

The Oregon Sentinel.

JACKSONVILLE, OREGON, SATURDAY, JANUARY 30, 1858.

NO. 3.

VOL. III.

Published every Saturday.

W. G. T. VAULT, Editor & Proprietor.

One Year, \$3 00; Six Months, \$2 00; Three Months, \$1 00.

Advertisements, One Square, 10 Cents; 20 Cents, 20 Cents; 30 Cents, 30 Cents; 40 Cents, 40 Cents; 50 Cents, 50 Cents; 60 Cents, 60 Cents; 70 Cents, 70 Cents; 80 Cents, 80 Cents; 90 Cents, 90 Cents; 1 00, 1 00.

Job Printing Office.

THE Proprietor, having a good variety of JOB TYPES on hand, is prepared to do all kinds of

PLAIN AND

ORNAMENTAL JOB PRINTING, ON THE SHORTEST NOTICE, and on the most REASONABLE TERMS; such as

Books, Pamphlets, Circulars, Handbills, Snowflakes, Concert Bills, Programmes, Ball Tickets, Bill Heads, Address Cards, Business Cards, &c., &c., &c.

Job work done in BRONZE, RED, BLUE OR BLACK INKS, to suit customers. Orders solicited.

Business Cards.

EL DORADO BILLIARD AND DRINKING SALOON, CORNER OF CALIFORNIA AND OREGON STREETS, JACKSONVILLE, O. T.

W. J. MATHEWS' BILLIARD SALOON, Opposite Eagle Hotel, KERRYVILLE, O. T. January 1, 1858.

DR. HODGES & TROMPSON, Physicians and Surgeons, OFFICE—Jacksonville Drug Store—Opposite Eagle Hotel.

H. J. LABATT, J. S. LABATT, SAN FRANCISCO. HARRISON & LABATT, LAW OFFICE, Corner of Montgomery and Commercial Streets, (Over Bank & Ball Bankers, San Francisco, Cal.)

H. J. LABATT, Commissioner for Louisiana and Texas.

S. M. SHELTON, J. M. TURNER, SHELTON & TURNER, ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW, Office on Fourth Street, adjoining the Jackson O. Depot, opposite Post Office, Yreka, Cal.

R. HAYDEN, Attorney and Counsellor at Law, WILL ATTEND TO BUSINESS in the Third Judicial District of Oregon.

W. G. T. VAULT, Attorney and Counsellor at Law, Notary Public for Jackson Co., Will practice in the Supreme and District Courts of the Territory.

D. B. BERNAN, ATTORNEY-AT-LAW, OFFICE—At the residence, Jackson, O. T.

THE PATENT TYPE AND ANTI-TYPES, See Labels to THE PATENT TYPE AND ANTI-TYPES, See Labels to

THE PATENT TYPE AND ANTI-TYPES, See Labels to

THE PATENT TYPE AND ANTI-TYPES, See Labels to

THE PATENT TYPE AND ANTI-TYPES, See Labels to

THE PATENT TYPE AND ANTI-TYPES, See Labels to

THE PATENT TYPE AND ANTI-TYPES, See Labels to

THE PATENT TYPE AND ANTI-TYPES, See Labels to

Home and Friends.

Oh, there's a power to make each hour
As sweet as heaven designed it;
Nor need we roam to bring it home,
Though few there be that find it;
We seek too high for things close by—
And lose what nature found us;
For life has here no charms so dear
As home and friends around us.

We oft destroy the present joy
For future hope, and praise them,
While flowers as sweet bloom at our feet,
If we'd but stoop to raise them!
For things as still as summer air,
When youth's bright spell hath bound us,
But soon we're taught that earth has nought
But home and friends around us.

The friends that speed in time of need,
When hope's last red is shaken,
To show you still, that come what will,
You are not quite forsaken;
Though all were night, if but the light
From friendship's altar crowned us,
'Twould prove the bliss of earth were this
Our home and friends around us.

The Little Shoe.

BY MARY NEAL.

I found it here—a worn out shoe,
All milled with time and wet with dew;
'Tis a little thing; ye would pass it by
With never a thought, or word, or sigh,
Yet it sits in my spirit's hidden well,
And in eloquent tones of the past doth tell.

It tells of a little, fairy child,
That bound my heart with magic wild,
Of bright blue eyes and golden hair,
That ever shed joy and sunlight clear—
Of a prattling voice, so sweet and clear,
And the tiny feet that were ever near.

It tells of a form that is cold and still—
Of a little mound upon yonder hill,
That is dearer far to a mother's heart
Than the classic "statue of Grecian art"
Ah! strangers may pass with a careless air,
Nor dream of the hopes that are buried there.

