBUNE, still hesitating to give the horrible details, lest I should do a gross injustice to the people of this State.

Yesterday Eliza Pinkston was brought to this city, and last evening her statement was taken more in detail than in the first affidavit. I read it for the first time this morning, and will append a copy of it to this letter as worthy of preservation in full, although the leading facts which it contains have already been forwarded by telegraph. This afternoon the poor woman was examined before the Returning Board. Under the rules of the board no correspondents were allowed to be present, and late this evening I learn that the reports of the proceedings furnished by the stenographers of the visiting committees to be published in the local papers are so meager as to convey only a very imperfect idea of what took place. The Democratic report will contain nothing about Mrs. Pinkston's examination, and that printed by the Republicans will omit altogether the cross-examination. I thought for a while, and I said so in a dispatch, that the admission of the Northern visitors and their reporters would insure almost as great publicity to the proceedings of the board as public sessions, but I have found that this has not turned out to be true. The reports of the proceedings that are published have been very imperfect, and in some degree partisan in their character. I don't mean that there is anything reported in them that does not occur, but I do believe that neither report tells the whole truth.

This evening I visited Mrs. Pinkston at her boarding-house in this city, and spent an hour in conversation with her. I was accompanied by Mr. Astwood of Carroll Parish, in this State. He is a well-educated and quite prominent Republican politician, and is the "yellow man" whom Mrs. Pinkston speaks of in her statement as having spoken at the same meeting with Mr. Brewster at St. James Chapel, Ouachita Parish, on the Friday before the election. The house at which Mrs. Pinkston is lodging in this city is apparently a very respectable one on Gravier-st., kept by a colored woman. I was impressed with its cleanliness, apparent comfort, and the general good order of everything about it. Passing through the parlor and dining-room, we were conducted up stairs to a gallery overlooking an interior court, and were shown into a neatly-furnished lodging-room opening upon it. As we entered Mrs. Pinkston recognized my companion, although she had never seen him except at the meeting referred to. I was introduced to her and, after saying that she was comfortable and, she hoped, recovering, she at once began to talk about her troubles.

Mrs. Pinkston is probably from 30 to 35 years of age, of pure African blood, and was born and grew up in Alabama. She is a field hand of ordinary intelligence for one of her class, and a very fluent talker. She has been the mother of four children, all born out of wedlock. I am bound to say that there is nothing exceptional in this, for, deplorable as it is chastity among the lower class of negro women is very rare. Her youngest daughter was 11 months old. She was married to her late and only husband about nine months ago. My friend remarked that she had been very cruelly used. "Yes," said she, "that I have;" and opening her dress in front and removing the cloths with which they were covered, she showed us two wounds in her breast. One was caused by a gun or pistol-shot, the ball evidently being a large one, and the other was a stab-wound from a knife. Gashes upon her throat and jaw and on the back of her head had been sewed up, and we were told that there were severe knife wounds on one thigh, on each of her heels, and a gunshot wound in one of her legs. In repeating some portions of her story, I shall not attempt to reproduce many of the negro idioms and expressions which she used, although I shall give the narrative as nearly as possible in her own words.

"At what time did these men visit your house?" I asked.

"About two hours before day," was the reply. "I heard them riding along the road—I heard the horses."

"Was any one in the house except you, your husband, and the little child that was killed?"

"There was an old colored man there early in the evening. When I went to bed I left him talking to Henry. He had been bulldozed and was bloody, and wanted to sleep in the house. I told him that there was only one bed besides that we occupied, and that I kept that for quality folks. I could not let him sleep in that, but I fixed up some old quilts in the corner and told him that he could sleep there."

"Did you see him while the men were at your house?"

"No; he must have got out while they were around my husband. He must have taken up a board of the floor and got out in that way."

She then described, substantially, as in her statement, appended, the arrival of the party and their conversation—their saying that Henry had fooled them once and that he should not do it again; that if he voted the Radical ticket at all he would vote it in h—ll, &c. She said the number of the men was about 30, of whom two were black men whom she knew.

"What did they first do to your husband?" I asked.

"They all got around him shouting: "'Gag him, gag him,' and they were cutting him with knives. They were so thick about him that I could not see him, but I could hear him struggling."

"Did they shoot him in the house?"

"I think so, but I am not sure. They took him outside, stripped off his drawers, tied his legs together with them and shot him. I could hear him breathe and moan (and she gave an imitation of it) and they shot him every time he breathed. They waited for him to breathe each time and then fired. All that time I was in the house, and the baby, which was asleep in the cradle, waked up and began to cry. I took it up in my arms and tried to hush it. Then the men came in and told me to put it down. I wouldn't do it, and told them that if they were going to kill me they might kill the whole line. Then one of them held the baby's head back as it lay in my arms and cut its throat from ear to ear and killed it. I then put it down."

