RATES OF SUBSCRIPTION.—One Dollar and Fifty Cents per annum, in advance. Two Dollars at end of year. Seventy-Five Cents for six months.
Subscriptions are not taken for a less period than six months.
RATES OF ADVERTISING.—One Dollar per square of one inch for the first insertion, and Fifty Cents per square for subsequent insertions less than three months. No advertisements counts less than a square.
Liberal contracts will be made with those wishing to advertise for three, six or twelve months. Advertising by contract must be confined to the immediate business of the firm or individual contracting.
Obituary Notices exceeding five lines, Tributes of Respect, and all personal communications or matters of individual interest, will be charged for at advertising rates. Announcements of marriages and deaths, and notices of a religious character, are respectfully solicited, and will be inserted gratis.

Anderson Intelligencer.

LEGAL ADVERTISING.—We are compelled to require cash payments for advertising delivery of Executors, Administrators and other fiduciaries and hereafter, against the rates our regularly notices, which will only be inserted when the money comes with the order:
Citations, two insertions, ... $2.50
Estate Notices, three insertions, ... 2.00
Final Settlements, six insertions, ... 3.00
TO CORRESPONDENTS.—In order to receive attention, communications must be accompanied by the true name and address of the writer. Rejected manuscripts will not be returned, unless the necessary stamps are furnished to repay the postage thereon.
We are not responsible for the views and opinions of our correspondents.
All communications should be addressed to "Editors Intelligencer," and all checks, drafts, money orders, &c., should be made payable to the order of E. B. MURRAY & CO.
Anderson, S. C.

BY E. B. MURRAY & CO. ANDERSON, S. C., THURSDAY, JUNE 13, 1878. VOL. XIII--NO. 48.

THE DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE.

The Famous Sherman Letter and the Secretary's Visit to New Orleans—Inside History of the Louisiana Election.

The examination of James E. Anderson, late supervisor of the election in East Feliciana Parish, Louisiana, revealed copies of letters which throw a flood of light upon the election in that State. The production of a copy of Sherman's letter produced an unusual sensation among the Republicans, and took them completely by surprise. In order that our readers may have a clear understanding of the situation, the documentary evidence furnished by Anderson is herewith appended.

The following is a copy of the letter sent by Anderson and Weber to Sherman:

NEW ORLEANS, Nov. 20, 1879.

SIR: We have carefully considered the arguments advanced by you in our interview. Your assurance that we shall be taken care of is scarcely specific enough. In case we pursue the course suggested by you, we would be obliged to leave the State. Will you, therefore, state in writing who we shall look to for the fulfillment of those promises? Respectfully,

D. A. WEBER,
JAMES ANDERSON.

HON. JOHN SHERMAN.

The following is a copy of the reply made by Sherman:

NEW ORLEANS, Nov. 20, 1876.

GENTLEMEN: Your note of even date has just been received. Neither Mr. Hayes, myself, the gentlemen who accompany me, nor the country at large, can ever forget the obligations under which you have placed us, should you stand firm in the position you have taken.

From a long and intimate acquaintance with Gov. Hayes, I am justified in assuming the responsibility for promises made, and will guarantee that you will be provided for as soon after the fourth of March as may be practicable, and in such manner as will enable you both to leave Louisiana should you deem it necessary. Very truly yours,

JOHN SHERMAN.

The following correspondence was also brought out in the examination of Anderson on Saturday. The opening letter was forwarded in July last to the New York *Sun*, inclosing copies of the foregoing letters and the six original letters written by Anderson. The possession of this evidence has induced the constant efforts of the *Sun* to have an investigation of the frauds in Louisiana:

Letter from James E. Anderson, (under fictitious initials):

NEW ORLEANS, July 2, 1877.

SIR: D. A. Weber and James E. Anderson were respectively supervisors in East Feliciana Parish during the last election. Some time during the past winter Weber placed a sealed envelope in the hands of a gentleman of this city for safe keeping. This envelope was opened by mistake and found to contain, among other things, the following documents; which, taken in rotation of dates, form an interesting inside history of the last election in Louisiana. Weber was killed in March and Anderson is now in Washington. Preserve the letters inclosed, as they may be needed for future use. W. B. F.

Letters from Anderson to Weber:

CLINTON, LA., Sept. 10, 1876.

DEAR DON: Am in receipt of your letter. Everything is going smoothly with me. The Democrats are satisfied with my official course—more so than the Republicans. Payne, my Democratic clerk, is a well-educated gentleman, and his selection shows that the Democrats mean nothing more than to have a fair deal, and that I propose to give them. As for Butler—well, he is hell on the end of a poker, and he is more of a mystery to me to-day than when I first came up. J. P. Harris has been here looking after Packard's interests. He says I must return 1,000 majority from this parish. If you were to rake this parish with a fine-tooth comb you could not find that number of Republicans, and how they expect me to return more of a Republican majority than there are Republican votes is a problem I have as yet failed to solve. Any information you can give me on the subject will be gratefully received. It is simply impossible to organize our party in this parish. Powers, De Gray, Butler, Campbell and company swear they will have nothing to do with it unless the niggers are kept in the background, and the darkies are equally as emphatic in asserting that they will not affiliate with the above named individuals, alleging that they are bull-dozers; and so it goes. In the meantime the Democrats are thoroughly organized, and are working like beavers. You can say to E. L. that the majority against him will be about 1,200; not very consoling, 'tis true, but nevertheless 'tis true. What is the prospect in West F.? My impression is that we will lose this State, but Hayes will go through. I ask nothing more. Yours, J. E. A.

