

THE WEEKLY UNION TIMES.

Devoted to Agriculture, Horticulture, Domestic Economy, Public Health, Politics, and the Current News of the Day.

VOL. IX.—NEW SERIES.

UNION C. H., SOUTH CAROLINA, MONDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 1873.

NUMBER 11.

THE THIEVES' CARNIVAL.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FRAUDS.

It would be irksome task to enumerate all the accounts rendered for repairs on committee rooms. It is sufficient to say that they amounted to thousands of dollars annually, when it is a well known fact that after the State House was fitted up not a committee room was repaired. See evidence of Robert Scriven and others, who state that they were in constant attendance and that no work was done, except placing the two wooden partitions. No transaction was allowed to pass without paying tribute to the inordinate greed which characterized the majority of the members.

On the 10th day of February, three days professional services rendered the committee appointed to investigate the accounts of the State House.

On the 10th day of February, three days professional services rendered the committee appointed to investigate the accounts of the State House. Clerk Jones, in his evidence, says: "Stationery includes refractions, dry goods, groceries, carpets, furniture, horses and carriages, and miscellaneous articles of merchandise, and the names used in the accounts were

generally myths. To further illustrate the frauds committed under this head, we refer to vouchers in evidence of A. O. Jones, designated as Nos. 54, 55 and 56 amounting in the aggregate to \$3,666. Mr. Jones says: "It is asserted that these accounts were for books and fine stationery furnished the members."

Attention is called to accounts numbered from 104 to 114, inclusive, where it will be seen that in January alone one firm furnished \$6,683 29 worth of "stationery," or more than fifty dollars worth per month to each member. In addition to the above, the accounts of Messrs. Bryan & McCarter and Mr. Stokes, well known dealers, who reside in Columbia, and who furnished stationery to the House and Senate, are itemized, and, from appearances, include most of the stationery actually used.

Clerk Woodruff says (and the vouchers prove it) that during one session each senator received a copy of

WEBSTER'S UNABRIDGED Dictionary, and a calendar inkstand which cost \$25.

The accounts of the Western Union Telegraph Company, together with Mr. Woodruff's evidence, will show that even the private telegrams of the senators were paid for by the State.

According to evidence and accounts, the Senate often used \$10 worth of postage stamps per day. Gold pens at \$10; inkstands at \$25; Webster's Dictionary and fine stationery certainly afforded our "Statesmen" every facility for an extensive correspondence.

JEWELRY.

We cannot refrain from commenting upon the large accounts of Mr. Isaac Sulzbacher, a well known jeweller of Columbia; and call especial attention to the accounts designated as "No. 27" and "B 5," mentioned in Woodruff's evidence, where jewelry was furnished to Senators Whitmore, Maxwell, Hayne, Rev. Wm. Johnston and Representative Tim Hurley. He also furnished fine gold pens costing as high as \$10 a piece, and, judging from the bills rendered, from five to ten pocket knives to each member during the session.

The accounts of Mr. Hayden, (a jeweller of Charleston,) designated A 1, by Woodruff, clearly demonstrate the manner in which bills were raised, the amount being for five call-bells \$12, and raised to \$112, by inserting the figure one (1). We quote from Mr. Woodruff's diary in reference to an account of Mr. Hayden for a watch for Senator Whitmore: "Wednesday, January 15, 1873, collected certificate for \$945, and paid Hayden for Whitmore's watch.

GRACIOUS GOODNESS!

Whitmore must have somewhere about ten thousand dollars this session. That ought to be satisfactory. He is always, though, after one more."

It has long been a mystery to the uninitiated where the matchless diamonds which flashed their rays of light in the halls of the Capitol, the showy watch chains and expensive watches came from; but an inspection of Mr. Sulzbacher's accounts, and those of a similar nature, will reveal the startling fact that they were furnished by an impoverished State.