"When were these wounds made on you?"

"After the baby was killed. Two of them committed adultery with me and then one of them tried to cut my throat. I held my chin down and the knife went across my jaw. I was also shot and stabbed. Then I made believe I was dead. I shut my eyes and laid perfectly still. One of the negroes got the ax that I chop wood with and hit me on the back of the head, making this gash (pointing to it). The ax came off the handle. Still I did not stir. Then the same man took a knife and cut a great gash on my thigh so long (about a foot). I heard the knife go through the flesh sounding like the cutting of new leather, but I did not stir or make a sound. Then one of them said, 'Cut off her feet,' and they cut my heel strings. I still lay there, and they thinking that I was dead, sure, went away."

"What did you do then?"

"I tried to get up, and my little girl, who had hidden under the mattrass, came out and asked me if they were gone, and helped me up. I could not stand and fell down again. Then my little girl said: 'Oh, ma! what you say help you up for when you fall down again?' Then she helped me up again. I told her to take up her little sister, and we kissed her. I told her to put her on the bed, but she said it would spoil the bed with the blood, and she put her in the cradle. My little girl then helped me out to where Henry was, and I stooped down and put my hand on him. His body was warm and wet. I thought it was sweaty, but I suppose it was blood. The blood was coming out of his wounds like this" (and she moved her hand to show the regular spurting of the blood escaping from an artery).

"How long did you remain there?"

"Only a few minutes when I heard the horses coming back. Then my little girl helped me over into the cotton patch. When they looked in the house one of them said, 'By God, she's gone; but she can't go far.' They seemed alarmed and excited. Then they took the baby out of the cradle and threw it into the lake."

After this she described her going to Mr. Tidwell's and her subsequent movements substantially as they are given in her statement. At times during the conversation she became very excited, and called on God to witness the truth of what she said. She was told of the report that she had said that a negro named Alexander Brooks, and others with him, had killed her husband and child. She said she never had told any one so. Brooks and her husband had a fight in August last, but they had made it up and were good friends again. To use her words, they had eaten together, and drunk from the same jug. Brooks, she said, was not a man who harbored resentment. She also most positively denied ever having killed her mother-in-law. She said that an old woman, Aunt Rose, had died in her house. They had lived together before Mrs. Pinkston's marriage and then had gone elsewhere. Mrs. Pinkston heard she was sick, went to see her, took her home, and the old woman died there. She and her husband buried her decently.

There are some circumstances which corroborate Mrs. Pinkston's story. I saw at the same place Mrs. Cora Williams (whose affidavit I will append to this letter). She was a neighbor of the Pinkstons, and is a bright negro woman about 20 years of age. She, too, is of pure African blood, but her features are almost as regular as those of a European. A delicate, oval face is crowned with an abundance of hair, and her style of beauty is one not often met with among those of her race. The same "bulldozers" visited her house earlier the same night, and she recognized some of them. For the details of this visit I will refer the reader to her statement.

Although it is a long time since I have been so shocked by the recital of any crime as I have been while listening to this story, it is only fair, indeed simple justice demands, that the other side of the story should be told. There is no other side to the worst phase of it. The horrible wounds on that poor woman's body tell a story that cannot be answered. No one denies that her husband and child were killed, and that she has been terribly wounded. That is a fact equally disgraceful to the State and the parish where it took place, no matter who the guilty persons are; but if there is any class in the community who are less responsible than others, that fact ought to be known. Mr. Charles M. Tidwell, who seems to have been the first white man to see Mrs. Pinkston on the Sunday morning, is here to-night and will probably be examined to-morrow. He "raised" Mrs. Pinkston in Alabama, and does not speak well of her. He says that she is of a quarrelsome disposition, ready to fight at all times. He says that she told him at least three different stories in regard to those who were at her house that night and engaged in the outrage, and that she is a "trifling character" and unworthy of belief. Mr. Tidwell impressed me as a man very careful to tell the truth. He drew the line in his talk between what he actually knew and what he had heard with great precision, and while he generally spoke ill of Mrs. Pinkston, he defended her against some charges brought against her by others.

