

TERMS—The Argus will be furnished at Three Dollars and Fifty Cents per annum, in advance, to single subscribers. Three Dollars each to clubs of ten at one office—in advance. When the money is not paid in advance, Four Dollars will be charged if paid within six months, and Five dollars at the end of the year. Ten Dollars for six months—No subscription received for a less period.
AD—No paper discontinued until all arrearages are paid, unless at the option of the publisher.

The Oregon Argus.

—A Weekly Newspaper, devoted to the Principles of Jeffersonian Democracy, and advocating the side of Truth in every issue.—

VOL. III. OREGON CITY, OREGON, JANUARY 30, 1858. No. 42.

ADVERTISING RATES.
One square (12 lines or less) one insertion, \$2.00
Two insertions, 3.00
Three insertions, 4.00
Each subsequent insertion, 1.00
Reasonable deductions to those who advertise by the year.

JOB PRINTING.
THE PROPRIETOR OF THE ARGUS IS HAPPY TO inform the public that he has just received a large stock of JOB TYPE and other new printing material, and will be in the speedy receipt of additional material to all the requirements of the locality. HANDBILLS, POSTERS, BLANKS, CARDS, CIRCULARS, PAMPHLET WORK and other kinds, done to order, on short notice.

Great Excitement in Kansas!
INDIGNATION MASS MEETING—JIM LANE'S SPEECH.

At a Mass Meeting irrespective of party held at Leavenworth, Dec. 14th, Gen. Jim Lane addressed the meeting as follows:
“**FELLOW CITIZENS**—I feel very happy for the opportunity of addressing the people of Leavenworth. I never seek the opportunity of speaking, but am always ready to lend my voice where the good of Kansas is the object. Gentlemen, we have come to the last move on the chess board of Kansas politics. It is the last move and the greatest move on this great political board. Gentlemen, this last act of the proslavery party is consistent with all their former acts, only this is the last and altogether the most desperate. It stirs up all our blood, and we hardly know what to do in this trying time. I have stood here on Kansas soil, and seen a fraudulent Legislature forced upon by a neighboring State. I have seen invasion come pouring in upon us. I have seen crimes of every shape committed upon the settlers of Kansas, but this last act crowns them all in villainy and fraud; and I speak here in Leavenworth responsible for all that I may say. That these villains who have committed this last great fraud have forfeited their lives to an injured people; that crime is so heinous that these outlaws have lost their claims upon the American people; that constitution heaped upon us is awful, disgraceful and damnable in all its forms. I cannot express my contempt for it in language half severe enough, when I think of the consequences it may bring about. The question tonight is not whether Kansas shall be a slave State. It is a slave State now. It is a slave State by the body of their constitution. Even the youngest slave in this Territory will remain a slave as long as he or she may live. But it gives you the liberty to say by your vote whether there shall be more slaves in Kansas. Thus Kansas is a slave State to-day and forever, unless you contrive some means to defeat the constitution made by these blood hounds at Leecompton. Your fathers called upon you to rise, and preserve the name of liberty which they gave to you; and if you vote for that constitution at all, you vote for a slave constitution, for it is written all over with slavery. I say here to-night that these men who made this constitution a blacker set you cannot find out of hell. You may commence at John Calhoun and go down to Bat Jones, the hero of Oxford, and blacker villains cannot be found.— Truth, they know not what it means.— Honesty they don't know has an existence. I say to you as Americans, as county men and friends, you will be discharging a holy duty to yourselves and to the country which you love and adore, even if you are compelled to crush out the authors of that constitution. I say the President of that convention, John Calhoun, who is covered all over with crime—upon whose tombstone should be written (if he should ever die) “felon! felon!”—is the dictator of Stephen A. Douglas. I don't wish to say that Douglas will favor this constitution; but if Calhoun should say so—although I never would believe him in any thing else—I should be constrained to believe him in this; for I don't know which I would trust first, Calhoun or Douglas. These men who framed this constitution have separated themselves from all honesty and from all honor which existed in that party. There are honest and true pro-slavery men, who left that party in disgust when they saw the poisonous fruits of that Convention. Calhoun and his party number to-day less than two hundred men. Men, did I say? No, fiends. We have villains in that party who understand how to make up election returns; and is not Calhoun able to send in more atrocious frauds than was even perpetrated in the last election? I told a member of that Convention last night that we will head or bow. I am not going to advise war or bloodshed here to-night, for perhaps there is no need of that. We have now got the goats so separated from the sheep that we can easily kill them without committing crime; for I truly believe if God should show his special providence to-night we should see in these stary heavens his hand commanding us to exterminate these damned villains. The whole people of the civilized world would loudly applaud us, while the women of Kansas utter praises to heaven that their virtue is again safe. They went to Leecompton, and played cards, drank whiskey and made this damned constitution. Why the very grocery keepers at Leecompton have got rich by these devils, and are now going down to Lawrence and investing their money in city lots. I do not wish to advise you what to do; but ere long we will have a mass convention here in Leavenworth city or Lawrence, of all the people of Kansas. We will have Union democrats, national democrats, conservative pro-slavery men, and all who are opposed to this last trick played

