

The Orangeburg News.

FIRST OUR HOMES; THEN OUR STATE; FINALLY THE NATION; THESE CONSTITUTE OUR COUNTRY.

VOLUME 1.

SATURDAY MORNING, DECEMBER 7, 1867.

NUMBER 42.

THE ORANGEBURG NEWS.

PUBLISHED AT ORANGEBURG, S. C.
Every Saturday Morning.

SAUEL DIBBLE, Editor.
Y. C. DIBBLE, Associate Editor.
CHARLES H. HALL, Publisher.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.
One Copy for one year..... \$2.00
Six Months..... 1.00
Three Months..... .60
Any one sending TEN DOLLARS, for a Club of New Subscribers, will receive an EXTRA COPY FOR ONE YEAR, free of charge. Any one sending FIVE DOLLARS, for a Club of New Subscribers, will receive an EXTRA COPY FOR SIX MONTHS, free of charge.

RATES OF ADVERTISING.
Square 1st Insertion..... \$1.50
2d "..... .75
3d "..... .50
A Square consists of 10 lines Devier or one inch of Advertising space.

Administrators' Notices, if accompanied with the cash..... \$2 75
If not accompanied with the cash..... \$5 00
Contract Advertisements inserted upon the most liberal terms.

MARRIAGE and FUNERAL NOTICES, not exceeding one Square, inserted without charge.

Terms Cash in Advance.

CARDS.

IZLAR & DIBBLE,
Attorneys and Solicitors.

Will practice in Courts of the State, and also of the United States, especially in the Courts of

BANKRUPTCY,
ORANGEBURG, S. C.
IZLAR, SAMUEL DIBBLE, Jr.
Oct 28 1y

W. W. LEGARE,
Attorney at Law and Solicitor in Equity,
Office in Public Buildings,
COURT HOUSE SQUARE,
ORANGEBURG C. H., So. Ca.
Dec 7 1y

P. J. MALONE,
ATTORNEY AT LAW.
WALTERBORO, S. C.

Will practice in the Courts of Orangeburg and Colleton, and attend promptly to all business entrusted to his care.
May 11 1y

E. C. DENAUX,
WATCH MAKER AND JEWELLER,
Work Neatly Repaired and WARRANTED.

RUSSELL STREET,
(OPPOSITE CORNELSON, KRAMER & CO.)
Sept 28 1y

BULL & SCOVILLE,
AGENTS FOR THE
Equitable Life Insurance Company
OF NEW YORK,
POLICIES NON-FORFEITABLE,
Dividend Declared Annually to Policy Holders
Feb 23 1y

Cornelson, Kramer & Co.,
ARE AGENTS FOR
JEFFERSON FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Chartered Capital \$250,000.
If any Parties wish to patronize this COMPANY and only hesitate upon the too general and fallacious idea that Southern Companies are not as good as Northern or Foreign. We only ask such to do the simple justice of applying to our Agents, or direct to the Home Office, and they will receive indubitable evidence on this point. With funds invested in Best Stocks, Real Estate, and Good Securities, no Company can be more solvent, with ample means. None shall be more prompt.
Oct 25 1y

STEVENS HOUSE,
21, 23, 25 & 27 Broadway, N. Y.
Opposite Bowling Green.

ON THE EUROPEAN PLAN.
THE STEVENS HOUSE is well and widely known to the travelling public. The location is especially suitable to merchants and business men; it is close proximity to the business part of the city—is on the highway of Southern and Western travel—and adjacent to all the principal Railroad and Steamboat depots.

The STEVENS HOUSE has liberal accommodation for over 300 guests—it is well furnished, and possesses every modern improvement for the comfort of its inmates. The rooms are spacious and well ventilated—provided with gas and water—the tables are prompt and respectful—and the table is generously provided with every delicacy of the season—at moderate rates.

The rooms having been refurnished and remodelled, we are enabled to offer extra facilities for the comfort and pleasure of our guests.
GEO. K. CHASE & CO., Proprietors.
June 1—1y

POETRY.

The Prodigal.

Brother, hast thou wandered far
From thy father's happy home?
With thyself, and God at war?
Turn thee, brother, homeward come.
Hast thou wasted all the powers
God for noble uses gave?
Squandered life's most golden hours?
Turn thee, brother, God can save?
He can heal thy bitterest wound,
He thy greatest prayer can hear;
Seek him, for He will be found;
Call upon Him, He is near.