We submit a portion of Mr. Sulzbacher's account for

REPAIRING CLOCKS,

Nos. 254 and 264, and referred to in A. O. Jones's evidence, which will show the amount to be several hundred dollars. Mr. Glaze, another jeweller of Columbia, has several accounts, some of which are designated as Nos. 61, 62 and 63, by A. O. Jones. Instead of jewelry we now have gorgeous military trappings for our legislative heroes, who belonged to a well equipped but badly organized militia. These

amounted to something over twenty-one hundred dollars. In connection with these accounts see evidence of P. Simkins, (under the head of "pay certificates," who states that he purchased some articles from Mr. Glaze, and that his account as well as that of S. J. Lee was settled with a legislative pay certificate. Afterwards he and Lee were both sued, and he paid Mr. Glaze two hundred dollars, and Mr. Glaze still holds the certificate as a claim against the State.

In the account of W. J. Whipper, attorney at law, designated as C 13, he charges the State the modest sum of

ONE DOLLAR PER DAY FOR FORTY, THREE DAYS professional services rendered the committee appointed to investigate the accounts of the State House.

On the 10th day of February, three days professional services rendered the committee appointed to investigate the accounts of the State House.

For years large accounts amounting to several hundred dollars, annually, have been paid for

CLEANING THE HALLS of the Senate and House of Representatives, while hundreds of convicts were in the city entirely idle. To illustrate the economy practiced now, we will state, that not one dollar is paid out for such work, convict labor being utilized.

We have examined the accounts for fitting locks to the desks of members, and find that during one session the State was charged with 367 new locks, where there are only 164 desks in the Senate and House, thus giving more than two locks to each desk. We submit a few accounts for wood and coal. Upon a close calculation, we find that during one session more than

ONE THOUSAND CORDS OF WOOD

and one thousand three hundred and twenty tons of coal were charged for, and at the same time there was not a single wood stove in use at the State House. Sergeant Williams in his evidence states that not a fourth of the wood and coal purchased was consumed at the State House. He also says that Mr. Crews furnished and delivered to any of the members who asked for it this necessary commodity.

From the account of Mr. Mayrant it appears that he furnished Senators Whitmore, Maxwell and others with wood.

The bills rendered show that thousands of dollars were spent annually for

HAIR BRUSHES AND TOWELS furnished, but will simply state that the accounts amounted to thousands of dollars! Verily, they should have been cleansed.

We respectfully call your attention to the accounts designated as Nos. 814, 82, 824, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88 and 89, in evidence of A. O. Jones, and C 7 and A 1 in the evidence of Mr. Woodruff, in which it is shown that State officials, members of the House and Senate, clerks and attaches were furnished with most of the leading daily papers of the State and a large number of weekly country papers. In addition to the above the accounts, vouchers and evidence show that novels, law and other books were furnished to the members in order that they might while away their idle hours in improving their minds at the State's expense, though thousands of their constituents' children were unable to attend school for the want of books. In evidence of the above we refer you to accounts designated as A 2, W 5, and others of a similar kind, and the evidence of A. O. Jones.

The accounts of W. K. Greenfield, Hardy Solomon, M. J. Calnan, and others, show the amounts paid by the State for the use of so-called committee rooms. These rooms were not only used during the sitting of the General assembly, but were often occupied the entire year at the extravagant price of

ONE DOLLAR PER DAY RENT

for each room. Add to this the cost of furnishing, gas bills, refreshments, &c., and this of itself would prove to the world that South Carolina was cursed with the most extravagant and corrupt class of legislators known in ancient or modern times.

We refer to accounts designated Nos. 2 to 5 respectively and No. 78, included in A. O. Jones's evidence. It has been clearly demonstrated that a sufficient sum has been paid in five years for rent of upper rooms in more than one building to have purchased the entire building. We call your attention to what seems to us our most palpable fraud, designated as No. 65 in evidence of A. O. Jones, where R. K. Scott certifies that an account for room rent, amounting to \$3,249 60, "is justly due." Mr. Jones, in his evidence, says that this is an account of R. K. Scott for the rent of a cottage for one year.

It could not be sold for that amount today. Mr. Greenfield says, in reference to this matter, that he rented the cottage in rear of McKenzie's building to R. K. Scott, to be used as a resort or

CADUCEUS ROOM

during his candidacy for the United States Senate, that he was paid by Governor Scott, and that he has no knowledge of the certificates being issued in payment of the same.

The voucher designated by Woodruff as No. 26, is for rent of the residence of John J. Patterson, for the use of Senator Whitmore, Owens, and others who resided in stately mansions, enjoying their gain stolen from an impoverished people while their poor dupes in their lowly cabins were suffering for the necessities of life.