by these d—d outlaws. There are men who wish to trust this to Congress, or wish to head off the constitution in some other peaceable way. But to my own feelings nothing is too bad for these d—d sons of b—s. I know Governor Walker himself will do all in his power to see that Congress will reject this constitution. He will act in any course the people of Kansas will adopt to defeat this heinous scheme; and, mind you, these black hearted villains will not have the United States troops to guard and protect them.
Now if the people of Kansas choose, and if we only had the feelings our fathers had in their perilous times, and could have the same noble spirit which actuated them—I say we could raise such a storm and feeling of indignation as would drive these d—d villains from Kansas long before the 21st of December, and their constitution would be laid away. If I had my say about it, I would say to Jack Henderson, Estlin and Calhoun, and every other d—d villain of them, leave Kansas now and forever. For I cannot live on the same soil with these black hearted fiends. I would drive them from this place to night and brand them with red hot iron upon their forehead, villain, villain; so they would have a deep disgrace wherever they might go. Oh, my heart revolts when I think of their acts in days gone by. They have used this language to us and carried it into effect, and now we will see what effect it will have at the other hand of the horn. Gentlemen, it was bad enough when they robbed us and plundered our property, when they drove women and children down the river, when they killed our friends and relatives; but now, when we have elected our Legislature, our Delegate to Congress, and the people by their votes decided Kansas should be free, to have a few d—d rascals try to stuff their peculiar institution down our throats, then I say it is time to arise and do something for ourselves, and show to these recreants of humanity that Kansas shall not be free. Gentlemen, I do not believe the people of Kansas will gratify this party so much as to keep away from the polls.— They will be there every man of them—they will go to the polls and vote every man who attempts to vote. If I had my way, though, I would send Jack Henderson and the rest of these scoundrels where they would never breathe the pure air again. (Here Henderson, being present, said, “Oh, Jim, dry up Jim.” “Stop that, Lane.”) Lane proceeded. Ah, Jack, you have gone far enough, you have trampled on us too much already, and now we have got you fast and mean to hold you, and your lives are in danger every moment you remain in this city. You are outlaws and villains, every one of you. (Here he was interrupted by some of the company attempting to put Henderson out, but quiet was soon restored and Lane went on.) A high official and an honest man said to me to-day “he should not be surprised if on any morning he should wake up and see these men dangling from some limb, hung there by an outraged people.” I then asked him if the United States troops would be used to protect these men. He replied, “No, the troops will not be used to protect these villains or their acts.” Why, think you that man, Calhoun, will remain at Leecompton much longer? Why, they are sick of him even there, and if he stays there much longer I would not insure his life. These men who formed this constitution were the men who committed these outrages summer before last. They deserve death for those acts, and they deserve a thousand deaths for framing this constitution. If your Convention, which is to meet soon, decides upon going to the polls, go there and see that no one votes who is not an honest voter. Guard against the returns which will be sent in to Calhoun. Mind they are not similar to the Kickapoo, McGee and Oxford returns, and with a fair vote they will not get two hundred votes, and I will forfeit my hat if they get a single vote south of Kansas river. We owe it to ourselves and to our ancestors that we should drive these villains to the wall, and, for myself, I should think it was a duty I owe to myself and to my God, if I forced every man of them to leave the Territory before the election, and so brand them that they may never deceive any other people on the civilized globe. You may say, “Lane, you are excited.” I say, ought we not to be excited? Have we not suffered enough to excite every nerve in our body? Have we not labored three years to build up Kansas a free and glorious State for ourselves and children to come after we have it within our reach, to have these usurpers by fraud and violence to institute a villainous project, ruining our best interests. Should we not feel like taking these villains by the throats and choke the very life from them? I feel so, I cannot help it. Do the best you can—put their vote down as small as you can, and yet we may be defeated. For myself,

