

# The Oregon Argus.

W. L. ADAMS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

OREGON CITY:

SATURDAY, MARCH 26, 1859.

## To the Republicans of Oregon.

There will be a Convention of the Republicans of Oregon at SALEM, on THURSDAY, the TWENTY-FIRST DAY OF APRIL, 1859, for the purpose of nominating a Delegate or Representative to Congress, and for the purpose of transacting such other business as may come before the Convention.

The Committee suggest that the following appointment be adhered to in electing delegates:—Curry 1, Cook 1, Jackson 4, Josephine 2, Douglas 4, Umpqua 2, Lane 6, Clatsop 6, Benton 4, Polk 4, Yamhill 4, Marion 7, Chackamas 5, Washington 3, Multnomah 4, Columbia 1, Clatsop 1, Tillamook 1, and Wasco 1.

The Committee also earnestly request that a full and complete organization of the Republicans be perfected in every county at an early day, and that the chairman of each county committee immediately send his name and post-office address to W. C. JOHNSON, Clerk of the Central Committee, at Oregon City.

W. T. MATLOCK,  
W. C. JOHNSON,  
I. HOLMES,  
L. H. WAKFIELD,  
W. L. ADAMS,  
Rep.  
Gen.  
Com.

Jan. 22, 1859.

## Equal Sovereignty—The True Position of Parties on Territorial Rights and Dependencies.

"The most rigid interpretation of the Constitution gives to Congress no power to interfere in any manner with the domestic economy of the Territories, any more than with that of the States. There is nothing whatever in it to warrant the idea that a citizen of any State of the Union, by becoming a resident of any Territory, relinquishes a single constitutional right which he enjoys under the protection of a State government, or, by the mere act of changing his residence, yet remaining a citizen of the United States, places in the hands of Congress the power to make his laws and select his officers."—Czapkay's Organ.

Now, if a citizen does not relinquish a single constitutional right, which he enjoys under the protection of the State government, it must necessarily follow that the citizens of a Territory have the same right to prohibit the introduction of slavery therein, as they would have under a State government, for the right to prohibit or introduce this institution is an undoubted right pertaining to the congregated citizens of a State. This conclusion cannot be escaped. It is the inevitable result of the proposition laid down by the Statesman, and wherein does it differ, in effect, from the proposition, "That every organized Territory is, and of right ought to be, perfectly free to establish or exclude slavery, and to settle according to their own pleasure all their domestic institutions?" There is and can be no difference. One proposition is the exact counterpart of the other. To say they differ, is to assert that a difference may exist without a distinction. One proposition is Republicanism, avowed to be such by Republicans, who attempt not to skulk away from their principles. The other, its exact counterpart, is of the same material, and no sophistry can relieve its author from the charge of Republicanism.

We appeal to Bro Adams, of the Argus, and Mr. Peagra, of the Press, to say, if Dush's position on the subject, is not identical with their own.—What, also, says the Jacksonville Sentinel?—Oregon Union.

As you have appealed to us for an assent to the correctness of your position, and as we believe you have mind enough to see the force of an argument, and candor enough to assign to us the 'position' we claim, we cheerfully answer, that so far as the position taken by Czapkay's organ is intended to be an endorsement of Morris's bill securing to the people of the Territories the privilege of electing their own officers, and a Congressional recognition of all the sovereignty in a Territory compatible with the Constitution and the laws of the land, his position is identical with our own, and, perhaps, with that of every other Republican. The endorsement, however, of Morris's bill, and the promises, logic, and conclusions of the extract you have quoted, as also the distinct avowal, in another part of the article you quote from, that the people of a Territory have the right to institute slavery and polygamy if they choose, are two very different things—for, while the former is our position, the latter is neither our position nor that of any clear-headed statesman or sensible man in the universe. The premises, logic, and sequences are well worthy of the intellectual caliber of the brainless blockhead that spawned them—a politician better qualified by nature and education to elaborate the 'usages of cliques and caucuses,' and discuss the 'relations' between a row of whisky bottles on the inside of a counter and a row of 'Democrats' on the outside, than he is for discussing grave matters of constitutional law regulating the 'relations' of Territories to the general Government, or even the 'relations' of States to each other. Take for instance the following specimen of statesmanship:

"The most rigid interpretation of the constitution gives to Congress no power to interfere in any manner with the domestic economy of the Territories, any more than with that of the States. \* \* \* The only power which Congress possesses over the Territories, by virtue of the constitution, is based upon the 'power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.' Mark the language. It does not confer the power to legislate for the people of the Territories, or to appoint officers over them; it confers no governing powers whatever. It simply vests in Congress, as agent for the States, the authority to dispose of the soil, as of any other public property."

