

THE PICKENS SENTINEL.

DEVOTED TO POLITICS, MORALITY, EDUCATION AND TO THE GENERAL INTEREST OF THE COUNTRY.

PICKENS, S. C., THURSDAY, APRIL 6, 1876.

NO. 31.

VOL. V.

[From the Greenville News.]

Letter from Mr. D. F. Bradley on the Mackey Investigation.

COLUMBIA, March 20, 1876.

I have read with some surprise the letter of Col. Crittendon, published in the News of the 19th instant, relative to the Mackey embroglio. The writer's alleged purpose is to place both sides of the Mackey impeachment matter before your readers. I submit whether, to a reflecting and unprejudiced reader there is but one side to the matter, to wit: The side of justice and right? In a word, if Mackey be innocent and the victim of villains and traducers, is it not a matter of right and justice to him that he have the opportunity of proving his innocence to the world? It need not be replied that a packed committee would present articles of impeachment against him whether guilty or not, for no man, or set of men, in trials of this character, where the evidence is a matter of public record, seen and read of all men, can be found so utterly indifferent to public opinion as to appear before the world as prosecutors of a man against whom no proof has been adduced. Again, if he be guilty, who can deny but it is a matter of right and justice to the State, that he be convicted and deprived of an office which has ever been the safeguard of the lives, liberties and property of her citizens. Widening the matter abstracted from the character of the charges, and the reputation of many of those who make and declare themselves ready to substantiate them, it is passing strange to me that the Judge himself, much more the Conservative members, should seek to stave off investigation. In no view could it do harm, and in every point of view, it is a matter of justice to the Judge and the people. In matters involving the purity and integrity of this important office, no one should be controlled in forming his opinion of duty and propriety, by the class of men who may array themselves for or against a thorough investigation, but should look solely to the question, whether there are reasonable grounds for such investigation. I am not willing to admit "that the worst elements of the Radical party, including every noted corrupt politician or official are arrayed," as Col. C. says against Mackey, while the best element of the Radical party are supporting him. Among those of the Republicans voting with Col. C., the name of Leslie, of Land Commission notoriety, is found, and if he be the best elements of the party, God save the country. There are a number lesser Republican lights voting with him, and on the whole, the division of the Republicans on the question, is about equal in point of honesty, while there is a vast preponderance of the better informed members of the party recording themselves for the investigation. I have great respect for the opinion of Chancellor Johnson and other opposing Conservatives, but I have greater respect for men who dare to form their own opinions on facts, and fearlessly carry them out; especially in all efforts to probe corruption in high places, and bring to punishment, those who commit wrong, and those who protect wrong doers. No thinking mind can doubt but that every well founded suspicion, even against a judicial officer, should be traced up for the honor of the bench, not to say in justice of the officer. This is always the safe course, never making injury, often producing good results. If Moses, Bowen, Buttz, and Whipper favor the investigation, this should not drive any one from the right, but it should rather encourage us, in seeing such men show a returning sense of propriety and integrity. It used to be said that if a Conservative favored a measure of Legislation, or voted and worked for a particular candidate, it would arouse the apprehension of the Radicals and defeat the measure or person as the case might be. Has it now come to be true, that intelligent Conservatives base their vote and action upon an important matter, on