One thing struck me very disagreeably, and that was the unconcern with which he and other white people from that locality speak of the outrage. They express no sympathy for the woman, and Mr. Tidwell admitted in conversation that he had taken very little interest in her case. He allowed her to stay at the quarters on his place since the death of her husband and had fed her, but he remarked that he couldn't help it and that she was of no use to him in her present condition. Again, he said that he did not know whether any of the Radicals had been to see her or not—he hadn't supposed anybody would have taken any interest in such a trifling character. Now in any community where there is the least respect for law and right people would take interest in such a case as this, no matter how lowly or how degraded the victims were. But in this case Henry Pinkston seems to have been a favorite among the white people who knew nothing against him, so that there is no excuse for that apathy that might possibly be defended if he had been a bad man, dangerous to the community. Several of the persons accused of having participated in this outrage are now in this city and demand the fullest investigation. It is only fair to say that without doubt Mrs. Pinkston has been mistaken in the identity of some of the "bulldozers." One man whom she mentioned in her first affidavit has been dead for months, and in her latest statements she omits the names of some she mentioned a week ago. Z. L. W.

State of Louisiana, Perish of Orleans: Eliza Pinkston, being sworn, in answer to interrogatories filed, says: That she is the wife of Henry Pinkston. I have had four children. I lived on Tidwell's place, up in Ouachita, on the island. The Saturday night before the election, or Sunday morning before day, Henry and I were in bed in the house at home. It was before we had got up. Some men rode up to the door. I heard the horses' feet. One said, "Halt." Then they stopped and got off their horses. There was a knock at the door. Some of them asked, "Is Henry in?" Dr. Younger's was the voice first called. They said the road was going to be blockaded to Monroe, and Brewster had come to guard Henry to Monroe to vote; that he was a friend of Henry's. Henry had not spoken yet. He was standing up in his night-clothes on the floor. Says I to Dr. Younger, "Don't hurt me; that is you." I peeped through the anger-hole and saw him step back when I spoke. A Mr. Logan, who rode a white mare, he jumped at the door and broke it open. Then Henry said, "Gentlemen, what you want to kill me for? I have done nothing."

Then they all gathered in, and Capt. Theobald said: "Gag him, gag him, — — him; don't let him halloo. He will vote no d—d Radical ticket here; if he does, he will vote it in hell." I then hallooed, and one man put his hand over my jaw to keep me from hallooing, and said: "Let us have the — — — — — —;" that he had fooled them that far; that he would fool them no further.

Henry had been forced to go to a Democratic meeting, to a dinner the Tuesday before, and he went up there and went home again and went to picking cotton before the meeting was over. I went home after the speaking was over. Henry then went to a Republican meeting at St. James Chapel the Friday after this Tuesday, which was the Friday before the men came to our house. I was along with Henry to that meeting. Mr. Brewster and a yellow man spoke there. Henry had cheered for Brewster, pulled off his hat, and said: "Go on; speak on." Dr. Younger and Capt. Theobald were there at that meeting and saw Henry cheer.

After they said Henry should fool them no further, on the Sunday morning the company came to our house, they began to cut him and gag him. They were cutting him with knives. I could see them gag him and hear him struggling. Heard him halloo once when they cut him. They tied a handkerchief around his mouth; they had a nubia around his neck choking him. They took him out of the house in the moonshine. They took his drawers off and tied his legs together, and when he was down they shot him till he was dead. Before they took him out of the house and before they gagged him he begged them not to kill him; that he would vote the Democratic ticket. Some of the men around then said, "Who hurrahed for Brewster, by God?" I had a child about 11 months old. After they had done with Henry they came back to me. I had my baby in my arms. They said, "Put your baby down," and I said, "No, Sir, if you kill me kill the whole file." I said I had done nothing, but was a poor woman. Some of the men laid its little head on my arm and cut its throat.

They went to cutting me. They shot me twice—once in my breast and once in my leg. This was in the house. I was fighting against them, and after they got me out of doors they cut me in the jaw. They cut into the jaw-bone, and cut me in the throat. I went to get under the bed after they killed Henry. They came to the house when they got done with Henry to look after me. They shot me in the leg as I was going under the bed. I heard them say they had shot all the loads out of their guns, and they had begun to cut me. They had cut my heel strings. I held my head down near my throat, and they cut my jaw. They got my ax that I cut wood with; they struck me on the head with it. It broke off just at the eye. They left me for dead. They left Henry on the side of the road without burying him. I had no clothes on when they left me.

After they left me for dead the company rode away. I had heard them say they were going to get George Tatem and another man. After they had gone about a mile they came back. I saw them coming. I had got over into the cotton-row. I hid there, and heard them say: "By God she is gone." Some of them took the child and threw it into the lake. The lake was about a quarter of a mile off. They then went off. I went over to George Tatem's as soon as I could get there and told him they were going to get after him. I went into Mr. Tidwell's house and spoke to him about what was done. I was bleeding, and he said I would bloody the floor and better go out. I then got some clothes at Epsey Williams's. From there I went to Mirand Gates's and staid there a few days. While I was there some white men came there. I thought I was going to be killed. I wanted some place to be safe and got down to Monroe last Tuesday a week ago.