D. A. W.

CLINTON, Oct., 12, 1876.

DEAR DON: Will leave on Saturday for New Orleans. Have sent my resignation to Kellogg. The parties who attacked me on Saturday night have carried their point from the fact that the Democrats have unwittingly aided them, and I shall leave the parish. Were I backed by more than my suspicions in this matter, I might pursue a different course. I will yet get at the bottom of the whole matter. I think I know who one of my assailants was and the motives that actuated him. Will write you from the city. Yours, J. E. A.

D. A. W.

NEW ORLEANS, Oct. 29, 1876.

MY DEAR DON: I am in receipt of yours of the 25th instant. The whole trouble here lies in the fact that there exists a conspiracy, the object being to hold no election in East Feliciana, and to throw the onus of the affair on my shoulders. Kellogg has refused to accept my resignation, at the same time assuring the Democrats that he desires my return, &c. The white-livered scoundrel has hired L. B. Jenks to dog my footsteps, and should I attempt to leave would undoubtedly be arrested on some trivial pretext. I'll beat the whole crowd yet, damn them. Of course nothing I can say will convince the Democrats that I am not in this arrangement, and that I, too, am to be made a victim. I think, however, that on election day you will find me in East Feliciana, and I shall teach Kellogg that there is many a slip, &c. I am convinced that Packard has no hand in this affair, but am in doubt as to E. L. Packard and Campbell have always favored the organization of our party in the parish. They have also conceded that the Democrats would carry it by a heavy majority, and have simply desired to cut down that majority as much as possible. Dr. Gray has always opposed this, and advocated no election or throwing out the parish, and in this he has been seconded by Kellogg, Jewett and others. They are likely to advocate and carry out any plan they may see fit, but may the devil take me if I allow them to saddle the blame on me. Tom Jenks and myself will be up in good time. There will be no Republican ticket in the field, and consequently few, if any, Republican votes cast. This, I think, will be their programme, as it will give them a case. The Democrats will undoubtedly poll about 1,500 or 1,600 votes, and if, as you say, they carry West Feliciana by 500 majority, E. L.'s game is cooked. Of course he cannot overcome such odds in Pointe Coupee. When I return I shall stop at my old place, No. 144 Custom House street. Come around as soon as you arrive. Find out who those damned niggers were that came over from your parish that night and whether they were in sympathy with their leader in his efforts to kill me. Truly your friend, J. E. A.

D. A. W.

NEW ORLEANS, Nov. 14, 1876.

DEAR DON: Meet me on royal street at 11 o'clock. Packard is raising hell over your refusal to protest. Morgan has followed me like a shadow since my return. Am in doubt as to whether he has been employed by the Democrats or Republicans. I think he is playing into the hands of both. In case he is with me, do not stop, but go to Crops', and I will follow as as soon as possible. There is no doubt but they have changed my statement so as to make it an intimidation protest. Pitkin refuses to show it to me. Make up your mind as to what we had better do. I am opposed to doing their damned dirty work, even to save Hayes. If we pull together and expose the whole thing, Pitkin, Kellogg, hell and the returning board combined can never carry this State for Hayes. Should we go with the right, it will give us a reputation and standing that would otherwise require years to acquire. As we are but boys yet, I incline to what is just in the premises, and trust to the future for our reward. Yours,

J. E. ANDERSON.

NOVEMBER 17, 1876.

DEAR DON: Since answering P.'s letter yesterday giving Burke's proposition, I have thought that possibly I might have put my foot in it. It is very possible he may be a spy or an actor and his letter a blind. However, I said nothing that could criminate either of us; merely stating that I had given Burke the information as he requested and Burke's reply. I stated, however, that in case he saw you, to show you my letter and ask your advice as one here acting in accord. No doubt it will bring him to the city, and should he call act carefully. I doubt if he is able to substantiate his statements, and I would not give a continental for them unless he can. Have you learned anything about the high joints? They are cursing me heavily, and assert that I have sold out and am going to Montalda to night. Will meet you at 11 sharp, if there is anything new.

ANDERSON.

NOVEMBER, 20, 1876.

MY DEAR SIR: Come around to my house this morning. I am not satisfied, and have no more faith in Sherman, Matthews and company than I have in Pitt Kellogg. Unless we get a written guarantee that we shall be taken care of, I am unwilling to go a step further. Come about 10 o'clock. As to ——, he will be out by that time. We ought to see Sherman again and insist on a written guarantee. Yours truly,

ANDERSON.