the favor or opposition of particular well known Radicals? Away with such flimsy excuses and pretenses to protect a judicial officer under a cloud of charges sustained by Conservatives of high tone and character. Were it necessary for us to ignore our own judgment, and shape our course on measures to the mere feeling of Republicans on them, then Leslie and the Republicans voting with Col. C., can lay claim to about as much bad notoriety, as those voting with myself and other Conservatives. Apart from these abstract views, what are the facts? I, and perhaps none of the Conservatives know anything personally of the guilt or innocence of Mackey, or of the truth, or falsity of the charges made against him. The matter laid before the House, consist of various charges set forth in a petition on the part of the citizens of Lancaster, as to his dismissal of the Grand Jury, amounting to an act of judicial tyranny, his unprecedented course in the case of the State vs. Lydia Massey and Cephas Rion, in the year 1874, in which he is charged with having threatened certain of the jury, that he would send them to jail, if they did not find a verdict as he directed, with other allegations by the Committee that there are others, and more serious charges of neglect of duty, corrupt practices, and even bribery freely made against Mackey, as occurring in Lancaster County, and capable of proof. This petition setting forth these flagrant usurpations of authority—and these charges of terribly corrupt practices, are signed by honored and respected Conservatives, and they have come here asking an opportunity to substantiate them. What terrible charges? Those against Moses are insignificant to some of them, for instance extorting by threats of imprisonment a verdict from a jury. In addition to these charges from Lancaster, other charges are made from Chester, backed by Major Hamilton and other citizens of known integrity. Do not these constitute a prima facie case? Can any one read them and for a moment hesitate as to the duty of the Legislature to test their truth or falsity? Has the Bench of South Carolina so fallen that such charges signed by worthy men against a judicial officer can be passed unheeded? It is a sad commentary on the times and people to contemplate, in its effects on good government and judicial purity in the future. I voted for the investigation, and am willing for the people to judge between those voting for and against it, with the facts before them. I have no fears of the verdict of an honest and intelligent people on such a question. But Col. C. and those voting against the investigation, in addition to reasons based on the type of Republicans supporting them and which I have shown to be blind pretences, without foundation or reason, allege that the investigation will lead to the suspension of Mackey, and will operate to release villains and rogues who are to be tried before the Judge this week. How weak, how silly, such a statement.—It is a cue of the Governor, given forth in that famous and unprecedented interview in behalf of Mackey, when he rushed fully armed and equipped to the defense of his friend and ally. Is Mackey the only Judge who can prosecute criminals to conviction? Is my friend controlled in this view by the old adage, "It takes a thief to catch a thief?" Does he not know that if Mackey should be suspended the Governor would appoint his successor, that the Governor is a special friend of Mackey; that a part of Mackey's defense would be to substantiate the guilt of Yocum and others in Chester; that the Governor would appoint a man who would not prejudice Mackey, and who if the parties were found guilty would not fail to punish them? The whole machinery is in the hands of the friends of Mackey, in case he were suspended. How then can they say to reasonable men that the investigation of Mackey would lead to the triumph of a band of thieves. This like the other excuses for opposing an investigation

of Mackey will not stand the test of reason. They are blinds, which must give way to intelligent reflection, and sound judgement. The matter is doubtless ended for this session and I have written my views of it in justification of the course of myself and others, who voted for the proposed investigation.

Respectfully,
D. F. BRADLEY.

Personal Government—A Formidable Indictment of Grant.

The New York Herald submits the following startling array of specifications:

1. One of his very first acts as President showed singular contempt for law and regard for his own will or desire alone. He nominated Mr. A. T. Stewart to be Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. Stewart, undoubtedly a capable man, could not disengage himself from his vast commercial interests, and a law which had stood for almost three quarters of a century on our statute books, and whose wisdom was unquestioned, forbade his taking the office under the circumstances. What happened? Gen. Grant coolly asked Congress to repeal the act. It refused, as was its duty, and the President sulked.
2. Next Grant drove Gen. Cox out of the Cabinet because he refused to appoint corrupt and inefficient friends of the President to office in the Indian Bureau elsewhere, in violation of civil service rules and honest government.
3. He drove Joseph Wilson the honest land commissioner, into retirement because he decided a Missouri land claim of the Dent family adversely to their interest.
4. He appointed a poker-playing Congressman as Minister to England, and kept him there until he was threatened with arrest, a public disgrace and scandal, in spite of his notorious connection with the Emma Mine fraud.
5. He attempted, against the will of Congress and the country, to annex St. Domingo, and sent out his own private agent, Gen. Babcock, to negotiate a treaty in violation of the constitution; and he was so contemptuous toward the laws that he actually sent to the Senate a secret agreement made and signed with Baez by this authorized private agent, under pretense that it was a treaty, and only withdrew it when the Senate privately informed him that the constitution required treaties to be made and signed by agents publicly nominated and confirmed by the Senate.
6. To consummate the annexation, in which he had involved himself with a number of men notoriously engaged in a land speculation, he kept vessels of war on the coast of the island at a great expense to support the usurper Baez, and levied war on the Haytian Republic, in violation of the constitution, which reserves the power of declaring and making war to Congress.
7. He caused the expulsion of Charles Sumner from the chairmanship of the Senate foreign relations committee, a post which he had held for many years and in which his services in the country were of peculiar importance, because he would not support the St. Domingo scheme.
8. He afterwards tried to bribe Sumner to acquiescence in the St. Domingo plot by the offer of the mission to England. This was when he saw that against Sumner's opposition the St. Domingo treaty must fall.
9. He appointed his brother-in-law, Cramer, to a high diplomatic position, although this person had already shown himself notoriously unfit while holding an obscure consularship.
10. He appointed another brother-in-law, Casey, to be collector of New

Orleans, and there maintains him, in spite of his proved incapacity and corruption and his open violation of law.