THE ROLL OF RASCALS.

The private bills of State officers, senators and members of the House, referred to in the evidence of Woodruff and Jones, in evidence of those who were the recipients of the supplies, are:

Lieutenant Governor Ransier, Lieutenant Governor Gleaves; senators C. P. Leslie, L. Wimbush, Frank Arnie, H. E. Hayne, B. F. Whitmore, H. J. Maxwell, C. D. Hayne, Y. J. P. Owens, W. E. Johnston, J. M. Allen, J. Hollingshead, Robert Smalls, W. B. Nash, S. A. Swails, Geo. F. McIntyre, E. S. J. Hayes, Jas. A. Green, John Lee, J. E. Green; representatives Jas. A. Bowley, Tim Hurley, Joseph D. Bacon, J. B. Dennis, C. H. Sperry, S. J. Lee, P. Simkins, P. R. Rivers, W. M. Thomas, W. H. Jones, F. J. Moses, Benj. Byas, Nelson Davis

For further information we refer to various bills of this class, designated by Woodruff as Nos. 1; 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 21, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 53, 78, 110, 115, 116 and 118. C 12, A 2, A 14, W 4, W 6, II 2, II 5, D 9, II 10, II 15; also to Nos. 21 and 54 in evidence of A. O. Jones.

To enumerate the bills designated by Mr. Jones in his evidence as "myths" and "queer accounts" would fill hundreds of pages. A few are inserted to illustrate this manner of robbing the treasury. The originals are submitted in his evidence, numbered as follows:

No. 9. A. Washburne.....	\$ 700 00
No. 48. James Stebbins.....	895 15
No. 58. A. L. Stungum.....	3,564 19
No. 81. William Hall.....	1,900 00
No. 89. Simeon P. Simplex.....	500 00
No. 88. J. S. J. Green.....	1,075 40
No. 118. R. O. Burkall.....	3,021 25
.....	3,752 15
.....	985 75
.....	500 00

Making an aggregate of.....\$20,368 89 MYTHS "AND OTHERS."

Mr. Jones says these "myths" were pushed through under cover of "and others" and that "the number was so great it would have been foolishness in him to have made inquiries concerning them." He also says if he had placed any impediment in the way of certificates being issued to pay this class of claims he would have lost his position, and that in some instances the only supplies furnished was the paper on which the account was made out. Sergt. Williams testified that vouchers and accounts were made out in the names of fictitious persons for large amounts passed upon by the committee on contingent accounts, and pay certificates drawn for them and delivered to different members. He recognized No. 1 referred to in evidence of A. O. Jones as one of that class. It calls for \$1,125, and he thinks it was given to W. H. Jones, a member from Georgetown. A large number of accounts were made out in the name of John Williams, sergeant-at-arms, among them Nos. 53 and 91, amounting to \$5,432 02, also Nos. 92 to 111, inclusive, amounting to \$15,630 08.

While Mr. Williams was being examined he said: "I know nothing of most of these accounts. I allowed my name to be used to assist the members from time to time.—Bowley, Dennis, Thomas and others were frequently benefited by the use of my name. The State received no consideration whatever for the certificates issued in the payment of these accounts. I did not know my name was used so often, nor for such large amounts, until now. I am sure it was arranged by introducing a legislative claim in my name and adding the words 'and others' to it, thereby getting it passed without creating any suspicion that it was a fraud. I remember the \$3,500 account; that was for the committee on contingent accounts. I think they took \$500 apiece. They promised me \$500, but never gave it to me."

Your committee cannot undertake to enumerate all the accounts submitted with this report, but will refer you to a few rendered by Messrs. Kinard and W. D. Love & Co., dealers in dry goods, and to those of Messrs. Strauss & Bro., D. Epstein, Wm. Robinson, dealers in clothing.

Clerk Jones in referring to the accounts rendered against Sergeant-at-arms Williams, says: "It seems he was appealed to by those who were naked and he clothed them."

CONCLUSION.