Letter from Anderson to P. C. Butler, of East Feliciana:

CUSTOM HOUSE, NEW ORLEANS, LA., COLLECTOR'S OFFICE, Nov. 16, 1876.

MY DEAR SIR: Yours of the 11th was certainly a surprise. I thought I fully comprehended the capability of that impression. I have suspected that you knew more of certain affairs than you cared to tell. I made no protest against the returns—simply a statement of what really occurred and what came under my observation. The parish will be thrown out, and nothing I could have done or can do will prevent it. Had you confided in me before, we might together have accomplished something. As it is there is no use in butting my head against a stone wall. I disliked the idea of making overtures to the Democrats, and was at sea as to what action to take in regard to your request. To-day Major Burke sent for me and stated they were desirous of saving the parish and asked what assistance I could give him and what I wanted. I repeated your statement verbatim save as regards Packard, which is too incredible to make unless strongly corroborated. I did not, however, mention your name, and left him under the impression that I would substantiate the statement made. He offered me $4,000 and an $1,800 position for four years. Your fears that you would be obliged to leave the State in case you made the exposure, I think, are groundless. The people would overlook your complicity in their joy at the result which would probably follow. But admitting that you must leave, I think this amount, together with the position, would give you a fair start in any part of the country. Should you accept, write to Burke—notify me also, and I shall explain the matter to him. Had you not better come to the city? Let me warn you against one thing: Do not make the attempt unless you have documentary evidence to prove your assertions. If you have simply heard Dick instruct Tom and Harry to perform some piece of rascality, do not attempt to prove it by the evidence of the latter. They will swear that nothing of the kind ever occurred, and you will be regarded as a falsifier. That is where the shoe pinches me. Why, could I prove all I know, some of these detestable scoundrels would be enjoying the hospitality of the Baton Rouge Penitentiary instead of running the State government of Louisiana. Thanks for your kind invitation to come up. I don't think that climate would be beneficial to me, especially at this period.

May the devil take the day I consented to go to East Feliciana. Let me hear from you soon. Take no steps without consulting me. I am anxious to break down these rascals, but there is no use in breaking our necks unless we can accomplish something. Should you see D. A. Weber, show him this letter and consult with him. We are acting together. Truly yours,

JAMES E. ANDERSON.

The following letters from Stanley Matthews were produced by the witness:

Agreement between Anderson and Nash, Representative in Congress, New Orleans, November 21, 1876:

By an agreement entered into this day between James E. Anderson, Supervisor of Registration for the parish of East Feliciana, Louisiana, and Charles E. Nash, member of Congress from the Sixth Congressional District of Louisiana, it is agreed that said Anderson shall suppress evidence showing that the said parish of East Feliciana was fairly carried by the Democratic party at the election held November 9, 1876, thereby electing the entire Democratic State ticket and Congressman, in consideration of which the said Nash agrees to secure for said Anderson the position of naval officer at the port of New Orleans, La.

(Signed) JAMES E. ANDERSON,
C. E. NASH.

The above agreement was signed in our presence, this 21st day of November, 1876.

(Signed) J. M. TOMLINSON,
O. B. MORGAN.

Letters from Stanley Matthews to Anderson:

MR. ANDERSON: You are at liberty to use the note on the other page as an introduction to General Harlan, who is one of the commission, and you can talk to him as *freely as to me*. You should say to Nash, if inquired of, that I have the agreement.

(Signed) STANLEY MATTHEWS.

CINCINNATI, March 29, 1877.

General J. M. Harlan.

DEAR SIR: This will be presented to you by Mr. James E. Anderson, who may desire to communicate with you *confidentially*. Yours truly,

STANLEY MATTHEWS.

WASHINGTON, April 17, 1877.

DEAR SIR: I had an interview to-day with the Secretary of State in reference to your appointment as consul at Callao, the place you desired. Unfortunately, the Secretary is already under such commitments in reference to *that* appointment as to make it impracticable to gratify your present wishes. I have, however, *the best reasons* for saying, sooner or later, and as soon as practicable, I shall be able to obtain for you a satisfactory appointment. *Keep me posted from time to time of what you may have in respect to places you would like to have* and feel competent to fill, so that I can better represent your wishes. Yours truly,

STANLEY MATTHEWS.

To JAMES E. ANDERSON.

CINCINNATI, April 27, 1877.

MY DEAR SIR: I have your favor of 22d instant, and I have also conferred with General Harlan, having traveled with him from Hiloda here, arriving last night. The General told me he had ascertained at the State Department that the consulate at Tientsin had already some time since been disposed of. We both concluded it would be better to wait until the extra session of Congress, which will be called to meet June 4, when I will be in Washington regularly, and situated so that I can give the attention to your application which I have promised, and when I do not doubt I will be able to secure your appointment to some foreign position which will be agreeable to you. Yours truly,

STANLEY MATTHEWS.

TO JAMES ANDERSON, Esq., New Orleans.

CINCINNATI, May 7, 1877.