I see no way of getting rid of that constitution but force. Yes, apply force to these usurpers, and only to the men who by their votes heaped this knavery upon us. You, who voted against the constitution, I am ready to respect; but the others ought to be put to death. If there is any peaceful remedy to overthrow this constitution there is no man in the Territory more ready to adopt it than your humble speaker. But I still believe there is no other safe way than by force. Take these men and give them a fair trial, but if you should find them guilty of perpetrating this fraud they should suffer death. Jack Henderson and Estlin grumble because I would put them to death. Why, there is not a moment for the past two years but what they would gladly have heralded in their papers “Jim Lane is dead.” Look over the list of men who voted for that constitution (and I have it here in my pocket), and you will find every man of them murderers, thieves and villains. Calhoun, although he has lain behind the curtain, is perhaps more guilty than any man in Kansas, not excepting Jack Henderson. Judge Johnson's opinion is to let them go, and live, and decrease the vote as small as possible, and let the finger of scorn point to them always. I would let Jack Henderson and Estlin live always, if it was not necessary to put them to death; but it is for the peace and prosperity of Kansas to kill them. I say cut their throats now—and I will not advise others to do what I will not do myself, and I will not ask to stay away, but will gladly join in the act. The time has come for action, and I have always believed that we should never have peace in Kansas until these hellhounds were driven from our midst. I have only one objection to killing them, and that is they are not fit to die. Wouldn't Jack Henderson be a pretty subject to be sent off for trial before a just and high tribunal? I say he is the best man among them, and I moreover say he and the rest of them are a set of outlaws to the human family, and I say get rid of them before the election. They have done enough. Drive them out, and while you are doing it here in Leavenworth we will take care of the rest of them. Men of Leavenworth, if I have said anything here to wound the feelings of any man here, save these devils, I would ask your pardon. As for these outlaws, I don't care a fig about them. If Jack Henderson, Calhoun or Estlin should cross my path I would shoot them down like a damned dog, for they are not men, but cold black hearted outlaws. Others will now speak to you, but will differ in my views. I thank you, and hope you will listen to them as to me.”

That would be as fair an election as some of the enemies of Napoleon attributed to him when he was elected First Consul. He is said to have called out his troops and had them reviewed by his officers with a speech, patriotic and fair in its professions, in which he said to them:—“Now, my soldiers, you are going to the election and vote freely just as you please. If you vote for Napoleon, all is well; if you vote against him, and you are to be instantly shot.” That was a fair election. [Laughter.] This election is to be equally fair. All men in favor of the constitution may vote for it—all men against it shall not vote at all. Why not let them vote against it? I presume you have asked many a man this question. I have asked a very large number of the gentlemen who framed the constitution, quite a number of delegates, and a still larger number of persons who are their friends, and I have received the same answer from every one of them. I never received any other answer, and I presume we never shall get any other answer. What is that? They say if they allowed a negative vote, the constitution would have been voted down by an overwhelming majority, and hence the fellows shall not be allowed to vote at all.—[Laughter.]