I remember when Mr. Dinkgrave was killed last August. Had seen Mr. Dinkgrave. The same company that was there when Henry was killed had been to our house about the time Dinkgrave was killed. They came there about 12 o'clock, when Henry was eating dinner. They rode up. The captain (Steel was the captain) halted the company and got off their horses. The captain came in and said he was commanded from the State to take weapons from everybody; that Dinkgrave had got killed and he must have all the weapons. Henry said he was not going to fight about anybody; that he was just trying to make a living for his family. They got his gun and broke it right in half before his face.

The above statement of the murder of my husband, Henry Pinkston, and my child, and about the treatment of myself, answers the questions filed for me to answer. I further say that my husband was killed on account of his politics. I believe if he had not been a Republican he would not have been killed.

LETTERS FROM THE PEOPLE.

THE POOR OF MINNESOTA.

DESTRUCTION OF THE CROPS BY LOCUSTS—AN APPEAL FROM THE REV. DR. EGGLESTON.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: The Rev. J. S. Bean of Beaver Falls, Minn., writes me that the grasshoppers have now taken most of the crops in Renville County for four years. This year many persons have not enough grain for bread, and none have any to export. There is consequently great suffering, especially for lack of clothing. This self-denying minister and his wife are themselves living chiefly by faith, feeling rather like helping their people out of their own poverty than like asking the impoverished people for a support. I cannot send them the money and the second-hand clothing they ask for, because my church is carrying on a vast mission work among the poor, and in this severe Winter every dollar that the liberality of our people can afford and every garment we can find is needed among the families whose children are in our Sunday-school, now numbering more than 1,200 scholars. But there must be many among the readers of THE TRIBUNE who can send money or clothing to this remote frontier country, the people of which have been so severely scourged with locusts. They are at this moment looking forward to the long and severe Winter of that climate, with a grievous deficiency of clothing and a considerable scarcity of food. The wife of this minister I have known from her childhood, and I know that all that goes into their hands will be wisely and kindly distributed. Send money direct to the Rev. J. S. Bean, Beaver Falls, Minn. Boxes of clothing should be sent, express paid, to the same address, and marked "via New-Ulm." Mr. Bean did not intend me to make this public statement, but since I am unable to give the help asked for myself, I pass this appeal to the enlightened public reached by THE TRIBUNE.

EDWARD EGGLESTON.

No. 311 Adelphi-st., Brooklyn, Dec. 1, 1876.

A NON-SECTARIAN SCHOOL.

ACTION OF THE PEOPLE OF LIMA, N. Y.—A PUBLIC SCHOOL WHICH WAS TAUGHT AFTER CATHOLIC METHODS—A TIMELY LETTER TO THE TRIBUNE.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

In THE TRIBUNE of Sept. 30 there appeared a letter concerning the public schools in the village of Lima, which stated that, through inadequate provisions on the part of the tax-payers and through the connivance of a trustee, elected in the interests of Romanism, the public schools had become sadly demoralized, and that a school had grown up under the direction of the Catholic Church. This school was not only under the direction of the church, but the catechism and religion of the Romish Church were taught there during school hours. Its teachers were Sisters of Charity. And more than all, it was supported at public expense. Bishop McQuaid often pointed to Lima as an example of a union Catholic school and one worthy of imitation.

The above-mentioned article aroused the people of Lima to a sense of their danger, and made them ashamed of their negligence. At the last annual meeting they elected a new trustee by a majority of one. This trustee was elected in the interests of a non-sectarian school. He has closed the Sisters' School, and placed more efficient teachers in the public school.

For my own part and in behalf of this community, I thank THE TRIBUNE for publishing the communication, and so arousing public interest. I am informed that the Sisters' School has now been opened as a parochial school under the patronage of the Catholic Church. The people of Lima having been set right once more should take immediate steps to keep right. They should erect a new school building; one that would not only accommodate the pupils of the village and do away with the necessity for a parochial school, but one that would be an ornament to the place. CENSOR.

West Bloomfield, N. Y., Nov. 29, 1876.

WHY ARE FREIGHT DISCRIMINATIONS UNJUST?

To the Editor of the Tribune.