MY DEAR SIR: I enclose letter to Gen. Thomas C. Anderson, asking his influence in favor of your appointment as deputy collector, in answer to yours of the 5th instant, just received. *Let me hear from you as to the result.* Yours truly,

STANLEY MATTHEWS.

JAMES E. ANDERSON, Esq., New Orleans.

CINCINNATI, May 7, 1877.

MY DEAR SIR: The appointment of Mr. James E. Anderson as one of the three deputy collectors or other place satisfactory to him in the custom house at New Orleans I would regard as in the interest of the public service, *a deserved recognition of his services* and a personal favor to myself. May I venture to ask your *personal influence in its favor?* Yours truly, STANLEY MATTHEWS.

GEN. THOMAS C. ANDERSON.

Stanley Matthews to Secretary Evarts recommending Anderson:

CINCINNATI, May 14, 1877.

MY DEAR SIR: The bearer, Mr. James E. Anderson, of New Orleans, is the gentleman in reference to whom, when last in Washington, I had a private conversation with you, urging his appointment to a consulship. Mr. Anderson has had until now a subordinate clerkship in the custom house at New Orleans, which has always been unsatisfactory to him, and now his residence there has become so unpleasant that he has abandoned it and his clerkship. The circumstances in which Mr. Anderson has been placed and in which he has been compelled to act a very difficult part are such as to give him *very strong claims* upon the administration in the public interests, and I do most earnestly urge that some satisfactory public employment may be found for him *at once*. Very truly,

STANLEY MATTHEWS.

Stanley Matthews to Anderson:

CINCINNATI, May 25, 1877.

MY DEAR SIR: I received your telegram to-day, and very much regret you are not satisfied with the appointment tendered you, and which by the papers this morning, I understand was the consulate at Funchal. I am really at a loss to know what further to do. I am quite willing to do anything you may suggest that gives promise reasonably of success. Did you see Mr. Evarts personally? *Write to me and explain* everything fully, and let me know what you think I can further do to serve you. Yours truly,

STANLEY MATTHEWS.

JAMES E. ANDERSON, Esq., No. 73 H street, Washington City.

Telegrams and letters from Anderson to Stanley Matthews:

WASHINGTON, June 7, 1877.

Hon. Stanley Matthews, Cincinnati:

The President claims to have received no letters. Want no more correspondence and *no more nonsense*. Come here and arrange this affair or you can all face the music. Telegraph me at once. Care nothing about documents in your possession.

ANDERSON.

June 27.

MY DEAR SIR: General Smith has given me the text of your letter. I have nothing further to ask at your hands, or of the monumental fraud who occupies the White House, beyond a return of those documents. A refusal on your part to return them will justify me in publishing (and I will publish) your letters in the statement I propose to make showing how Louisiana was carried for Hayes. I shall remain here until Friday next. If I do not hear from you by that time, I promise you shall hear from me before the Ohio election.

TO HON. STANLEY MATTHEWS, Virginia.

WASHINGTON, June 19, 1877.

MY DEAR SIR: When any ward bummer, shoulder-hitter, &c., who can fill no other position must be provided for in a seaport city, they are given a position as inspector of customs. The hours are from 6 a. m. till 6 p. m.; the duties, to stand under a broiling sun and prevent rascally sailors from smuggling. The pay amounts to from $1,035 to $1,400 per annum. This is the position offered me by General Smith. I have told him, politely, of course, that he can take the position and go to the devil. He has no time to attend to my wants on account of the outside rush, so I have withdrawn from the contest and shall now proceed to get satisfaction in my own way. If you desire to return me the documents given you you can do so. I think it better you should, as by doing so it will leave *you* out of future complications. You can use your own judgment, however. In any event, you shall hear from me before the October elections. I shall be in Philadelphia for one week. You can address me there for that period. Very truly yours,

JAMES E. ANDERSON,

Philadelphia, Pa., care of J. E. Sypher, Attorney at Law.

HON. STANLEY MATTHEWS.

Stanley Matthews to James Anderson:

(*Personal and Confidential.*)

UNITED STATES SENATE CHAMBER, WASHINGTON, Feb. 12, 1878.

MY DEAR SIR: I have your note of yesterday, and in reply beg to say that I do not recollect the suggestions heretofore made by you to which you refer, and which you think, if adopted, might still prove advantageous to the public interest, and I would be glad to hear your report. I have never been subjected to so much misrepresentation in regard to everything I have undertaken to do, that I do not think it would be *wise* for me to go to Philadelphia or Baltimore for the purpose of meeting you. In case you should find it convenient to be in Washington *I shall be pleased to see you.* Yours truly, STANLEY MATTHEWS.

MR. JAS. E. ANDERSON, Philadelphia.

A LEAF FROM HISTORY.

The Bayonet Era in the South Carolina State House.