11. When public opinion, outraged beyond endurance at Casey's conduct, demanded his removal, he apparently submitted by requiring and ostensibly accepting Casey's resignation, "to take effect on the appointment of his successor;" but he has never appointed a successor, and thus Casey remains collector in spite of the public demand for his removal.
12. He removed a collector of internal revenue at Chicago because this officer refused to join Orvil Grant, the President's brother, in a whiskey fraud.
13. Later, in violation of law, he gave to this same brother Orvil the monopoly of trading with certain tribes of Indians, and caused the exclusion of other traders, certified to be respectable men. This is the first time in our history when a President's brother has become an Indian trader, or has received a monopoly, contrary to an express law, from his brother.
14. He gave the Federal appointments in the city of New York to a ward politician, said to be connected with the Tammany Ring, but who was his own intimate.
15. He appointed and long kept in the important office of Attorney General of the United States a man openly charged with frauds, known to be ignorant of law, unfit by character and acquirements for the place, but notoriously a subservient tool of his own.
16. He tried to promote this incapable Attorney General to the chief judgeship of the supreme court, a public scandal which was prevented only with the utmost difficulty.
17. He took away the custody of government funds from the solid house of the Barings, who had held it since the foundation of the government, and entrusted the public moneys to Clews & Haight, as a reward for notorious partisan services and in spite of warnings that this house was not trustworthy or of good standing. The firm has since become bankrupt, but the public does not yet know how much the treasury lost by its failure.
18. He gave to one of his former military aids, Leet, a monopoly of certain customhouse warehousing, and maintained him in it until the outraged merchants became too clamorous at the injustice they were compelled to suffer.
19. He has accepted costly gifts and repeatedly rewarded the givers with public places for themselves or for their friends.
20. He permitted and defended the moiety frauds, by which the revenues of the country were farmed out to low politicians, with the known design of securing the political fortunes of some of his favorite adherents.
21. He was and is the intimate of Alexander Shepherd, a man openly and generally accused of corruption in Washington, and
22. When Congress, compelled by a rigid investigation, destroyed the district government which Shepherd controlled, in order to put him out of place and power, the President had the indecency to renominate him at once as the head of the new government—a nomination so scandalous that the Senate immediately and unanimously rejected it.
23. In spite of this he still retains Shepherd in favor as one of his most intimate associates.
24. He shocked the public sense of propriety by inviting to the White House, on a public occasion, Harrington, the confederate of Shepherd a person then undergoing trial for felony, and never acquitted for the charge.
25. He consorts constantly with men of doubtful character, and still

has among his intimates both Shepherd and Harrington.