SIR: I have for a long time taken your paper in preference to other New-York journals, because of the fairness of the views expressed upon most subjects. Will you give me your views upon the following questions: The four large trunk lines of railroad have been for months past carrying freights at unremunerative rates—indeed, the prices are so low that it is said they do not pay running expenses. As the result, the value of the stocks of these roads is daily depreciating. Now, some one is greatly to blame in this contest. If Mr. Scott and Mr. Garrett are wrong, the stockholders should call upon them either to discontinue this ruinous competition or to resign their positions. I see in your issue of the 22d that you speak of Mr. Vanderbilt as protecting New-York from "unjust freight discriminations." Will you be kind enough to explain what you mean by "unjust discrimination?" and since the principle which is being contended for should be the same whether viewed from New-York, Philadelphia, or Baltimore please say upon what ground can I, as a stockholder, demand of Mr. Scott that he should conform to Mr. Vanderbilt's requirements? T. C. H.

Philadelphia, Nov. 24, 1876.

A DEFENDANT'S STATEMENT.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: In your issue of this date appears an article in the Brooklyn news column to the effect that Robert Brown, now an editor of a Tarrytown paper, was sued by his wife for the support of herself and child, and had to pay $5 weekly alimony. If coercion by force into a union with such a woman can be called marriage, then it is expected that she will try and derive all the pecuniary benefits that may be derived therefrom. Now, on the trial it was fully proved that she committed perjury in swearing to falsehoods, and farther, that her word could not be relied on in the least. She swore that she never was arrested before; it was shown that she had been before the Kings County Grand Jury on two separate indictments, one for assault and battery with intent to kill, and the other on a charge of grand larceny, preferred against her by the son of Capt. Duncan, United States Shipping Commissioner. The sum allowed her child was a small percentage of the salary that, it was stated, I had been receiving for the past four years. It will simply be doing justice to myself and relatives to insert this true statement of the case. Yours respectfully,

Tarrytown, Dec. 1, 1876. ROBERT T. BROWN.

MEETING OF SOROSIS.

At the regular social meeting of Sorosis at Delmonico's on Monday, letters were read from Chancellor Crosby and President Barnard acknowledging the memorial presented them with relation to instituting test examinations for women, expressing their approval of the movement and promising to submit the memorial to the trustees of the University of the City of New-York and Columbia College. Miss Bush gave a rhapsody by Liszt. Mrs. L. E. Lyman read a paper on "Women as Journalists." A song was sung by Miss May Nunez. A paper on journalism was read by Mrs. Caroline A. Soulé. Miss Bush played a wedding march by Liszt. "In School Days," by Whittier, was recited by Mrs. George Robinson. Mrs. Yennl gave an Irish recitation. Mrs. Thomas of Philadelphia read a paper on "Woman in Agriculture." Miss Carnham recited an original poem. A German version of "Mary had a Little Lamb" was given by Mrs. Bergholz. Mrs. Soulé read a paper on the "Home Training of Girls with a View to Business Possibilities." A discussion of this topic followed, after which Miss Mary Beadle spoke to the club with regard to the executive abilities of the upper classes of English women.

She was fond of conundrums, and when she learned that mulier was Latin for woman, she thought she had a good one. So she asked her husband what was the difference between herself and a mule. And as he had been married several years, he was too thoughtful to trouble her by guessing, but kindly remarked that he had never been able to see any.—[Norwich Bulletin.

THE POLITICAL CRISIS.

A WARNING TO DESERTERS.

HOW WINANS WAS BOUGHT BY DEMOCRATS IN 1871—FEARS OF A SIMILAR CASE IN THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: For the last fortnight, since it has been evident that there were elected in November 185 electors for Hayes and 184 for Tilden, it has seemed to me that the most imminent and real danger was that one of the Hayes electors would be bribed either to vote for Tilden, or for some third person, so as to throw the election into the House of Representatives. Perhaps this danger has seemed more real to me because I was present in Albany at the time of the last similar purchase—in the case of Winans in 1871. Then, you will recollect, the Democrats had 65 members of the Assembly, which is a bare majority and exactly enough to pass a bill. By the forced resignation of "Jim" Irving, after his assault on Smith Weed, they were left with only 64 votes.

For three days no business was done, while they searched among the Republican members for one who would betray his trust. Sums ranging from $35,000 to $50,000 were offered to various members who were esteemed "weak brethren," but without result. Members who were thought assailable were watched over through all their waking hours. But at length the absence of Mr. Frear's stereotyped motion to adjourn, as soon as the Assembly met, showed that the work had been done; and the first roll-call showed that Winans—who had never been suspected—was the man.

He received as nearly as could be ascertained about $70,000, and evidently at the time utterly underestimated the vileness of his act and its effect on the public mind. The result is a lesson for to-day. Winans was a man widely respected and influential both in the Legislature and among his constituents. His home at Dunkirk was a happy one, enlivened by the presence of a wife and daughter. From the hour of his fall he was shunned by all but the venal. He was regarded as a Judas or an Arnold. One member of his family refused all communication with him. In one short year his ill-gotten money was gone, his home destroyed, his family scattered, and he was as a vagabond on the face of the earth.