In the course of his speech on the Army bill delivered in the House of Representatives a few days ago, the Hon. Milton I. Southard, of Ohio, introduced some very interesting telegrams and testimony relating to the dark days of 1877 in Columbia. We copy this portion of his remarks from the official report in the Congressional Record:

On the 14th of October, 1876, this telegram was sent by Gen. Sherman to Gen. Ruger, who had previously been transferred to Columbia, South Carolina:

HEADQUARTERS OF THE ARMY, WASHINGTON, Oct. 14, 1876.

To Gen. Ruger, Columbia, S. C.:

We are all back from California. If you want anything, say so. I want all measures to originate with you. Get along with the minimum force necessary, but you shall have all we can give if you need them. W. T. SHERMAN, General.

On the 16th of October Gen. Ruger answered that telegram, as follows:

COLUMBIA, S. C., Oct. 16, 1876.

To Gen. W. T. Sherman, Washington:

Think I have troops sufficient unless circumstances change. Have nineteen companies in the State now in stations of one to four companies. Have some companies still in reserve. No special disorder has occurred since Ellenton riot last month. If I need more troops will ask for them. I shall be here to-day.

RUGER.

Notwithstanding that telegram from Gen. Ruger, in which he said that all was peaceful and quiet there, and that if he needed more troops he would call for them, and without further information, the very next morning a proclamation was issued by President Grant, from Washington City, declaring South Carolina in insurrection, and there followed numerous telegrams from the general of the army, ordering all the troops from the Atlantic coast, from the extreme North to as far South as Fortress Monroe, into the State of South Carolina. Here is a specimen of the telegrams sent:

HEADQUARTERS OF THE ARMY, WASHINGTON, Oct. 17, 1876.

To Gen. W. S. Hancock, Commanding Military Division Atlantic:

It will be necessary to reinforce Gen. Ruger to the maximum possible, and we may have to order every available man from the North Atlantic posts.

Acknowledge receipt.

W. T. SHERMAN, General.

In obedience to these orders from Washington, all available forces were sent into South Carolina and other Southern States under pretence of preserving order, but with the purpose and effect of carrying the election. Actual military possession was taken of those States, and the elections were controlled in violation of the Constitution of your country, in violation of law, and in violation of every principle of justice and right.

Not only that; it did not stop there; military possession of those States was continued until long after the elections. The Legislature of South Carolina was organized, not by the members who were elected to it, but by the Administration here in Washington through the use of Federal troops. I hold here in my hand the official telegrams relating to that organization. There was a dispute about certain members from Edgefield and Laurens who held the certificate of the Supreme Court; they were to be ejected. Gov. Chamberlain sent this telegram to Washington City:

COLUMBIA, S. C., Dec. 1, 1876.

Hon. J. D. Cameron, Secretary of War, Washington:

Cannot Edgefield and Laurens men be removed? They are now acting as members, and have no credentials. If they are removed the House can act and order be restored. Cannot we be protected against unlawful intrusion, when we have no power to enforce the exclusion?

D. H. CHAMBERLAIN, Governor.

Then followed a telegram from the attorney-general to Gov. Chamberlain, and also one to Gen. Ruger from the Secretary of War. Here they are:

WASHINGTON, Dec. 2, 1876.

Gov. D. H. Chamberlain, Columbia, S. C.:

The President thinks that you should exercise your own resources as Governor in behalf of the Legislature which you have recognized by assisting it to purge itself of unauthorized persons.

If you are resisted in this Gen. Ruger has been instructed to enforce your authority.

ALPHONSO TAFT, Attorney General.

WAR DEPARTMENT, WASHINGTON, D. C., Dec. 2, 1876.

To Gen. T. H. Ruger, Columbia, S. C.:

The Governor of the State of South Carolina should exercise his own resources to purge the Legislature which he has recognized of unauthorized persons. If he is resisted in this it will become your duty to enforce his authority.

J. D. CAMERON, Secretary of War.

Subsequently the following telegrams were sent in relation to the same subject:

EXECUTIVE MANSION, WASHINGTON CITY, Dec. 3, 1876.

Gen. T. H. Ruger, Columbia, S. C.:

Fearing your instructions may be conflicting and leave you in doubt as to your duties in the present unhappy condition of affairs in South Carolina, I wish to say this: Governor Chamberlain is the legal constituted Governor of the State, and remains so until the Legislature canvasses the vote and installs his successor; and he is entitled as such to your support and protection. It is a civil duty to organize the Legislature devolving on State authorities. All you can do is to prevent unauthorized persons from forcibly interfering with the Governor and other authorized officers in the performance of their duties. To be plain, I want to avoid anything like an unlawful use of the military, but it will be entirely right to sustain the Governor, or any of his agents or officers, in the performance of any duty in connection with the Legislature if interfered with by outsiders while in the performance of that duty. U. S. GRANT.

COLUMBIA, S. C., Dec. 5, 1876.

To Hon. J. D. Cameron, Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.:

Gen. Ruger announces this morning that he will no longer guard doors of State House. The city is filled with armed and violent men. There is greater need than ever before of protection of State House. Specific orders must be sent respecting this matter at once, in order to avert riot and bloodshed. Vacillation here now is most unfortunate.