Ye cannot know of the little thing,
From memory's silent font can bring
The voice and form that were once so dear;
Yet there are hearts, were they only here,
That could feel with me when, all wet with dew,
I found it this morning, this little shoe.

[From the Democratic Standard.]

The Apportionment of Delegates.
Our attention has been called to a recent action of the Territorial Democratic Central Committee, which met at Salem for the purpose of fixing upon a day for the assembling of a Democratic Convention, at which are to be nominated such officers as will be required under a State organization. The duty also devolved upon this central committee to regulate the apportionment of the several counties, in regard to the number of Delegates each county is entitled to. These two matters were passed upon, and the Committee adjourned.

Since the adjournment, complaints have been made by no inconsiderable portion of the Democracy in every section of the Territory from which advice have reached, that great injustice is done them by the apportionment. A cursory glance over a scale of last, and other preceding year's contrast with that for the Convention held for the 15th March ensuing, will cause the uninitiated to wonder by what singular freak of community the peculiar rage visible has been produced. Inquired meditation will solve the curious problem.

Fortunately for us, who have not been long in Oregon, the records of the past are preserved, and are attainable all that may care to examine them. In again, there is a principle involved, deciding upon the questions which have provoked discussion among the Democrats of Oregon, and which still seem to threaten welfare if persisted in, that can be well understood by intelligent Democrats who have never set foot upon the soil of the Territory, as by him who has passed the lot portion of his life here. Democratic peoples are the same everywhere. They are immutable, fixed, eternal, pervading.

With these records before us, shall we have no hesitation in the course to pursue, nor will impartial men deem discussion of these vexed questions indelible. A lifetime passed in strict adherence to Democratic doctrine, some dozen years more devoted to active connection with Democratic assemblies, from primary organization onward to the highest domestic sphere, has rendered us quite competent to a duty we here essay.

Throwing aside for the present the causes to whatever of schism now prevail among our Democratic brethren in Oregon, we shall rest the argument strictly on a principle and universally recognized rules of the party elsewhere in the Union. And, it is in no spirit of vanity that we say, when we may be called to comment upon causes of this disruption, which exist local prejudices, our stand-point will enable us to reason more calmly and dispassionately than men of far superior ability might, who have been entangled with them. We came to Oregon some six months ago. We brought no prejudices with us, nor have we any impression of their baneful influence within our heart or mind during a residence here. Gentle men who are so much engaged in local politics here, should not be so ready as they are to show the political views

of the hospitality of the one was not exceeded by the other; it could not have been.

We listened to both intently, and believe that most of those we conversed with, sincerely believed their own course was the correct one to pursue. From all we could gather, there might be honest judgment warped on either side. We can see no real cause why the Democracy of Oregon should be divided, and will gladly hail the day when angry feelings shall be no more among them. But it is not to be expected that a large body of the Democracy, after having been trodden under foot, as it were, will rise up to do honor to their oppressors. It is a true apothegm, that power begets tyranny. Can it be urged that those who gained power here not long ago, have less faults than their fellow-men, and that they are infallible? Or, granting, for the sake of argument, that the proscribed merited the obloquy inflicted, is it not the noblest attribute of power which restrains the heavy hand of the master? Why, even in absolute governments, on great occasions, dark dungeon doors are thrown wide open, and political prisoners are permitted again to breathe the pure air of Heaven. But we have digressed.

It is a recognized usage in Democratic party government that no new system can be foisted upon its adherents, without first consulting the masses in reference to its propriety, nor are they bound in honor to submit to its regulations, until fair means be taken to secure public sentiment in support of the system proposed. The very name of Democracy signifies the liberality of its fundamental principles. It is a government of the people, with the creative power lodged only in the hands of the people. This power rises paramount to all representative dominion, and wherever in our country's brief history the representative has dared to usurp this high prerogative, like an enraged giant, the people have turned upon the recreant, and smote him unto political death. If this be the creed of our party in the loftiest ranks of government, is it not frivolous to assert that in its own domestic regulations even a modicum of tyranny or arbitrary power would be countenanced? If the representative of the party

is to be the obedient of a constituency, can a representative clothed simply with consultative powers, direct and control the body whom he is chosen to represent? Even in the older States, where a certain line of primary organization has been satisfactorily obtained in one, that same system cannot at the mere dictum and caprice of a Committee be engrafted upon another State, by which a before recognized, established system shall be superseded. The Democracy should first be made aware of the change proposed, and afterwards their representatives must sanction or reject it, agreeably to instructions.