But the ease with which a man of previously good character was found to succumb to temptation shows the danger of the present. A single man holds the Presidency in his hand. A million of dollars would be nothing to be offered for one vote. What a temptation! A million of dollars for a moment's work, and that not a legal crime, with a prospect of the enjoyment of his wealth abroad, where few would know how it was obtained. And of course the tempter would urge plausible reasons. He would not make a bald money proposition. He would suggest patriotic excuses. When Winans voted he did not do it sneakingly. He made a speech in which he thought he justified his action on high moral principles. But the world knew better; and his speech was forgotten in an hour, while his act will be long remembered.

It is a sad thing that we have had a campaign which justifies such a fear. But such it has been. The whole from beginning to end has been conducted on strictly "business principles." A certain number of electoral votes were to be had, and the means were adapted to the necessities of each particular case to achieve that result. We have seen within a few days how utterly unscrupulous the Tilden managers are as to methods; and how careless of the will of the people. Mr. Tilden was willing to be elected by a vote in Vermont or Rhode Island if he could get one through a technicality, though he knew the people in both States had rejected him. So now in Nebraska and South Carolina. If the end can be achieved the means are not to be considered. How Gov. Hayes would spurn an election similarly secured!

But the danger is a real one, and I have thought that a recital of the fate of Winans might do good. Q.

Flushing, L. I., Dec. 4, 1876.

THE OREGON ELECTOR.

HIS TRUE COURSE IN THE PRESENT DISCUSSION—ALL QUESTIONS OF LEGALITY SHOULD BE REMOVED.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: The following paragraph is clipped from your valuable journal, and has doubtless passed into other columns also without protest:

> No fear is entertained by the Republicans that Watts, the Oregon postmaster, who has been elected on the Republican ticket as a Presidential elector, will be disqualified. The ground is taken that he resigned his Federal office before he will be qualified as an elector, which removes all objections that can be urged against him. He is not an elector until he qualifies and takes the oath of office, which he does not do until the meeting of the electors at the capital of the State.—[San Francisco Alta California (Rep.)

If, as the preponderating weight of authority and precedent and reason seems to establish, all votes cast for ineligible officers (ineligible at the time they are so cast) are null and void, what sophistry it is to contend, as does the writer above, that this radical defect, inhering *ab radio*, can be cured by any subsequent action on his part. Though it be true "he is not an elector until he qualifies and takes the oath of office," it is the holding of the office of postmaster at the time of his election that disqualifies him alike from taking the oath or filling the office. The better, more honorable, and therefore wiser way, in my opinion, would be to follow the current of the same decisions, treat his place as vacant, and by absenting himself or resigning to serve enable his colleagues to supply the vacancy beyond all possible cavil.

The issue has grown to be too momentous, and the avidity with which the political gamblers for the Presidency, in their "little game" of ecarte, you have so well described, would clutch at the opportunity to "peg a hole" or two in the official count is too transparently dangerous to allow any elector to go into his college embarrassed by any possible question of regularity. It is to be hoped that neither Mr. W. nor any other elector of questionable title—whose office, at most, is one of honor and not profit—will permit any petty ambition or obstinate tenacity of office to imperil the ultimate triumph of the good cause. H. F. C.

Morristown, N. J., Dec. 4, 1876.

REDUCTION OF REPRESENTATION.

PROVISION OF THE CONSTITUTION TO MEET CASES OF INTIMIDATION

To the Editor of The Tribune

SIR: If it can be proved (and if true it must be susceptible of proof) that the rights of the colored men in Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi have been "in any way abridged" in the matter of voting at the late election, the representation from those States should be reduced. This is the explicit declaration of clause 2 of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution: "But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, &c., is denied, * * * or in any way abridged except * * * the basis of representation therein shall be reduced." * * *

This of course will have to be done by legislation. Now is it likely that the Democratic majority in the House will pay any respect to the Constitution in this matter? It is the dictate of common justice, that only that proportion of voters who are allowed to vote should be entitled to representation. Otherwise we put a premium upon violence and fraud and intimidation. We make the vote of 100,000 ex-Confederates at the South worth as much as that of 200,000 loyal people at the North. S. G. L.

Redding, Conn., Nov. 30, 1876.