Please answer. All I ask is that State House be protected against violence.

D. H. CHAMBERLAIN, Governor of South Carolina.

WAR DEPARTMENT, WASHINGTON CITY, Dec. 5, 1876.

To Governor D. H. Chamberlain, Columbia, S. C.:

General Ruger's instructions are to protect the Legislature from all outside interference, and those instructions will be repeated.

J. D. CAMERON, Secretary of War.

I hold in my hand the official testimony taken in relation to use of troops at the Presidential election before a special committee of the last Congress, of which the honorable gentleman from New York (Mr. Wood) was chairman and I was a member. The publication of this testimony could not be obtained at the time, but I have it as it was written. In it I find the testimony of Gen. Ruger in plain and unmistakable terms that he construed these telegrams to him to mean that the Laurens and Edgefield members and the other conservative members of the South Carolina Legislature were the "unauthorized persons." And he interpreted these telegrams aright, for they could have no other significance; and accordingly he took steps to enforce these orders. The telegrams and the testimony of General Ruger I will insert in my remarks.

Gen. Ruger sent word by his orderly to the Legislature of South Carolina, after the two houses convened in the hall of the State House, telling the Conservative members that they must not be there at 12 o'clock on the next day. In obedience to that order they withdrew, and having withdrawn, a committee waited upon Gen. Ruger, and asked him if these members would be permitted to return the next day, and he told them that they must not go back. Here is the testimony of Gen. Ruger:

Question. Did you give Gov. Chamberlain any assurance that you would aid his force in excluding anybody at that time from the hall of the House? I mean while the two Houses were in session together.

Answer. I had some orders in reference to that subject, but I gave Governor Chamberlain no such assurance, prior to receipt of such orders, that I would aid in excluding any members.

Q. What orders did you have?

A. I think you have the telegrams.

Q. At a still later period than that did you make some order in reference to the exclusion of certain persons from the house?

A. A committee of the Conservative Legislature called upon me and submitted certain propositions in writing; I do not recollect now exactly the words, or perhaps the substance, but they asked that they should be permitted to occupy the hall as the legally constituted Legislature. I told them that if their body went to the hall for the purpose of entering there as the lower House of the Legislature they would not be permitted to enter, that is, that if they were refused admission by the civil officers or the civil guards at the door, and if the doorkeeper should call upon the military officers there to prevent their forcible entrance or assist in doing so, the officers would prevent it. That was after they had gone out in the first place and when they proposed to go back, but they did not go back.

Q. What authority did you have or for what reason did you make that order?

A. My reason for it was the instructions which I had and my understanding of my duty under the circumstances. Governor Chamberlain called upon me before that for assistance in enforcing the authority of the Speaker, I think. He made a verbal application, and afterward made an application in writing the same day. That was, I think, on the 30th of November. I had declined, and had reported the state of the case to Gen. Sherman, and the dispatch which I received in reply to that was that he (the Governor) should exercise his own resources to purge the Legislature he had recognized of unauthorized persons, and in case he was resisted that I should assist him. I think those were the words or substance.

Q. That was in reference to the members from Laurens and Edgefield Counties?

A. I presume so. I had also, before that application by the committee of the Conservative House, received a dispatch to prevent unlawful interference with the Legislature by outsiders.

Q. You left it to him to decide which was the lawful Legislature?

A. I considered that the other, that is the one called the Conservative House, should be classed as outsiders. I did not assume anything as to the legal status, but I considered it within the intent of my orders that I should support the authority of the Governor.

Q. I think you did not quite finish your statement as to your answer to the committee that waited upon you.

A. The substance of it was, that if they appeared there, as proposed, for the purpose of occupying the hall of the House of Representatives, and if they were refused admission by the persons at the door—the State constables or persons having charge as doorkeepers—and such persons should call on the officers in command of the troops at the State House for assistance to prevent their entrance, it would be his duty under his orders to give it. If they were granted admission, of course I should not have prevented their entry.

In response to a question whether Gen. Ruger had not sent his orderly to exclude the Conservative members when both parties were in the hall, he said:

A. I did at one time send word to Speaker Wallace by Maj. Maginnis that at twelve o'clock the next day the members from Laurens and Edgefield should or must not be there. My impression was that the Legislature would adjourn that evening, and that when they came back at twelve the next day these members should not come. But that had nothing to do with the application by the Governor. Several gentlemen had been to see me before that, and had asked whether I should give orders to exclude the members who had certificates signed by the Secretary of State or prevent their entering the hall. I said that I should not. They asked if I would say that the members who had certificates from the Supreme Court might go in; I said I would not consent. That would have brought up a new subject, and I did not know what it might call forth; also I did not regard it within my authority. I was told by these gentlemen that the members who had the certificate from the Secretary of State would probably go to the hall, and when I heard that the Conservative House had gone up and taken possession of the hall, I thought that I had not been fairly treated. I suppose that Mr. Wallace knew of this conversation.