26. In their defense he even went so far as in an annual message to undertake by several millions the debt of the District of Columbia; a gross attempt to deceive the public which was immediately exposed in Congress.
27. He was a party in an intrigue whereby his own salary was doubled, and caused it to be privately understood in Congress that the bill raising congressional salaries would not receive his signature unless his own salary was doubled.
28. He was for months engaged in an attempt, at last successful, to make one of his intimates, Rufus Ingalls, Quartermaster General of the army, and held vacant the Russian mission as a temptation to Gen. Meigs, who stood in the way of this scheme.
29. He supported Kellogg as Governor of Louisiana without authority from Congress, confessing that he did not know who was the rightful Governor, and on his own will alone; and he has used the army for many months to hold Louisiana down for this favorite.
30. He did not scruple last year to grossly misrepresent to Congress and the country the condition of Louisiana and other Southern States, in order that he might thereby support his corrupt personal followers there.
31. While a congressional committee was in New Orleans investigating the condition of Louisiana he violently took matters in his own hands, and in their presence dispersed the legitimate Assembly of the State by means of the army.
32. He ordered his Secretary of War to send the approval of the whole Cabinet to Sheridan for the dispersion of the Legislature and his banditti dispatch, though it is known that he did not take the trouble to consult any member of the Cabinet in the matter, and that several members did strongly disapprove of these measures.
33. He refused to see or hear the committee which Congress had sent to New Orleans, and sent a message to Congress founded on assertions which the report of that committee of Congress showed to be false and groundless.
34. Thus he first insulted his Cabinet and then Congress in order to carry out his personal aims, and sought, by artful misrepresentations and false statements, made when truth was at his call and unofficially known to him, to justify a dangerous usurpation of power by the military and the prostration of civil rule.
35. He endeavored to intimidate a congressional committee into making a report on the condition of Arkansas, to subscribe his own views; summoned them before him and told them what they ought to report, and did not even take the trouble to ask them what facts they had found in their investigation. Fortunately, they were too independent to submit to his dictation.
36. One member of the committee who made a minority report in accordance with his wishes, he rewarded with the post of District Attorney at Chicago, an office from which he was lately dismissed for incapacity.
37. He used the powerful influence of the administration to cause the passage of the Habeas Corpus and Force bill, a measure flagrantly unconstitutional, and, as subsequent events have shown, without the excuse of necessity or expediency.
38. He insulted the public sense of honor and decency by retaining Mr. Delano in office long after the grossest scandals had been proved against him and his subordinates in the management of Indian affairs; and when at last compelled by the dread of losing an important election to dismiss him, he gave him a strong testimonial of character and expressed his regret at parting with him.

39. In the prosecution of the whiskey thieves he gave his countenance not to honest officials doing their duty but to the political gamblers and personal adherents whose crime were threatened with discovery.

40. When an honest but over zealous prosecuting officer uttered words in the heat of argument at which the President chose to take offense, instead of pardoning his words on the score of his honest zeal for the public interest he ordered his dismissal.
41. He kept near him in the most intimate official relations two men, Babcock and Leakey, when both were under grave suspicions of complicity in revenue frauds.
42. He restored Babcock to his place after a trial which did not in the general opinion clear his character of the gravest suspicion of infidelity to public trusts, and when the President in his own examination was compelled to admit that important papers had been concealed from him by his secretary.
43. In his sworn testimony in defence of Gen. Babcock he had the insolence to say that he revoked the order of Mr. Bristow changing the supervisors at his own will, without consulting the secretary, and as though he was dictator.
44. Unawed by public indignation, regardless of public decency, unmoved by the fact that State after State has been lost by the party which elected him, because of his misconduct, he only a few days ago flung a new defiance at the people by accepting, the moment it was tendered, and "with regret," the resignation of Mr. Bolknap, whose crime had been already made known to him.

How HE WAS OUTWITTED.—The story is told of an old Quaker who lived with a woman as his wife, but refused to be bound by any form of marriage. Their relationship was known to be a perfect marriage in all but the form, and his friends, while acknowledging the purity of the man's ideas, were grieved at the scandal created by his action, as he was known to be a good man. He was, however, deaf to all remonstrances, although his friend presented the matter in every possible light. At length some of the oldest and gravest among his friends determined that the matter ought to be settled, with or without his sanction. They therefore called on him, and, in the presence of his wife in all but the name, they renewed their arguments. In the course of the conversation they artfully managed to draw from her the remark that she considered him as her husband. Immediately afterward they spoke to him in such a way that he, not suspecting their intention, replied: "Why, I consider her as my wife." "Then I pronounce you man and wife. Those whom God hath joined together let no man put asunder," said the oldest man in the party. The outwitted Quaker was furiously angry, but he had been caught beyond question.

General Rufus Ingalls explains that the watch he gave Mrs Grant was worth but \$180. He will have some difficulty in making the country believe that Grant would give him the Quartermaster-Generalship of the United States for that small gift.— Besides the presentation address, printed on tinted satin in golden letters, specifically stated that the jeweled time piece was made for Queen Victoria and cost over \$4,000.

Stealing the criminal calendar to put a stop to a court, is the latest dodge in Edgefield. Last Friday, when Judge Carpenter called for the calendar, the clerk reported that it had been stolen the night previous. There were about seventy cases upon it, and a sudden halt was occasioned in criminal business.

Mr Leonard Dove a young man of culture and promise, committed suicide at Doves depot on the Choram and Darlington Railroad, recently.