THE SOUTHERN CLERGYMEN.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: What a sad comment upon the frailty of human nature is indicated by the testimony of the clergy of the South, who, having eyes to see, see not, and ears but hear not, of the outrages. They live in the midst of a people full of political and social prejudice, and of hatred toward the poor down-trodden negro. How strange that circumstances make men's minds oblivious both to fact and philosophy. It is the old, old story, of the "priest and the Levite passing by on the other side." What wonder that skeptical thoughts arise in thinking minds concerning the practical power of Christianity for humanity, when it can be said of its leading representatives, "What do ye more than others?" in "breaking every yoke?" I think there can be no question but that history repeats itself in the fact that reverence for the Deity, for creeds, outweighs humane thoughts. Can we accept the testimony, as unbiased, of a class of men who were, during the rebellion, more unanimous and fervent in their prayers for the success of the Confederate arms, in the interest of perpetual human bondage, than were our own Northern clergy for the success of our arms in preserving the Union? Are these men, who rarely ever visit outside their own white membership, competent witnesses in regard to an ostracised race with whom they can have no social relations so as to obtain a hearing from them? I am glad, on this Thanksgiving Day, that I can read THE TRIBUNE and find it on the side of humanity, as well as a rebuker of corruption, as it ever has been. T. P.

Birmingham, Nov. 30, 1876.

MR. TILDEN FOR RECEIVER.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: I desire to approve Mr. Evarts's proposal to put the Government into the hands of a receiver, and suggest that Samuel J. Tilden be forthwith appointed by the Supreme Court. His great and eminent services in that capacity for so many railways point him out as the best qualified man in the country for realizing profits to be divided between himself and others "in interest." It is believed by a good many people just now that he will divide fairly. By all means let him be appointed. AN OLD RAILWAY MAN.

New-York, Dec. 4, 1876.

THE DEMOCRATS' CRY OF FRAUD.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: I have been very much interested in the editorials headed "Stop Thief" and "The Lesson of Florida," in which you give the true history and true character of the Democratic party both in the past and in the present. The members of that party are pretty persons to talk of the Republicans gaining an election by fraud. They fully understand how this is done, for they have been a long time schooling themselves in the practice of election frauds. It is a well established fact in history that Henry Clay was cheated out of his election for the Presidency in 1844 by Democratic frauds. That same party intended to elect Tilden and defeat Hayes at the recent election by the same system of frauds, added to the same intimidation and murder. Is it not time that this game of the Democracy had an end? We on the Western Reserve, the Republicans I mean, are with you, and like the ring of such articles. Keep them up. Give the people light, and in due time this system of frauds will be put down by the voice of an indignant people. N. B. GATES.

Elyria, Ohio, Nov. 30, 1876.

HONEST DEMOCRATS MUST ACT.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: I have been waiting for some time to see if there was not a representative Democrat in the country who had manhood enough to protest against the unfair means which the Democratic party is using to get power. I voted for Samuel J. Tilden, as I supposed he was an honest man, but if he will accept the highest place in the nation through a legal technicality in Oregon, or through bribery in South Carolina, or through assassination in Louisiana and Florida, he is not fit to occupy that high position. If the leaders of the Democracy are so blinded by partisanship that they descend to the means which they are now employing, they will find at the next election that the masses of the country Democrats are made of different material. J. B.

Otego, N. Y., Nov. 30, 1876.

A MAN OUT OF TEMPER.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: Are you mad, or crazy? I have just read your editorial on "Florida," and also your telegraphic dispatch from Tallahassee; and I can only ask, What do you mean? "There are three counties yet to hear from" and you, nor any other person knows how Florida has gone. Then, why all this rant about Democrats? Is it not to cover up an anticipated fraud? Surely such a paper as THE TRIBUNE now is, has great claim to respectability. Fairness, candor and logic, are supposed to have some place in all respectable partisan journals, even though they are sometimes unscrupulously so, but THE TRIBUNE dives down below them all and is equated only by Wendell Phillips in virulence. What made THE TRIBUNE once so powerful was the unassailableness of its position, the clearness of its logic, and the apparent honesty of its convictions. Alas how fallen! D. C. PECK.

Bridgeport, Conn., Nov. 25, 1876.

THE SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTION.

THE BOARD OF CANVASSERS RIGHT.

ILLEGAL INTERFERENCE OF THE SUPREME COURT—AN ATTEMPTED USURPATION OF THE BOARD'S POWERS—THE BOARD COMPELLED TO ADJOURN.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: The Board of State Canvassers of South Carolina have been accused of defying the law in regard to the orders of the Supreme Court of that State. It is due to them and the country that the actual facts should be told.