Q. While the two bodies were in the House together, and while the two Speakers were on the stand, was word sent by you to Mr. Wallace, the Speaker, that at 12 o'clock the next day the Laurens and Edgefield members must not be there?

A. I do not remember that I said that they must not be there; I think I said either must or should not, but which expression I used I do not remember.

Q. Do you know whether that message was repeated the second time?

A. I think not. I told Maj. Maginnis to say to Mr. Wallace that these members should not or must not be there at the time of meeting next day.

Q. Were they in the House at that time?

A. Yes, sir; so I understood at the time. I gave the message to Maj. Maginnis.

MR. POTTER'S COMMITTEE.

His Letter to a Northern Friend About the Frauds Investigation—The Cry of "Revolution" Only a Republican Pretense for Partisan Purposes.

Hon. Clarkson N. Potter has been appealed to so generally by letter and by representatives of the press to express his views as to the investigation into the Presidential election frauds that he decided to make public a private letter which he wrote in reply to one from a clergyman in New York, and which covers very fully the inquiries addressed to him, not only from that but other quarters. Mr. Potter shows very conclusively that the cry of "revolution" which the Republicans have set up over this investigation is simply the cry of wolf when there is no wolf, and is a repetition of the bloody shirt business. The letter is as follows:

WASHINGTON, May 27, 1878.

MY DEAR SIR: I have your letter of the 25th. I agree with you in wishing Congress would adjourn. I am one of those who think the world is governed too much. I should be glad to see the power of Congress over matters of private and special legislation entirely cut off. And since much of the public legislation proposed disturbs business and unsettles industry, I have thought it might be well if Congress, unless convened by the President, met but every other year, as is the case with the Legislatures in some of the States. I accordingly proposed an amendment to the constitution providing for biennial sessions of Congress, but it has not been received with any favor. Other sections of the country do not feel as we do about this, and want currency or subsidy or other legislation.

You ask me why Mr. Stephens was "howled" down, The "howling" was by the newspapers. To interrupt the pending order of business by a motion or a statement requires unanimous consent, and every member has the absolute right to object to the interruption. This objection is expressed by the words, "I object," or a demand for "the regular order." Sometimes one person will prevent the interruption, sometimes the desire to prevent it is general, and then the cry of "regular order" will be from many persons. It so happened that there was a very general unwillingness to hear Mr. Stephens. He had suggested that we should receive and adopt the Hale amendment. It was reported that he has given the Republicans a list of twenty-two names who would follow him in any motion of his to prevent investigation. About this he was grossly mistaken, and this made our side especially unwilling to hear him. But you will observe that when I rose to make a proposition to Mr. Hale, and the Republican outcry prevented my being heard, it was announced by the press that "Mr. Potter's jury was interrupted," while Mr. Stephens was head-lined as "the venerable statesman howled down by Potter's mob." You ask me why we would not let the Hale amendment be attached to our resolution. Because it was not germane. An inquiry into frauds accomplished, and which changed the electoral vote, is proper, to prevent their repetition, but an inquiry into mere attempts at fraud which resulted in nothing is not. First, because we understood it contained recitals to which we could not assent, and which would have forced us to vote against our own resolution; second, because we offered Mr. Hale every opportunity to have his amendment adopted as a separate resolution. That it was not so offered shows it was really not desired. Third, because its incorporation into the resolution might have had the effect of preventing any report upon the resolution. As it is, the committee will have probably but one opportunity to report in this Congress, and this amendment could, if added to the resolution, be made to prevent the report at that time, and thus to deprive us of an opportunity to report at all. Just as we got ready to report, we should be liable to be stopped to take further testimony in some of the added States brought forward for the very purpose of preventing a report.