VARIOUS.

General Grant before the Impeachment Committee.

We publish below all the material portions of General Grant's testimony, given in July last, before the Impeachment Committee.

GENERAL GRANT'S TESTIMONY.

I have seen the President very frequently in reference to the condition of affairs in the rebel States. When I was asked to be at a Cabinet meeting, it was because some question was up in which, as General of the army, I was interested. I am not aware of any interview with the President on amnesty. I have occasionally recommended a person for amnesty. I thought myself at that time, that there was no reason why a person had risen to the rank of a General he should be excluded from amnesty any more than one who had failed to reach that rank. I spoke on that point. I did not see much reason for the \$20,000 clause. These are the only two points that I remember to have spoken of at the time. I afterward, however, told him that I thought he was much nearer right on the \$20,000 clause than I was. I was present when the proclamation was read in the Cabinet, but my views were not asked. I never gave any opinion to the President that would be published in any newspaper or in any publication of general amnesty.

Question. Did you ever give your opinion to the President that his proclamation interfered with the stipulations between yourself and General Lee?

Answer. No, sir; I frequently had to intercede for General Lee and other paroled officers, on the ground that their parole, so long as they obeyed the laws of the United States, protected them from arrest and trial. The President, at that time, occupied exactly the same ground, viz: That they should be tried and punished. He wanted to know when the time would come that they should be punished. I told him not so long as they obeyed the laws and complied with the stipulation. That was the ground I took.

Q. Did you not also insist that that applied as well to the common soldier?

A. Of course; it applied to every one who took the parole, but that matter was not canvassed except in case of some of the leaders. I claimed that in surrendering their armies and arms they had done what they could not, all of them, have been compelled to do, as a portion of them could have escaped, but they surrendered in consideration of the fact that they were to be exempt from trial so long as they conformed to the obligations they had taken; and they were entitled to that.

Q. You looked on that in the nature of a parole, and held that they could only be tried when they violated that parole?

A. Yes; that was the view I took of the question.

Q. That is your view still?

A. Yes, sir; unquestionably.

Q. You consider that the like terms were given by General Sherman to the armies which surrendered to him?

A. Yes, sir; and to all the armies that surrendered after that.

Q. And you held that so long as they kept their parole of honor, and obeyed the laws, they were not subject to be tried by courts?

A. That is my opinion. I will state here that I am not quite certain whether I am being tried, or who is being tried, by the question asked.

Q. Did you consider that that applied to Jeff. Davis?

A. No, sir; he did not take any parole.

Q. He did not surrender?

A. No, sir. It applied to no person who was captured; only to those who were paroled.

Q. Did the President insist that General Lee should be tried for treason?

A. He contended for it.

Q. And you claimed to him that the parole which General Lee had given would be violated in such a trial?

A. I did. I insisted on it that General Lee would not have surrendered his army and given up all their arms if he supposed that after surrendering he was going to be tried for treason and hanged. I thought we got a

very good equivalent for the lives of a few leaders in getting all their arms and getting themselves under control, bound by their oaths to obey the laws. That was the consideration which I insisted upon we had received.

Q. Did the President argue that question with you?

A. There was not much argument about it. It was merely assertion.

Q. After you had expressed your opinion about it did he coincide with you?

A. No, sir, not then. He afterward got to agreeing with me on that subject. I never claimed that the parole gave these prisoners any political right whatever. I thought that that was a matter entirely with Congress, over which I had no control; that, simply as General-in-Chief, commanding the army, I had a right to stipulate for the surrender on terms which protected their lives. That is all I claimed. The parole gave them protection and exemption from punishment for all offences not in violation of the rules of civilized warfare, so long as their parole was kept.

Q. Do you recollect at any time urging the President to go further in granting amnesty than he had gone in his proclamation?

A. Just as I said before, I could not see any reason why the fact of a volunteer rising to the rank of a general should exclude him any more than any other grades. With reference to the \$20,000 clause, I thought that a man's success in the world was no reason for his being excluded from amnesty, but I recollect afterwards saying to the President that I thought he was right in that particular and I was wrong.