That is the position of the suttler that you pretend to think 'identical' with ours. The idea of resorting to 'the most rigid, strict construction' of the Constitution to curtail the powers of Congress over Territories, is certainly rich for a young man belonging to a party, the head of which, in order to keep up with public sentiment, endorsed the Pacific Railroad scheme as within the legitimate action of the Government, and extorted his constitutional authority from the 'war-making power'—a party that votes millions from the treasury for such one-horse improvements as the 'military road' from Jo Lane's farm to

Camp Stuart, in order to put money in the pockets of partisan contractors—a party which is now willing to vote a corruption fund of \$30,000,000 into the hands of the President under the pretense of buying Cuba, when, according to Judge Story,

"There is no pretense that the purchase or cession of any foreign territory is within any of the powers expressly enumerated in the Constitution."—Story's Commentary, p. 460.

The criticism of Czapkay's Agent upon the clause of the Constitution referred to, so far from being our position, or the position of the Republicans, is the legitimate progeny of one A. S. Watt, who gave birth to it six years ago, and it hasn't grown much under the nursing of Gov. Curry and the Agent, since it was born.

We now quote the 'position' of Judge Story, as of some weight on constitutional construction—a position which, being 'identical with our own,' shows that the Union's conclusions are wrong:

"No one has ever doubted the authority of Congress to erect territorial governments within the territory of the United States, under the general language of the clause 'to make all needful rules and regulations.' Indeed, with the ordinance of 1787 in the very view of the framers, as well as the people of the States, it is impossible to doubt that such a power was deemed indispensable to the purposes of the cessions made by the States."—Story's Com., p. 477.

We now quote from a decision of the Supreme Court rendered in 1810, by Chief Justice Marshall, in the case of *Sere vs. Pitot*:

"The power of governing and legislating for a Territory is the inevitable consequence of the right to acquire and hold territory.—Could this position be contested? The Constitution declares that Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States. Accordingly we find Congress possessing and exercising the absolute and undisputed power of governing, and legislating for the Territory of Orleans."—5th Cranch, 336.

The Supreme Court made the same decision in 1828 in the case of *Carter vs. the American Insurance Company*.

At a later date the Court made the same decision in the case of *McCulloch vs. the State of Maryland*.

In 1840, Judge Thompson, in the case of the United States vs. Gratiot, referred to this clause in the Constitution as the undoubted source of the power of Congress over the Territories.

In a case from California, *Cross vs. Harrison*, Judge Wayne, in delivering the opinion of the Court, said:

"The territory has been ceded as a conquest and was to be preserved and governed as such, until the sovereignty to which it had passed had legislated for it.—That sovereignty was the United States under the Constitution, by which power had been given to Congress 'to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.'"

Here we have five decisions of the Supreme Court, reaching from 1810 to 1854, declaring that the Constitution makes Congress sovereign over the Territories. In addition to this, we might quote from a speech made in the Senate by Douglas, June 5, 1850, and another speech made on the same floor in the same year in reply to Calhoun, also from a letter written by Duchanin to Sanford from Washington city, Aug. 21, 1848, all taking the ground that Congress had the power to legislate even to the exclusion of slavery from the Territories. We might also instance the fact that the framers of the Constitution understood it as lodging sovereignty over the Territories in Congress, and hence every administration from that of Washington down has acted upon such an understanding, while not a single statesman of the lowest grade has ever denied that the Constitution made provision for the government of Territories, by the general Government. In addition to this we might quote from a speech of Senator Green of Missouri made in the Senate December 16, 1857, on Lecompton, and the opinion of Jackson's Attorney General, B. F. Butler, on the Arkansas case—both of which represented the sovereignty of Congress over the Territories to be so 'plenary and unlimited'—that the simple act of organizing a State government and setting it in motion while an organic act of Congress is in force, is downright rebellion. Both of these extracts are copied into the Salem paper in large capitals, and endorsed by the editor as emanating from statesmen of great ability.

In view of this array of evidence, how could you expect us to nullify all the decisions of the Supreme Court for the last forty-nine years, and disregard the opinions of all statesmen, for the honor of occupying a 'position' 'identical' with that of a jackass founded on the bran that oozed out of Curry's 'incipient State' ranting, which he held up to the astonished gaze of such Democrats as Dolf in the last Legislature.