But you suggest that to raise a question about the last Presidential election will bring on disturbance or revolution. Not at all. About that "possess yourself in peace." There is not the slightest chance of revolution or disturbance. When the whole country was at fever heat on the subject of the election a way was found to establish a tribunal to pass upon the election, and every one submitted to that determination. The President's title rests upon that. If now it should appear that there was fraud which palpably affected the electoral vote and which the commission did not notice, and if a legal remedy exists for correcting the error, you cannot believe that such a proceeding under the law could lead to disturbance. If there be no such legal remedy existing, and Congress should hereafter, by the approval of the President, or by two-thirds of both Houses without that approval, provide one, why should the legal determination thereafter had any more produce disturbance than the decision of the electoral commission did? Is it exactly because this is not Mexico, and because the people prefer determining questions by legal methods, and if the legal methods have not been provided to invent legal methods of determining them and submit to the determination thus arrived at, that this country cannot be Mexicanized? About the enumeration of electoral votes there could be no question. Eight and eight could only be counted as sixteen. Neither could there be question that the conceded vote of every State should be counted. To refuse that would be revolutionary. But when there were two *bona fide* returns from a State, each claimed to be its vote, it was a necessity to decide between those returns before either return could be counted. This determination could only be made by the Vice President, who opened the returns, or by the Congress in whose presence they were opened. I thought it clear from the nature of our government, from the precedents and from the opinions so many statesmen had expressed, that this grave power upon which the last election did, and upon which any election might depend, could only be vested in Congress. If this power rested in Congress alone, then the action of Congress was necessary before a choice could be made between conflicting returns, and so, whenever the two Houses of Congress could not agree in their choice of a return, one House preferring one and the other the other, no choice could be had, and the vote of that State would be lost. Not because one House had any greater rights or powers than the other, not because either or both Houses together had the right to reject arbitrarily or to refuse to reckon any certain electoral vote, but only because in case of *bona fide* conflicting returns from a State, each claiming to represent its electoral vote, it was a necessity to choose between the returns before the vote of the State could be counted. This was the view at last established. For the electoral commission to decide the disputed votes was created by Congress, and that was the only authority it possessed. Now, it seemed to me in 1876 that this was so clear, and that the leading Republican Senators had so generally committed themselves to this view in previous discussions, that we ought to stand upon that ground to declare that we would abide the action of Congress, would accept whomever the Congress found to be elected, and that if the two Houses should fail to agree as to which of the returns from any State from which there were *bona fide* duplicate returns should be received, whereby the vote of the State was lost, and no election by the electors should thus result, we would then abide and maintain the choice of the House of Representatives, the body authorized by the constitution to elect the President where there is no election by the electoral college. Instead of doing this we drifted along until at last the Republicans, hewing all the while to the line, had got us where we were ready to accept the electoral commission. Having accepted it, of course we were bound to submit to its results, but we ought at least to be allowed to show—if such was the fact—that the returns upon which the commission passed were procured by fraud. I admit that the Presidency is not worth a civil war, but I have not believed there was any danger of such a war. The generation who charged up the heights of Fredericksburg and defended the works at Petersburg will not go lightly into another civil struggle. We must get years further on before that will happen. I remember after the election remarking to General McDowell that a great mine ought to be exploded by a spark, to which he answered, "Yes, if the train be inflammable, but this time the powder is wet." He was right. There never was danger of a civil war. The whole thing was, as I think, a gigantic game, in which we held the cards and the Republicans bluffed us. Years hence, when it is remembered that we needed only one electoral vote and that your side could not get on without every one of the remaining seventeen; that we had 300,000 popular majority; that our majorities were around the capital, yours in New England, the Northwest and the Pacific coast; that the moral sense of the country was that our man was elected and yours not; that you had nothing on your side but the control of an army of which 10,000 men could not be got together, the privates mostly in sympathy with us, and commanded by officers educated to understand the supremacy of the civil over the military authority—officers who, excepting the leaders, Grant, Sherman and Sheridan, could, I believe, never have been generally used to resist the declaration of the House of Representatives, (I am told this will appear certainly whenever the secret correspondence of the War Department is revealed,) and that you were laden down with the care of the national credit, the first shock to which would have arrayed against you all the moneyed institutions in the country; that under such conditions, I say, your leaders contrived and were able to carry through the capture of all these votes, will be regarded as one of the greatest political performances of history. I admit the success of the Republican leaders. Having lain down when the law was on our side and when we ought to have stood up, it is not for us now to stand up as long as the law remains against us. But you will ask whether if there be no danger to public order from legal proceedings there may not be from action by Congress. No; no more than from the action of the courts. Congress represents the people of the country, but does not march before them; it expresses, but does not anticipate their will. Should fraud connected with the electoral count appear so gross and palpable that you and all honorable men should unite in denouncing it, Congress might then take action. But if so, what Congress might do, being the result of the action of men, of all parties of the great body of the people, not of a party, would be effected quietly, certainly and without violence or disturbance. In saying this I do not mean that I expect the investigation to be followed by either legal or Congressional action. What, if anything should be done because of the inquiry must depend upon the results of the inquiry. But I do mean that whatever action, if any, should follow the investigation, such action can neither disturb the order nor the prosperity of the country. This cry of wolf when there is no wolf, this effort to make it appear that there is danger to peace or order from this investigation, is a Republican pretense, like the "bloody shirt" justification of carpet-bag government; like the "public danger" excuse advanced for the enforcement of Durell's infamous order and the protection of the returning board by bayonets; like the cry set up after the election to prevent any agitation and to secure submission. We must have a very sorry sort of popular government if Congress cannot even inquire into frauds in the choice of the executive without endangering the peace and prosperity of the country.

What then, you ask, is the purpose of the investigation? I answer, to ascertain facts, so that if frauds be established a repetition of such frauds may be prevented, and if not, to clear up the general belief throughout the country that there were such frauds. It is true that not every allegation of wrong is to be inquired into by Congress, but when a large majority, of the people believe that the last Presidential election was secured by organized fraud, surely an inquiry to ascertain the facts ought to be had. The feeling amongst many Republicans after the election was that while we had been cheated in the returns we had bull-dozed the negroes as badly, so that the accounts of wrong were about equal. This belief in the bull-dozing of the negro was based mainly upon the fact that in certain districts in the South which usually gave Republican majorities there was not returned a single Republican vote. Now, the people