Q. Did you not give your opinion at all that amnesty ought to be granted to these people in any extent?

A. I know that I was in favor of some proclamation of the sort, and perhaps I may have said so; it was necessary to do something to establish governments and civil law there; I wanted to see that done, but do not think I ever pretended to dictate what ought to be done.

Q. Did you not advise?

A. I don't think I did. I have given my opinion, perhaps, as to what has been done, but I do not think I advised any course myself, any more than that I was very anxious to see something done to restore civil governments in those States.

Q. Did you ever give your opinion at all to the President as to what should be done?

A. I do not think I did; after matters were done I was willing to express an opinion for or against particular clauses.

Q. Did you suggest anything?

A. No, sir.

By Mr. Woodbridge—Q. I understand your position to be this: That you did not assume to originate or inaugurate any policy, but that when any question came up, and your opinion was asked as to what the President was going to do or had done, you gave an opinion?

A. That is it exactly, and I presumed the whole Committee so understood me; I have always been attentive to my own duties, and tried not to interfere with other people's; I was always ready to originate matters pertaining to the army, but I never was willing to originate matters pertaining to civil government of the United States; when I was asked my opinion about what had been done I was willing to give it; I originated no plan, and suggested no plan for civil government; I only gave my views on measures after they had been originated; I simply expressed an anxiety that something should be done to give some sort of control down there; there were no governments there when the war was over, and I wanted to see some government established, and wanted to see it done quickly. I did not pretend to say how it should be done, or in what form.

I will state here that before Mr. Lincoln's assassination the question about issuing a proclamation of some sort and establishing some sort of civil government there, was up, and what was done then was continued after Mr. Johnson came into office.

Q. Did you give your opinion on that, after it was done?

A. I was present, I think, twice during Mr. Lincoln's administration, when a proclamation that had been prepared was read; after his assassination it continued right along, and I was there with Mr. Johnson.

Q. Tell us what conversation you had with the President on the subject, as far as you recollect.

A. I have said once or twice, as far as I can recollect, I disagreed with two clauses of the proclamation as to the plan of establishing provisional governments there; that was a question which I knew nothing about, and which I do not recollect having expressed an opinion about; the only opinion I recollect having expressed on that subject at all was to the Secretary of War; I thought there would be some difficulty in getting people down there to accept offices, but I found afterward they were ready enough to take them.

Q. Did you recommend certain generals of

the Confederate Army to the President for pardon who fell within exemptions?

A. Yes, sir, I recommended General Longstreet, I think, a year and a half ago, and although I cannot recollect the name of any body else, I think I recommended several others.

Q. Do you recollect recommending J. C. French, a graduate of West Point?

A. Yes, sir. He was a brigadier-general.

Q. What part did he take in the rebellion?

A. He was a graduate of West Point.

Q. Do you recollect recommending the pardon of George H. Stuart?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What part did he take in the Confederate service?

A. He was a general; he took no very conspicuous part.

Q. Was he a graduate of West Point?

A. I think so; but not a classmate of mine.

Q. Do you recollect Lloyd J. Dean "Beall"?

A. A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you sign an application or make a recommendation for his pardon?

A. I do not think the records will show that I recommended his pardon, but I am not sure; I know that he sent his application through me, with the request that I should send it to the President with some endorsement; my recollection is that I made some endorsement as to his general character, which was as high, up to the breaking out of the war, as any man's could be.

Q. Do you recollect P. D. Roddy, said to be a rebel Brigadier-General?

A. Yes, sir. I do not recollect what my endorsement was in Roddy's case, but I know that had I to do it over again, I would recommend his pardon very quickly, and I presume I did so. If he is not pardoned yet I would be very glad to sign a recommendation for him now.

Q. Do you recollect any other officers of the rebel army who were recommended for pardon by you?

A. No, sir, I cannot mention any. You have already gone over a bigger list than I thought I had recommended. I do not think I recommended Gen. Pickett for pardon. I recollect receiving letter after letter from him, and letters were sent to me time and again in his behalf. He was especially uneasy lest he should be tried by a military commission, on account of some men who were executed in North Carolina. I do not recollect ever having talked to the President about him.

Q. Do you know whether he has been pardoned yet?

A. I do not know. I was not in favor of his pardon, nor was I in favor of his being tried by a military commission. I think his great anxiety was to receive some assurance that he would not be taken up and imprisoned for offenses alleged against him as a commander in North Carolina. He wanted to be able to go to work and make a living. It is likely I may have recommended that he be given assurance that he would not be arrested and imprisoned. Do not think I signed a recommendation for his pardon. You have no right to ask what my opinion is now.