When, in 1803, the citizens of Indiana memorialized Congress to remove the restrictions of the ordinance of '87 from their Territory, on the ground that it was an unjust, and 'unnecessary regulation,' as it kept out emigration and deprived the country of labor, Congress thought otherwise, and the committee to which the memorial was referred reported through their chairman, John Randolph, that it was 'highly dangerous and inexpedient to impair a provision wisely instituted to promote the happiness and prosperity of the Northwestern country, and to give strength

and security to that extensive frontier.—The committee further assured the settlers that at no distant day they would be amply remunerated for present hardships for want of laborers, by a heavy immigration of free laborers. If Congress had listened to the prayer of these petitioners, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Wisconsin, all of which have been carved out of the then Indiana Territory, would have had slavery as securely fastened upon them as Missouri now has—their 'soil, climate, and productions' being much the same, and labor 'paying' equally as well. The result has shown that the 'rules and regulations' of Congress respecting that part of the 'property' of the United States, which consecrated the soil to free labor, and protected the white laborer from the encroachments of negro-gang competitions, were not only wise but 'needful.' Shall we take a position 'identical' with that of an ass that affirms they were not only unnecessary but unconstitutional, and that the people of Indiana Territory had either the inalienable right, or constitutional right, or both, to curse their posterity for all time by depriving the weaker portion of their fellows of their 'inalienable rights,' and converting them into a capital for aristocrats, with which they could drive poor white laborers out of the arena of competition and out of the Territory? Our position is, that slavery existed in most of the thirteen original States by the force of municipal local law, and was not founded in natural right, but was contrary thereto, and the Constitution tolerated it as deriving its sole authority from such local legislation—legislation which had fastened an evil upon certain localities, over which the general Government surrendered all control in guaranteeing State sovereignty, but over which in the Territories the general Government retained full control, by lodging in Congress the right to make all 'needful rules and regulations' for the Territories, which we demonstrated beyond the successful evil of the most artful political jesuit by reference to the ordinance of '87 and five successive decisions of the Supreme Court. This position is 'identical' with that of every statesman, excepting Calhoun and his disunion followers, who ever expressed an opinion during the first sixty years of the Government. We shall never be deceived into a concession that slavery can claim any authority outside of the original compact, from nature or the Constitution. We drive it right back to 'local law' as the foundation of all its authority, and plant that authority upon might as its foundation instead of right, and we are determined it shall have no other. It shall never pack the Constitution into a Territory under one arm and the Bible under another, and, after having spread the Constitution on the ground, and laid the Bible on it, proceed to spit down on them, and then, with a devilish grin, taunt us by pointing beneath its foundations for its authority to be there—an authority that we had conceded by acknowledging that the people of a Territory had the right (constitutional or natural) to invite slavery, white or black, to squat down among them. Concede this principle, and we concede, according to the *Charleston Mercury*, the moral principle, the substantive basis upon which the great issue is to be fought. We have shown that to concede it would be the concession of a falsehood—for mere temporary triumph, perhaps—a concession from which we should some day have to recede. It is the very foundation upon which the whole superstructure of sectional Democracy rests—it is the grand swivel in the chain, one end of which is reaching after the Territories and even free States on our continent, and the other after Cuba, and Congos in Africa, with which to Africanize this continent. Concede this principle, and you are irresistibly led to concede all the other pretensions of sectionalism, viz: that the Constitution carries slavery into the Territories, and into the free States, and is also at variance with the enactments of 1819 and 1820 against the slave trade. This position conceded, and we will be surely driven step by step to the present ultimatum of Black Democracy, viz: that slavery is national and freedom sectional. It would be a concession intended to demoralize the Republican party, and bind it hand and foot, ready to be sold out in 1860 to a Douglas faction that upon certain contingencies will be thrown up from the crater of the Charleston convention, which, among Douglas's friends, it is now feared will be too hot with the fires of hell for either the ambition of Douglas or for fusing the driven-niggers of the North with the fire-catchers of the South.—If Douglas and his followers are really for territorial sovereignty, why not say so?—Why not favor the doctrine that Congress ought as a matter of expediency to permit the people of the Territories to elect their own officers, and relinquish, if you please, all the sovereignty compatible with the Constitution and laws of the land that Congress is willing to part with, without sanctioning a Nebraska bill which gives to the Administration the power to appoint all the territorial officers and send out Governors clothed with the veto power? If popular sovereignty is what they are after, why, in the name of God, hasn't some convention ever said so, instead of silently passing over the 'grievances' of the Territories in having corrupt and imbecile officials forced upon them by a corrupt and imbecile Administration—and then singing out the right to have such 'domestic institutions' as slavery and polygamy if they choose?—just as though the key-stone of

the whole arch of self-government consisted in a natural or constitutional right to enslave others and have forty wives if we choose,—notwithstanding that, by disregarding the natural law that equalizes the numbers of the sexes, we deprive thirty-nine other white men of their natural right to a wife each.