Your committee feel assured that no language, by way of comment, would add force to the simple statement of facts attending this era of revelry, embracing peculation, embezzlements and robberies of a character hitherto unknown in South Carolina. The perpetrators are covered with infamy and

disgrace, and should be pursued during their natural lives with the sword of Justice hanging by a thread over their heads.

Justice to the honest taxpayers of the State, what can be said to relieve those who are burdened and debilitated by the testimony submitted shows these persons either were reckless of the interest of the people of the State, or bribed at, connived at, or colluded with the robbers to fleece the people—a collusion as humiliating as the facts are disgraceful and culpable.

We regret to place this on record; but it is true, and the facts as proved justify your committee in joining with the good people of the State in denouncing such conduct.

JOHN R. COCHRAN, Chairman.
H. A. MEETZE.

On part of Senate.
S. DIBBLE.
G. MULLER.
J. G. BLUE.

On part of House.
THE COST OF BAD ROADS.

The Enormous Taxation Imposed for the Privilege of Riding Over Bad Roads—Our People Bear it With Perfect Equanimity.

(Extract from Professor Sandford's Address Before Georgia Agricultural Society.)

We complain heavily of Radical taxation for the last twelve years, and we have abundant and just reason for complaint, but I venture the assertion, that we pay more for the privilege of riding over bad roads, than for our national, State and county taxes combined; and this point, I think, is susceptible of demonstration. Now, let us see where these taxes come in. Here is a farmer, who, for the comfort of himself and family, invest \$200 in a buggy. Now, on a system of hard, smooth, wellgraded roads, this buggy ought to last, in good running order, for ten years. In this instance, the annual outlay for buggies is \$20. But what are the real facts in this case? Does the buggy last ten years? On our rough and uneven roads, with ruts and holes into which the wheels are constantly falling with the momentum of sledge-hammers, we doubt whether the life of the average buggy extends beyond five years. If this be true, then there is an annual expense of \$40 for buggies—\$20 more per annum than in the case of good roads. This extra \$20 per annum is, to all intents and purposes, a tax for the privilege of using bad roads. And now multiply this tax for every man in the State of Georgia, who rides in a buggy, and what a fearful array of figures does it bring out; a tax for the privilege of bad roads.—What I have said in regard to the buggy, holds good with reference to every class of vehicles; from the \$900 pleasure carriage, down through the list of road wagons, carts and humbler conveyances. I venture to say, that if we could get at the extra cost of carriages, buggies, wagons, etc., with the wear and tear of harness, and the unnecessary consumption of horses and mules, we should be astonished at the huge amount in dollars and cents, that this fearful array of items would foot up; to say nothing of personal discomfort, and the wear and tear of patience, which cannot be reckoned in dollars and dimes, but which seriously detract from enjoyment.

Again, another heavy tax which we pay for bad roads is this, that we are compelled to keep a number of horses and pay an amount for their support which would not be necessary under a system of good roads. It is a fundamental maxim with eminent road makers, such as McAdam, Telford and Stephenson, that a good road should be perfectly level, or nearly so as the nature of the country will allow. Trustworthy experiments by these engineers have shown that when a road rises one foot in height for twenty of its length a horse can draw continuously only one-half the load that he can on a level; and, therefore, on such a road two horses will be needed to do the work of one. Now, take the common county and neighborhood roads in our State. How many of them can you find that have as good a grade as one in twenty? How very frequently do we find a grade of one in ten, or even as high as one in five? If a horse can pull only half his proper load, when the grade of the road rises one in twenty, of course when it rises one in ten he can draw but one-fourth of his proper load.—And it is an undeniable fact that many portions of our roads do have this injurious grade. What is the consequence? If the load of the horse is adapted to his power of drawing on the level road it follows that when he comes to a hill rising one in twenty, or still worse, of one in ten, his strength is over taxed, he becomes prematurely worn out, and there is a consumption of horse flesh which has to be resupplied with new horses; and new horses, in their last analysis, mean simply money. On the contrary, if the load of the horse is accommodated to what he can easily draw up a slope of one in twenty, or of one in ten, then he is underworked on the level portions of the road, and an excess of horses must be maintained to supply this inequality of work. I think it a moderate estimate to say that, taking all the farms in our State, at least one-fifth more horses are fed and maintained to do the hauling over bad roads than would

be required on a system of good roads. If this hypothesis be correct, then do we not pay a tax for the privilege of bad roads, equivalent to the expense of supporting one-fifth of the horses and mules in Georgia?