HOW THE CONSTITUTION WOULD HAVE BEEN VOTED DOWN IF SUBMITTED.
Mr. President, that may be true. It is no part of my purpose to deny the proposition that that constitution would have been voted down if submitted to the people. I believe it would have been voted down by a majority of four to one. I am informed by men well posted there—Democrats—that it would be voted down by ten to one; some say by twenty to one.
But is it a good reason why you should declare it in force, without being submitted to the people, merely because it would have been voted down by five to one if you had submitted it? What does that prove?—Does it not show undeniably that an overwhelming majority of the people of Kansas are unalterably opposed to that constitution? Will you force it on them against their will simply because they would have voted it down if you had consulted them? If you will, are you going to force it upon them under the plea of leaving them perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way? Is that the mode in which I am called upon to carry out the principle of self-government and popular sovereignty in the Territories—to force a constitution on the people against their will, in opposition to their protest, with a knowledge of the fact, and then to assign as a reason for my tyranny, that they would be so obstinate and so perverse as to vote down the constitution if I had given them an opportunity to be consulted about it?

NO RIGHT TO INQUIRE WHAT THE PEOPLE'S OBJECTIONS ARE.
Sir, I deny your right or mine to inquire of these people what their objections to that constitution are. They have a right to judge for themselves whether they like or dislike it. It is no answer to tell me that the constitution is a good one and unobjectionable. It is not satisfactory to me to have the President say in his message that that constitution is an admirable one, like all the constitutions of the new States that have been recently formed. Whether good or bad, whether objectionable or not, is none of my business and none of yours.—It is their business and not ours. I care not what they have in their constitution, so that it suits them and does not violate the Constitution of the United States and the fundamental principles of liberty upon which our institutions rest. I am not going to argue the question whether the banking system established in that constitution is wise or unwise. It says there shall be no monopolies, but there shall be one bank of discount in the State, with two branches. All I have to say on that point is, if they want a banking system, let them have it; if they do not want it, let them prohibit it. If they want a bank with two branches, be it so; if they want twenty, it is none of my business; and it matters not to me whether one of them shall be on the north side and the other on the south side of the Kaw river, or where they shall be. While I have no right to expect to be consulted on that point, I do hold that the people of Kansas have the right to be consulted and to decide it, and you have no rightful authority to deprive them of that privilege. It is no justification, in my mind, to say that the provisions for the eligibility for the offices of Governor and Lieutenant Governor require twenty years' citizenship in the United States. If men think that no person should vote or hold office until he has been here twenty years, they have a right to think so; and if a majority of the people of Kansas think that no man of foreign birth should vote or hold office unless he has lived here twenty years, it is their right to say so, and I have no right to interfere with them; it is their business, not mine; but if I lived there I should not be willing to have that provision in the constitution without being heard upon the subject, and allowed to record my protest against it.

I have nothing to say about their system of taxation, in which they have gone back and resorted to the old exploded system that we tried in Illinois, but abandoned because we did not like it. If they wish to try it and get tired of it and abandon it, be it so; but if I were a citizen of Kansas I would profit by the experience of Illinois