In conclusion, Mr. Union, you probably understand our 'position' to be a perfect willingness to endorse popular sovereignty in the fullest and broadest extent that the Republican party chooses, so long as they don't travel out of their way to concede a false principle, or lay the ax at the root of natural and inalienable rights. We are too well posted with the wire-workings of the slave power at Washington City, with the principles, past history, and future prospects of the Republican party, to be either demagogued or entrapped. So you see that our position is not 'identical' with that of a jackass founded or physicked with Curry's 'incipient State' bran.

## The War Debt.

The war debt, if it had been paid, would have amounted to \$500 to each voter in Oregon, and \$100 to each man, woman, and child in the State. This would have made money plenty, and have enabled us to support a State government with ease.—Delusion, and the rest of the driven-nigger orators, when urging upon the people to vote 'for convention,' told us that we must have two Senators and a Representative in Congress in order to get the war debt paid. They also urged that, as by becoming a State the war debt would be paid, it would really be money in our pockets to shoulder the burthen of a State government, which would only amount to some twenty odd thousand dollars, in order to get the five million war debt. We have long known that the Government at Washington was inclined to look upon our war debt as a grand scheme for swindling the Government, and we stated when Grover was nominated for Congress, that he was the very last man that should be sent to Congress, as he had had a finger in auditing the claims, and had personal demands against the Government which would cause him to be looked upon with suspicion at Washington as the interested agent of a gang of swindlers.—He, Smith, and Lane, all went before the committee, a committee of their own sectional politics, and, according to Smith's letter, made 'lengthy speeches' on the war debt, and the effect was just what we predicted—the debt was cut down from six millions, to but little over one million, and then the committee refused to ask Congress to make an appropriation to pay even this pittance. If Grover is sent back to Congress, as he will be, if the clique can send him, we predict that the war debt will be still further cut down, or wiped out entirely. We have no doubt but that Oregon would have been much better off to have hired Lane, Smith, and Grover to stay at home, and had nobody there to represent us.

But, as the war debt isn't paid, and isn't likely to be, we must go to work, and make our money by hard knocks. Lane, Smith, and Grover have accomplished just what they went to Washington for—got Oregon admitted—and for this act of patriotism and mighty statesmanship, they are now jingling twenty-five thousand dollars in their pockets. The act, while it has put twenty-five thousand dollars in their pockets, will take about twenty-five thousand dollars out of our pockets by way of supporting another set of ignorant, lazy, unprincipled locofoco State officers. The tax will be divided principally among about three thousand voters, and will have to be paid, notwithstanding the war debt isn't provided for. Notwithstanding all this, we shall soon have these sniveling sectionalists fairly bursting their buttons off on the stump among us in spouting about the wonderful feat they accomplished in getting Oregon into the Union—how they were permitted to dine with the President—what great influence they had with the Cabinet—how they were the intimate, confidential friends of Buchanan, and the particular friends of Douglas—how Jo Lane stands fair for a nomination at Charleston for the Presidency, and Delusion for the Vice Presidency—what a great country Oregon is thought to be at Washington—and how certain we are to have the war debt paid, the Pacific Railroad built, and the Union saved, if we elect the 'regular nominee' of the sectionalists to Congress.

TAX.—The Union says that the law passed by the last Legislature raises a tax of one cent for this year of \$38,000 over and above the ordinary tax, and that the next State Legislature must raise \$30,000 more to meet the expenses of a State government. It will also cost the counties some twenty thousand more to meet the expenses of the county courts—making in all the sum of about 88,000 as the State expenses per annum.

CATTLE LOST.—We think not less than two thousand head of cattle have died in the Willamette valley in the last few weeks. Estimating them at \$25 each, we have an aggregate loss of \$50,000, all for the want of cattle-sheds and a little feed. Range has at length become poor through excessive pasturing, and the consequence is that cattle in most sections begin to fall off in October, and keep getting poorer till February, when the cold rains and sleet chill them until they are unable to navigate, and they are soon down. Although the most of them eat heartily after they are down, nine out of ten in this condition are never raised. Horses manage better to shift for themselves than cattle, although we learn from a gentleman from Marion county that a good many horses have died in that section.