Q. Did you ever advise the pardon of Gen. Lee?

A. Yes, sir. General Lee forwarded his application for amnesty through me, and I forwarded it to the President as approved; I do not recollect having had any conversation with the President on that subject; I think it probable that I recommended the pardon of General Johnston immediately after the surrender of his army, on account of the address he delivered to it, which I considered in good tone and spirit; I recollect speaking of that, and saying that I should be glad if General Johnston received his pardon, on account of the manly manner in which he addressed his troops.

I have no recollection of any conversation with the President on the subject of general amnesty, or on the subject of amnesty at all; I have never recommended general amnesty, and never was in favor of it, until the time shall come when it is safe to give it.

Q. Did you give any opinion in favor of the North Carolina proposition?

A. I did not give any opinion against it; I was in favor of that or anything else that looked to civil government until Congress could meet and establish government there; I was perfectly willing to leave it to the civil department; I asked no person what I should do in my duties; I was willing to take all the responsibility, and did not want to give my views as to what the civil branch of the government should do.

By Mr. Thomas.—Q. You have stated your opinion as to the right and privileges of Gen. Lee and his soldiers; did you mean that to include any political rights?

A. I have explained that I did not. There was no difference of opinion on this point between President Johnson and me, but there was

as to whether the parole gave them any privileges or rights.

By Mr. Boutwell.—Q. How recently has the President expressed to you the opinion that Gen. Lee or others, who had the benefit of parole, should be tried and punished?

A. Not since about two years.

Q. Have you at any time heard the President make any remark in reference to the admission of members of Congress from the rebel States into either House?

A. I cannot say positively what I have heard him say on that subject. I have heard him say as much, perhaps, in his published speeches last summer as I ever heard him say at all upon that subject; I have heard him say, and I think I have heard him say twice in his speeches that if the North carried the elections by members, enough to give them, with the Southern members, a majority, why would they not be the Congress of the United States? I have heard him say that several times.

By Mr. Williams.—Q. When you say "the North" you mean the Democratic party of the North; or, in other words, the party favoring his policy?

A. I mean if the North carried enough members in favor of the admission of the South. I did not hear him say that he would recognize them as a Congress. I merely heard him ask the question, "Why would they not be the Congress?" I heard him say that, in one or two speeches; do not recollect where.

By Mr. Boutwell.—Q. Have you heard him make a remark kindred to that elsewhere?

A. Yes. I have heard him say that aside from his speeches, in conversation. Cannot say just when. It was probably about the same time.

Q. Have you heard him at any time make any remark or suggestion concerning the legality of Congress with the Southern members excluded?

A. He alluded to that subject frequently on his tour to Chicago and back last summer. His speeches were generally reported with considerable accuracy; cannot recollect what he said except in general terms, but I read his speeches at the time, and they were reported with considerable accuracy. I do not recollect having heard him say anything private on the subject specially. I never heard him allude to the Executive Department of the Government. I never heard him make any remark looking to the controversy between the Executive and Congress.

Q. Were you present when this North Carolina proclamation was read in Cabinet?

A. I would not be certain, but am of opinion that the first time I heard it read was in presence of the President and Secretary of War only.

Q. Did you assent to that plan?

A. I did not dissent from it; it was a civil matter, and although I was anxious to have something done, I did not intend to dictate a plan.

I know that immediately after the close of the rebellion there was a very fine feeling manifested in the South, and I thought we ought to take advantage of it as soon as possible, but since that, there has been an evident change there. I may have expressed my views to the President. I do not recollect particularly. I do not suppose that there were any persons engaged in that consultation who thought of what was being done at that time as lasting any longer than Congress met and either ratified that or established some other form of government. I know it never crossed my mind that what was being done was anything more than temporary. I understood this to be the view of the President and of everybody else. I did not know of any difference of opinion on the subject. He was very anxious to have Congress to ratify his views. Mr. Lincoln, prior to his assassination, had inaugurated a policy intended to restore these governments. I was present once, before his murder, when a plan was read. The plan adopted by Mr. Johnson was substantially the plan which had been inaugurated by Mr. Lincoln as the basis for his future action. I do not know that it was verbatim the same. I think the very paper which I heard read twice while Mr. Lincoln was President, was the one which was carried right through.