on the subject, and defeat it if I could.— Yet I have no objection to their having it if they want it; it is their business, not mine.
So it is in regard to the free negroes.— They provide that no free negro shall be permitted to live in Kansas. I suppose they have a right to say so if they choose; but if I lived there I should want to vote on that question. We, in Illinois, provide that no more shall come there. We say to the free States, “Take care of your own free negroes, and we will take care of ours.” But we do not say that the negroes now there shall not be permitted to live in Illinois; and I think the people of Kansas ought to have the right to say whether they will allow them to live there, and if they are not going to do so, how they are going to dispose of them.
So you may go on with all the different clauses of the constitution. They may be all right; they may be all wrong. That is a question on which my opinion is worth nothing. The opinion of the wise and patriotic Chief Magistrate of the United States is not worth anything as against that of the people of Kansas, for they have a right to judge for themselves; and neither Presidents, nor Senators, nor House of Representatives, nor any other power outside of Kansas, has a right to judge for them. Hence it is no justification, in my mind, for the violation of a great principle of self-government, to say that the constitution you are forcing on them is not particularly objectionable, or is excellent in its provisions.
Perhaps, sir, the same thing might be said of the celebrated Topeka constitution. I do not recollect its peculiar provisions.— I know one thing; we Democrats, we Nebraska men, would not even look into it to see what its provisions were. Why? Because we said it was made by a political party, and not by the people; that it was made in defiance of the authority of Congress; that it was as pure as the Bible, as holy as the ten commandments, yet we would not touch it until it was submitted to and ratified by the people of Kansas, in pursuance of the forms of law. Perhaps that Topeka constitution, but for the mode of making it, would have been unexceptionable. I do not know; I do not care. You have no right to force an unexceptionable constitution on a people. It does not mitigate the evil, it does not diminish the insult, it does not ameliorate the wrong, that you are forcing a good thing on them. I am not willing to be forced to do that which I would do if I were left free to judge and act for myself. Hence I assert that there is no justification to be made for this flagrant violation of popular rights in Kansas, on the plea that the constitution which they have made is not particularly objectionable.

THE MAJORITY DISFRANCHISED.
But, sir, the President of the United States is really and sincerely of the opinion that the slavery clause has been fairly and impartially submitted to the free acceptance or rejection of the people of Kansas, and that, inasmuch as that was the exciting and paramount question, if they get the right to vote as they please on that subject, they ought to be satisfied; and subject it might be better if we would accept it, and put an end to the question. Let me ask, sir, is the slavery clause fairly submitted, so that the people can vote for or against it? Suppose I were a citizen of Kansas, and should go up to the polls and say, “I desire to vote to make Kansas a slave State; here is my ballot.” They reply to me, “Mr. Douglas, just vote for that constitution first, if you please.”—“Oh, no!” I answer; “I cannot vote for that constitution conscientiously. I am opposed to the clause by which you locate certain railroads in such a way as to sacrifice my county and my part of the State. I am opposed to that banking system. I am opposed to this Know Nothing or American clause in the constitution about the qualification for office. I cannot vote for it.” Then they answer, “You shall not vote on making it a slave State.” I then say, “I want to make it a free State.”— They reply, “Vote for that constitution first, and then you can vote to make it a free State; otherwise you cannot.” Thus they disfranchise every free State man who will not first vote for the constitution; they disfranchise every slave State man who will not first vote for the constitution. No matter whether or not the voters state that they cannot conscientiously vote for those provisions, they reply, “You cannot vote for or against slavery here. Take the constitution as we have made it, take the elective franchise as we have established it, take the banking system as we have located it, take the judiciary system as we have formed it, take it all as we have fixed it to suit ourselves, and ask no questions, but vote for it, or you shall not vote either for a slave or free State.” In other words, the legal effect of the schedule is this: all those who are in favor of this constitution may vote for or against slavery, as they please; but all those who are against this constitution are disfranchised, and shall not vote at all. That is the mode in which the slavery proposition is submitted. Every man opposed to the constitution is disfranchised on the slavery clause. How many are they? They tell you there is a majority, for they say the constitution will be voted down instantly, by an overwhelming majority, if you allow a negative vote. This shows that a majority are against it. They disfranchise and disfranchise every man who is against it, thus referring the slavery clause to a minority of the people of Kansas, and leaving that minority free to vote for or against the slavery clause, as they choose.

Let me ask you if that is a fair mode of submitting the slavery clause? Does that mode of submitting that particular clause leave the people perfectly free to vote for or against slavery as they choose? Am I free to vote as I choose on the slavery

question, if you tell me I shall not vote on it until I vote for the Maine liquor law?— Am I free to vote on the slavery question, if you tell me that I shall not vote either way until I vote for a bank?— Is it freedom of election to make your right to vote upon one question depend upon the mode in which you are going to vote on some other question which has no connection with it? Is that freedom of election? Is that the great fundamental principle of self-government, for which we combined and struggled, in this body and throughout the country, to establish the rule of action in all time to come?