When the board met on the day fixed by law (Nov. 16), certain gentlemen representing the Democratic candidates were in attendance, and made sundry queries of the board as to their proposed action. Such of these queries as were in writing were answered in writing, and the board then awaited the arrival of returns of the several boards of county canvassers. Among the questions raised was one as to the power of the board to hear protests and contests as to the various officers voted for—a power expressly conferred by the statute, but which the Democrats claimed was unconstitutional. The board decided to exercise the powers thus expressly given them. This was made the basis of a proceeding in the Supreme Court of the State against the Board of State Canvassers on behalf of the Democratic candidates to prohibit the board from exercising any but ministerial functions, and to compel it to declare elected such persons as were found to have had the highest number of votes according to the statements and returns forwarded by the Boards of County Canvassers. The prayer for a prohibition and mandamus was made in one form of proceeding. In other words, the court was asked to grant upon one petition two totally distinct modes of relief. The court very kindly suggested that there should be two separate and distinct proceedings instead of one, which suggestion the Democratic lawyers immediately acted upon. The board made its return to the court, and the legal fight began.

Now, in the cases presented to the court there were no issues of fact involved. What the Democrats alleged as matters of fact were admitted, but the conclusions of law were denied. Here, then, were two independent issues of law: (1) Had the Board of State Canvassers any power to exercise judicial or quasi-judicial functions? (2) Should it declare the election of every person who had received on the face of the election returns the greatest number of votes? These points were fully argued to the court, and it would have been easy for the court to decide them one way or the other. In the mean time the time fixed by law within which the board could act was running on. The Board of Canvassers, feeling embarrassed as to their duties, went into court and asked how far they might proceed with them. The court took time to consider, and, instead of giving any direct instructions to the board, did what?

Why, it ordered the board to go on and perform the clerical labor of aggregating the statements from the Boards of County Canvassers and certify the result of such aggregation to the court!

Well, the board did go on and do this work, and when it had finished its labors it made a statement to the court, but at the same time it protested that the court had no right to call for such statement. In making this protest the board also declared that it could not, because of certain allegations and evidence of fraud filed in relation to Laurens and Edgefield Counties, &c., determine who were properly elected in those counties. Still the time passed on. No order came to the board from the court. The 22d of November arrived, and the board must cease its labors on that day. The returns had all been aggregated, and it remained to make a declaration of the election. The statute required this to be done. On the declaration which should be made depended the electoral vote of South Carolina for President and Vice-President, the State officers, members of the General Assembly, and all other officers but Governor and Lieutenant-Governor. Another day's delay would have resulted in a total failure to have any officers declared elected, because the board expired by statutory limitation on the tenth day. The board, therefore, made its declaration, and filed the same with the Secretary of State, as required by law to do, and adjourned *sine die*. That night, within an hour or two of midnight, the members of the board were first served with a peremptory mandamus to declare as duly elected to the General Assembly such persons as appeared by the statement made to the Supreme Court to have received the highest number of votes. The order had been already voluntarily complied with by the board, except as to the counties of Edgefield and Laurens, concerning which the court had already been informed that the board did not think it could properly make any declaration whatever. The only thing left for the board to consider was, could they reconvene and do what the court directed, or should they tell the court that they could not obey its order because, before it was served, they had fully performed their duties and had adjourned *sine die*. The board, in the light of such legal authorities as they had access to, concluded it could not lawfully reconvene or perform any action as a board. The result of the maintenance of this legal position—a position sustained by Cooley, by the courts of New-York and other States—is that the board is in jail for an alleged contempt of an order never communicated to it and only served on it nearly 12 hours after its final adjournment!

Let this also be understood: The court has not yet decided that the Board of State Canvassers has no power to hear protests and contests, and from the beginning of the case until the final adjournment of the board no interlocutory or other restraining order of any sort was made by the court, or, if made, served on the members of the board! Another thing ought to be borne in mind. It is charged that the action of the board was done for the purpose of cheating Tilden out of the electoral vote of the State. The truth is that so far as the electoral votes are concerned, they were canvassed from statements of boards of county canvassers of the several counties of the State, every one of which statements was signed by a Democratic commissioner of election. There was no county whose votes were rejected; no votes were added by resolution of the Board. On the statements themselves, every Hayes and Wheeler elector had a clear majority. Moreover, in two counties, owing to an error on the part of a clerk of election, votes for a Hayes and Wheeler elector were not entered or counted, although fully explained by managers' affidavits. These votes, justly due to Republican electors, were not allowed on the aggregation of the returns. To have defeated the will of the people by failing to declare these Republican electors elected would have been a crime indeed, for which the Board could not hope to have found pardon from the loyal people of the country. J.

Columbia, S. C., Dec. 1, 1876.

THE CONTROLLERSHIP.

JOHN KELLY TO BE NOMINATED TOMORROW.

CONTROLLER GREEN TO RESIST REMOVAL FROM HIS OFFICE—THE COURTS TO BE APPEALED TO—JOHN MORRISSEY WORKING WITH MR. GREEN—VIEWS OF POLITICIANS AND LAWYERS.

The differences between Mayor W