This brings us to the action of the Central Committee recently convened at Salem. Let us see whether they acted in accordance with these prescribed party regulations.—Heretofore the apportionment in Oregon has been in accordance with her legislative representation, with specific provisions made for the sparsely populated counties.

This system seemed to have given general satisfaction. Then why change it for another which comes in the form of innovation; of which no mention was made in but few places that we can hear of; and which, we confess, seems more like a Punishing Angel than the Marmoset occasionally sent out, than any other similitude we can just now think of. In the administration of Justice, even the wretch guilty of the most heinous offence cannot be punished for his crime if there be no specific statute to meet his case. And shall the adherents to Democratic principles be less scrupulous than Justice? Evidently the basis of the present promulgated apportionment, as we have found in the desire to punish many Democrats who failed to support Hon. Jos. Lane in his canvass. These men erred in this step, we grant, to oblige the chastising Committee, but though we have searched the old files of all the papers in our office, truly we have yet to discover that this was specifically classed as an unpardonable political crime before they committed it. To be sure we find it condemned as such afterwards, by an incompetent, self-constituted, biased tribunal; but neither does that perhaps old fogey, Justice, allow transgressors to be punished, *ex post facto*. With criminals, or rather transgressors, in either of these cases, community has no alternative but to submit that they shall roam at large, subject merely to such censure as the moral tone of society may inflict. The people have no remedy beyond the enactment of statutes in time which shall govern the malefactor's next offence, if they can catch him at it.—Can the power be maintained to punish those proscribed either for an offence not specified, or by *ex post facto* provision, any more than in the other cases cited? Or can the dictum of the Committee coerce the great mass of the Democracy to withhold communion with those brethren, whether they prefer to do so or not?

It is a recognized usage in Democratic party government that no new system can be foisted upon its adherents, without first consulting the masses in reference to its propriety, nor are they bound in honor to submit to its regulations, until fair means be taken to secure public sentiment in support of the system proposed. The very name of Democracy signifies the liberality of its fundamental principles. It is a government of the people, with the creative power lodged only in the hands of the people. This power rises paramount to all representative dominion, and wherever in our country's brief history the representative has dared to usurp this high prerogative, like an enraged giant, the people have turned upon the recreant, and smote him unto political death. If this be the creed of our party in the loftiest ranks of government, is it not frivolous to assert that in its own domestic regulations even a modicum of tyranny or arbitrary power would be countenanced? If the representative of the party is to be the obedient of a constituency, can a representative clothed simply with consultative powers, direct and control the body whom he is chosen to represent? Even in the older States, where a certain line of primary organization has been satisfactorily obtained in one, that same system cannot at the mere dictum and caprice of a Committee be engrafted upon another State, by which a before recognized, established system shall be superseded. The Democracy should first be made aware of the change proposed, and afterwards their representatives must sanction or reject it, agreeably to instructions.

of the new style apportionment. A thought given in regard to the peculiar political tenets of the favored five counties, taken in contradistinction with the faith professed and dominant in the emancipated fourteen counties, might perhaps, better evidence the desire which agitated and rose paramount in the Committee's minds than any other exegesis we can offer. We append the apportionment of 1856 under the old system, and that of 1857, in accordance with the new system:

	1856	1857
Columbia,	1	1
Wasco,	1	1
Washington,	2	2
Multnomah,	4	4
Clackamas,	5	4
Yamhill,	4	4
Marion,	7	9
Linn,	6	10
Lane,	2	7
Umpqua,	6	2
Douglas,	4	4
Coos,	1	1
Curry,	1	1
Josephine,	2	4
Jackson,	4	8
Benton,	4	4
Polk,	4	6
Tillamook,	1	1
Clatsop,	1	1

Total, 61 74
Thus we see that in 1856, while the five large counties of Linn, Marion, Lane, Jackson and Polk had but 27 votes—or three and a half less than one-half the whole number of Delegates,—in 1857, under the new proposed system, these same counties have together 40 votes, or just three more than one-half of the body to be elected.

The Apportionment.

The Standard, under its new, and as we very fervently hope, abler and better management, has culled in opposition to the action of the Democratic Central Committee in the matter of the apportionment of delegates to the approaching State Convention.

As Mr. O'Meara, in the article to which we purpose this replication, has assumed his own latitude of argument, we may be permitted to follow precedent so far as may be necessary in reference to all of these vexed questions of usage.