The Leecompton Swindle.
As our readers would no doubt like to see how some of the democratic papers in the States regard Buchanan's plan for subjugating Kansas we publish this week a few extracts:
From Forney's Press.
When we supported the Kansas-Nebraska bill in 1854, we did so upon the solemn understanding that “the will of the majority should prevail in Kansas.” The repeal of the Missouri Compromise (which asserted Congressional rule) excited the fanaticism of the free States to madness, and the idea which called for that repeal, that the people should control in Kansas and Nebraska, was scouted and denied. In the whole history of American legislation, no measure was more distinctly based upon this indefensible principle, than the Kansas-Nebraska bill. And yet, notwithstanding that the will of the majority was declared to be the main purpose of this Kansas and Nebraska bill, and the removal of the whole question of slavery from the halls of Congress a leading essential to its enactment into a law, the northern fanatics arrayed against it a most formidable antagonism, and, from 1854 to 1856, the Democracy in the free States were defeated upon nearly every trial. When Mr. Buchanan was elected, however, the Administration of Gen. Pierce having made every honorable effort to adjust the difficulty in Kansas without success, the Democracy rallied anew upon the principle that the majority should rule, and with the advantage of a name illustrious in our annals, the name of one, who, while always true to the South, had not been a party to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise line, and was known to be in favor of fair play in Kansas—the Democracy triumphed after a close and fearful conflict. The first election in the Territory of Kansas took place on the 5th of October, 1857. These which preceded it, though legal according to the forms, were controlled by the minority in the Territory, but were submitted to, inasmuch as no other alternative was left to those who objected to them. It is a remarkable fact, that immediately after this election of October 5th, 1857, the Kansas Constitutional Convention elected in June of the same year, and elected, too, by some 2,000 out of 15,000 voters in the Territory, should have proceeded deliberately to defy the will of the majority in all their action. Conscious that of their whole number there was scarcely a single representative of the majority in the Convention, that sentiment being strongly hostile to the institution of slavery—conscious that the minority had just been defeated in an election for delegates to Congress and for members of the second Legislature—conscious that the Democratic party had been committed in every State in the Union in 1856 to the principle that the will of the majority should prevail—they proceeded to construct a Constitution which not only defied the majority, but so fettered that majority in reference to the only vital issue at stake in the Territory as to leave the votes of the people on the subject of slavery to a set of men who could, and in all probability would, reject those votes, if they happened to be against that institution. The Democracy of the country are now called upon to endorse a Constitution thus framed—to approve the action of this minority Convention, in regard to the slavery question—and falling in this, to accept the disgrace of being identified with abolitionism and sectionalism. Such is the hard measure proffered to the men, who for more than three long years have patiently submitted to aggressions of a minority in the Territory of Kansas, and who, bearing these aggressions upon their shoulders in the great conflict of 1856, nevertheless carried their flag in triumph, upon the distinct assurance, made by all their organs to the people, that the will of the majority should prevail in that Territory.
From the Columbus (Ohio) Statesman, leading Democratic paper of Ohio, Nov. 25.
There is not only no danger in letting the people “vote all they please upon” their fraudulent law, but as a matter both of principle and of practice, there is no safety without it.
To deny them the right, and try to force down upon a people an organic law, is the grossest form of anti-Democracy, which, so far from being sanctioned by any partisan reason, is rendered all the more odious and repulsive by any such reason. What is State sovereignty worth, if maintained at the expense of popular sovereignty? How can you make a State, with any regard for public liberty, unless you know the people thereof desire to become a State; and as the Louisville Democrat so ably argues, how can you know a people wish to become a State under any given form, unless you submit that form to their own direct determination? In the name of God, what else have the Democracy been fighting for all this while?
From the Chicago Times, leading Democratic paper of Illinois, Nov. 24, 1857.
A PREDICTION.—Forney's Press, no any other press ever uttered words more pointed, truthful and emphatic than the following:
“The public man who falters in this issue seals his doom. The northern Democrat who tries to make the Convention of