Q. What paper was that?

A. The North Carolina proclamation.

Q. You understood that Mr. Lincoln's plan was temporary, to be either confirmed or a new government set up by Congress?

A. Yes, and I understood Mr. Johnson's to be so, too; that was my impression; I never heard the President say the plan was to be temporary, but I was satisfied every body looked at it as simply temporary until Congress met.

Q. You stated that the North Carolina proclamation was a continuation of the project submitted by Mr. Lincoln. I wish to inquire of you whether you ever compared them, to ascertain whether they were the same or not?

A. No, sir, I never compared them; I took them to be the very same paper; they

were substantially the same, if not the very same.

THE PRESIDENT, GENERAL GRANT AND MARYLAND AFFAIRS.

On the 18th of July General Grant was recalled and examined in relation to Maryland affairs, as follows:

By Mr. Thomas.—Q. Did the President propose, at any time, to use the military power for the adjustment of the controversy in Baltimore, between the police commissioners appointed by Governor Swann and those who claimed authority independent of Governor Swann?

A. I understood that he wanted to use it, and I called his attention to the law on the subject, which changed his views and determination. I called his attention to the only circumstances in which the military forces of the United States can be called out to interfere in State matters. It was his intention to send troops there to enable Governor Swann, as he termed it, to enforce his decision in the case of those police commissioners.

Q. Did the President, on account of your opinion, change that purpose?

A. I made a communication to him on the subject, which led to the Attorney General giving an opinion as to the power to use the military forces of the United States to interfere in State affairs, and that led to a change of what was intended to be done. After this whole question was settled as to sending the military there, there were six companies of new troops organized in New York harbor, which belonged to regiments south of here, and I ordered them to their regiments, and to stop at Fort McHenry on their way down, in order to keep them there until after the election, with a view to have a force there in case there was a bloody riot.

Q. Do I understand you to say that the President changed his purpose in that respect before the difficulty had been adjusted in Baltimore?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did the President signify his wish concerning the army verbally?

A. Verbally and in writing.

Q. Were you sent for formally?

A. Yes, sir. I was sent for several times—twice, I think, while Governor Swann was there in consultation with the President. Finding that the President wanted to send the military to Baltimore, I objected to it.

Q. Are you distinct in your recollection as to when the President acquiesced in your views?

A. It was prior to the election, two or three days. When the matter was left entirely to me, I ordered those troops down to join their regiments, and to halt at Fort McHenry until after the election.

Q. Was it before or after the arrest of the commissioners appointed by Governor Swann that the President withdrew his request to you to use the army in that controversy?

A. I cannot state precisely as to that. It was before I ordered the troops from New York. What took place was in conversation, until I found that there was a determination to send troops there, and then I communicated, officially, to the Secretary of War, my objection, to using troops in that way. That called out the opinion of the Attorney-General, and it was then that what I proposed was withdrawn. I thought this was in writing, but do not find the paper.

Mr. Marshall.—The President seemed to think he had a right to send the army under the circumstances. After I sent my written communication, giving my views in reference to it, the President then left the subject entirely in my hands. I think that is in writing.

Mr. Eldridge.—That was a formal withdrawal of his first opinion?

A. Yes, sir. I think I was sent a copy of the Attorney-General's opinion as a sort of order in the matter, virtually leaving it to me.

Q. After that time you did have the management of it?

A. Yes, sir, I sent General Canby to Baltimore, and went there twice myself, and had troops stop there on their way to the South.

Q. It was entirely within your control?

A. Yes, sir.

By the Chairman.—Q. They were solely for the purpose of being used in the case of a riot?

A. Solely for that purpose.

By Mr. Marshall.—Merely as a police force?

A. Yes, sir.

FREDING' TURNS TO COWS.—"Young Dairyman" enquires if butter made from cows fed on turkeys will be unsaleable? Yes, but it is easily prevented. Take four ounces of saltpetre, dissolved in one quart of water, and put a small tablespoonfull in each pan before straining the milk, and you may feed turkeys in any quantity or manner, and no persons can detect the turkeys in the butter. I have tested this so thoroughly that I have not a doubt of its entire efficacy.—A Dowell (Vermont American).