As a public journalist and as a democrat, our mission is that of the promulgation and advocacy of democratic principles. The prosperity and success of the party are objects with us always above and beyond any selfish and personal considerations whatever; and however widely we may differ with many of our party friends in matters of policy and expediency, the time will never come when justly we shall be charged with the prostitution of our position as a public journalist to any purpose of personal gratification or vengeance at the expense of our political principles, or the sacrifice of the interests and harmony of the party.—That which our reason and judgment declares to be right, we shall advocate with what of honest earnestness and ability we may command, and the wrong, whenever and wherever it may arise, we shall as earnestly and promptly condemn and repudiate. The usages and customs of the party command our approbation and support for no other reason than that they are not only necessary but indispensable to the maintenance of our principles and the protection of the party from fraud and imposition, and this consideration is common with us all, and equally entitled to the entertainment of others as of ourself. That which menaces and impinges upon the rights and liberties of the humblest member of the party, menaces and affects the rights and principles of us all, and while we should never either advocate or defend any measure of encroachment upon the rights of others as members of the party, we should take good care to resist and oppose any scheme looking to the gratification of the whims and caprices of the factious and interested few at the expense of the many. We support as well in action as in theory the usages and customs of the party, because they are reasonable and rightly necessary for the self-preservation of the party, and from no other motive. As a partisan, we are amenable to the public judgment for our actions—if we wantonly and unjustifiably violate the rules and observances of the party, no resolves can or should avail us to avoid the rightful consequences of our own action. If one of the consequences of such a violation of usage and duty, be a temporary deprivation of certain partisan rights, it is the judgment of the people, the majority, and imposed not for "punishment," but for the protection of the many from the impositions of the few, and in this light alone is such action justifiable. These rights accrue from the observance of the moral obligations imposed upon us as partisans, and the power and action which confer them has the right to suspend or refuse them. It is therefore clear that at once the right and duty of the party as such is to protect itself from every wrong menacing and endangering the integrity and harmony of its organization, and it is also clear that this protection is to be effected by the observance of the

of every true democrat at heart sincerely solicitous for the prosperity and success of the principles of the democratic party. Individually, we are firmly of the opinion that we can best contribute to the success and triumph of the democratic party by the advocacy and observance of all honorable and rightful measures and policy tending to the dissemination and practice of the principles of the democratic party, and this course we shall steadfastly pursue, relying upon the intelligence and sound judgment of the people for their approbation and endorsement. We desire the cordial union and harmony of the party, believing it to be essential to our success, and if it is to be obtained without a sacrifice of principle, the establishment of baleful and pernicious precedents and manifest injustice to the tried and the true, no one will go further or more cheerfully in the line of concession to accomplish the noble and patriotic purpose than ourself.

The Standard, in assailing this apportionment says, that it was the duty of the committee to fix upon a day for the assembling of the convention, and adds: "The duty also devolved upon this Central Committee to regulate the apportionment of the several counties, in regard to the number of Delegates each county is entitled to."

If it is conceded here as it evidently is if there is any meaning in language, that the duty devolved upon the committee to "regulate" the apportionment, then the only question in issue is whether the committee in adjusting the apportionment have established a basis in accordance with fairness, equality and justice. If the apportionment is unfair and unjust, it is properly a subject for the remedial agency of the convention when assembled. The Central Committee possesses no power not delegated to them by the convention, and the limited powers they do possess are subject in all cases to the supervision and control of the convention. If, therefore, any county is wronged by this apportionment, their proper recourse is upon the convention. To suppose that the members of the convention when assembled, will not do that which is just and right in the premises is irrational and silly, not to say meanly dishonest. We trust that in the discussion of this question, all intimations of dissension may be studiously avoided. Malicious and unfounded aspersions cast upon the motives the committee we place in the same category.

In every State in the Union without, as we are quite confident, a single exception, the rule is to apportion the delegation to a State convention according to the democratic vote of the counties. The purpose of such a convention is to ascertain the will of the majority of the party; and this can only be effected by delegate apportionments in conformity with the numerical strength of the party in the several counties. This is the rule, and it is founded upon principles of strict justice and supported by reason and common sense. It is morally impossible that the rule can in any case work injustice to any portion of the party; and while the doctrine that the will of the majority must prevail is respected, this basis of apportionment will be maintained and adhered to under all circumstances.