Another place where the tax for bad road comes in, is the loss of time. Here is a farmer who lives ten miles from Americus, or some other market town. He has a wagon and two good mules; he loads on two bales of cotton and starts for Americus.—With the ratty and boggy roads, steep hills and deep mud holes, you know it is a good day's work to get those two bales to Americus, and return in the day. We will suppose at a moderate estimate, that his wagon and team are worth \$2.50 per day. Now, suppose he had a firm, smooth, well graded road over which to drive his wagon, it would be just as easy for his team to carry four bales, as it is now to carry only two; in other words, he could then accomplish in one day, the same amount of hauling that now requires two days. His team, as I have said, being estimated at \$2 50 per day, and his being compelled to take two days to accomplish the work of one, is it not a logical inference, that in this case, the farmer pays a tax of \$2.50 a day, for the privilege of using bad roads? Now multiply this item by the number of farmers in the State of Georgia, who go through this identical process numberless times during the year, and what a fearful burden of taxation it piles up. If this tax came in a visible, tangible shape, or if it were collected by government officials, backed up by bayonets, what an amount of righteous indignation it would provoke! But it comes so noiselessly and quietly that our people bear it with the equanimity of Christian martyrs, and in deed seldom think of it as a tax at all.

At a certain town in Georgia, which annually ships from ten to twelve thousand bales of cotton, there was a few years ago a long, narrow causeway leading to a bridge, said bridge and causeway being wider than necessary for one vehicle, and yet not wide enough for two. Whenever, therefore, a vehicle fairly secured the entrance to the causeway, it was necessary for the other vehicles at the end of the bridge, no matter how many they were, to wait until the first vehicle had entirely passed over. On one occasion, I passed this causeway, and at the end of the bridge I counted eighteen vehicles—buggies with ladies and gentlemen, wagons loaded with cotton, carts with wood, etc. There they stood, on a wintry day, reminding one of "patience sitting on a monument smiling at grief," waiting, with Christian resignation, for a one-horse team to drag its slow length along the causeway and over the bridge. The owners of these vehicles never once dreamed that they were paying the heaviest sort of a tax for the privilege of riding over a causeway too narrow for two vehicles to go abreast; nor did they once imagine that the loss of time in buggies, wagons, carts, etc., with the vexation incident thereto, would have paid the cost of constructing a wider embankment, twice over, in one season. All this is altered now. To the credit of that town, be it said, a few enterprising citizens saw the heavy tax that they were paying, and resolved to pay it no longer; and now they have a broad embankment and a wide bridge, ample enough to cover any amount of travel.

ARE WE IN DANGER?—Governor Hampton seems to think so. Else; why his warning to his audience on the 22d ult. Why the extreme caution that characterizes his every word and action!

The elections in Sumter, in Georgetown, in Newberry, what do they indicate? How many negroes do you know who even profess to be Democrats? Do you suppose that the recently unearthed secret history of Elliott, and Nash, and Wright, and Sam Lee, will have any other effect upon the rising young negroes of the State, than to stir them up to follow these illustrious exemplars?

By what majority was Hampton elected, when there was no decent white man who dared to say aught against him? For stealing—ninety thousand; against stealing—ninety-one thousand. Two years ago, then, ninety thousand citizens of South Carolina came out openly and declared for thievery. With all the decent people united to a man; with all the enthusiasm developed by a struggle recognized as vital, we carried the State by one thousand majority, in a total vote of more than one hundred and eighty thousand.

If our people believe that they will win without special effort, if they believe that Republicanism has no life left in it, they are destined to experience a most grievous disappointment. Then too there is an undercurrent, the strength of which we cannot yet measure. But this we know, men who aspire to office will often risk the public weal, that they may advance themselves.—Some plausible argument can always be found by self-seeking demagogues, to justify bolting. Let us recognize the dangers of our position and set ourselves to work with energy and unanimity. Let us organize our clubs and prepare in time for an active campaign. We will not win if we underestimate the difficulties which are before us.—We will win if we determine to overcome them.—F. in Greenville News.