Nominations are binding upon the party because they are the nominations of the majority, and because we hold to the doctrine that the minority are under moral obligations to acquiescence in the will of the majority. Are not these positions undeniable? But let us look at the reverse proposition. It is claimed that the committee should have adhered to the old legislative apportionment. That apportionment was made in the year 1854 by the legislature for purely and exclusively legislative purposes, and made upon the basis of population at that time. The country had far outgrown that, and the constitutional convention for this reason, and because it had become unequal and unjust, changed it, so pronouncedly improper and unfit for the purpose for which it was originally adopted, the precious fossil is now paraded for our "cloud and pillar" to guide to a just and equitable basis of democratic apportionment! The idea is a fancy one, but we confess we have no fancy for it, and desire none. The question of the whole population in the several counties has nothing on earth to do with any rational view of the subject under consideration. Suppose that Multnomah county had a population of twenty-five thousand, of voters, five thousand, and that Clackamas had the same, both holding a representative delegation of five members each; and suppose that of the five thousand voters in Multnomah, four thousand were black-republicans, while in Clackamas there should be four thousand democrats to one thousand republicans—then, according to the system urged, in a democratic State convention the four thousand democrats from Multnomah would have five votes in the convention while the four thousand democrats of Clackamas would have no vote, and thus the four thousand democrats would offset four thousand and, virtually "disfranchising" and "silencing" three thousand democrats of Clackamas.

It should fall upon the black-republicans and those who vote that ticket, rather than upon democrats who show their faith of their works.

The former basis, if it may be dignified by that name, was established in the first instance by the chairman of the Central Committee without any expression of opinion from the remaining members of the Committee, and was universally acquiesced in because then the search for that kind of capital was not quite so keen as unfortunately it happens to be now. What then was right and proper for the Central Committee to do, is right and proper in them at this day to regulate and adjust. If it did not require the action of the assembled convention to establish that most unjust and inequitable basis of apportionment, why require such interference now to do that we all know and admit to be fair, equitable and just. We are told that the Committee have transcended their powers; that they should have awaited and submitted the movement to the action of the convention when in session. Why so? If it is right that the delegation to a democratic convention should be in proportion to the party strength in the respective counties, what matter is it who first declares it? The right, come how or from what quarter it may, is always welcome to the heart at the honest and right-thinking mind.

If it is admitted, as surely it must be, that the delegate representation should be in proportion to the party strength in the several counties, how is this strength to be ascertained? Certainly by reference to the returns of the previous election. If you are asked the question, "How many democrats have you in your county?" do you answer any how else than from your memory of the result of the election? It is not the fault of the Central Committee that a particular county has not of record as many democratic votes as it should have, and this is sometimes an evil more to be attributed to a fast-finding disposition than to the zealous and earnest advocacy of democratic principles.

We therefore maintain that the action of the committee in this matter was in all respects right and proper, and we predict now that in less than a single year, the wisdom and expediency of the action will not be questioned.

Rather than persist in being inferably tedious, we shall rest here, and recur to this subject again.

HISTORY OF BILLIARDS.—The origin of this game, according to a little book lately published by the Appletons, like the birth place of Homer, is a contested point—and its antiquity, like that of many elderly spinners, is involved in considerable doubt. Some suppose it to have been imported into Rome from Persia, under the consulate Lucullus, while others hold that Caligula introduced it from the East. The records are unauthentic, until the return of the Templars from the first Crusade. It soon became the favorite amusement and means of escape to which the cloistered monks of the day were permitted to have recourse. The game fell with the Knights Templars, and was revived by Louis XI., of France, who preferred it to the bloody tournaments then in vogue. Henry III. still more widely patronized it; and we find that Mary Queen of Scots, in a letter written the evening before her execution, complains that her "billiard table has just been taken away from her, as a preliminary step to her punishment."

It became a favorite game with the ladies in France and Germany. Madame de Stael was an enthusiastic advocate of billiards.—Even when exiled in Switzerland by Napoleon, she oversteered the time limited for her departure from Paris, in order that she might personally superintend the removal of a billiard table. The Duchess de Bern was also noted for her fondness for the game. Mr. Phelan says that "the Frenchman is the most brilliant of the English the most careful, the Americans the most successful, and therefore if that may be any argument—as it is commonly admitted to be the most conclusive—the very best of billiard players."

"Mr. Peech, how is it you have never called on me for your account?"
"Oh," said Mr. Peech, "I never ask a gentleman for money."

"Indeed; then how do you get on if he don't pay?"
"Why," replied Peech, "after a certain time I conclude he is not a gentleman and then I ask him."

"We have no sympathy for a rained railway speculator. None for an ill-tempered man with the toothache. None for an alderman with the gout. None for a dandy splashed by a mud cart."

In the choice of a lover, a woman should be chosen for her virtues, and not for her wealth.

The best of us are not what we seem to be. We are all of us a little bit of a fool, and a little bit of a knave. We are all of us a little bit of a hypocrite, and a little bit of a liar. We are all of us a little bit of a sinner, and a little bit of a saint. We are all of us a little bit of a man, and a little bit of a woman. We are all of us a little bit of a creature, and a little bit of a god.