PORK.—We saw Albright the butcher pay \$30.68 for a hog brought to market last Monday. It weighed 236 pounds, and brought \$13 per hundred. Our market affords much better beef this winter than it did last, as a few farmers around here are furnishing stall-fed cattle. Ten cents on foot is paid for such cattle.

LAFAYETTE, March 20, 1859.  
FRIEND ADAMS: I thought it my duty to notify you of a little underhanded game that is going on to injure you. Not many days ago, Mr. —, who lives about nine miles west of here, mailed a letter at this office to T. J. Dryer, informing him that your business out South this winter was to pack the State Convention of April 21, so as to get the nomination for Congress.—You may rely upon what I state to be correct, without asking how I got my information. I write this as strictly confidential, as my only object is to put you on your guard against the attempts of such men as Dryer's correspondent to injure you by false reports.

Yours, &c.,  
We print the above letter, withholding the author's name, thus violating no confidence, to correct a report which has been as widely circulated as Mr. — of Yamhill and a few others have been able to scatter it. But, suppose it was true that we wanted to run for Congress—had been out South—and had made known our wishes to our friends—whose business would it have been? Haven't we and all others a perfect right so to do? And isn't it common for men who expect to be candidates before a convention to see their friends or write to them on the matter? Everybody knows it is, and that there is nothing either criminal or dishonorable in it. We, however, dispose of Dryer's correspondent in this short way. First—We haven't been out South! Second—We never told a single man in Oregon that we wanted to run for Congress. Third—We never wrote a letter to a man in Oregon even intimating that we should be a candidate before the convention, and we will give \$500 for each man (of truth) who will state that we ever told him so, and \$500 for every letter that we have ever written even intimating that we desired to run. Fourth—We have no desire to run for any office whatever, but have a desire to engage in agricultural pursuits, raise cattle, enjoy the peace and quiet of home, and nurse the babies. We have also a strong desire to see our country prospering under a wholesome, economical, and moral government—a state of things we have been laboring the last four years to bring about—a condition we shall continue to labor for during our whole life. We shall probably find it in the line of our business to travel occasionally to visit delinquents and collect a little money to carry on the Argus, and while we are out we shouldn't wonder if we made an occasional speech in defense of the great principles of republicanism. In fact, we are in the war for life, and we calculate to do some hard fighting yet. We therefore give due notice of our intentions so that the nervous and sensitive needn't be at all alarmed at reports of our ambition, stealthily put in circulation by such as Dryer's correspondent from Yamhill—a man who is a Mormon in sympathy, who voted for the abolition candidate against Clay in Ohio in 1844, who was a practical amalgamationist, a notorious liar, a man whose highest ambition consists in breeding disturbances by covert attacks through anonymous or confidential letters, and who, to his other qualifications, adds that of being sneaking, low-flung, and cowardly.

ARRIVAL OF THE MAIL.  
The steamer Northern reached Portland on Tuesday evening last, bringing dates from the East to Feb. 26. We are indebted to Dr. Steele, agent of Wells, Fargo and Co., Mr. Hoyt, of the Express, and J. W. Sullivan, of San Francisco, for late papers.

Summary of News.  
The Committee of Ways and Means have directed their chairman to report in favor of taking a census in Kansas, and also adversely to the establishment of a branch mint in New York.

A State Convention of the opposition party was held in Louisville, Ky., Feb. 22d, for the purpose of nominating State officers. Joseph T. Bell was nominated for Governor, and Alfred H. Allen for Lieutenant Governor.

It is reported that two commissioners are on their way to St. Thomas, having been commissioned by Gen. Mirmon to invite Santa Anna back to Mexico, and offer him the leadership of the Reactionist party.

The Secretary of War has sent orders by telegraph to New Orleans, to the proper government officials, to proceed immediately to have the bar at the mouth of the Mississippi cleaned out, employing the men, materials, etc., required the expenses to be defrayed out of a sum of \$71,000, the unexpended balance of the Congressional appropriation for the payment of the contractors on the bar.

The House, Feb. 19th, reduced the appropriation for the army by two millions of dollars below the estimate presented by the Secretary of War.

Major Ben. McCulloch has arrived at Washington, direct from Sonora, where he was sent by Government a few months ago. He reports matters to be in a state of great confusion in Sonora, and predicts that a general war among the various opposing factions must break out ere long.

It is now stated in Washington political circles that Lord Napier was recalled as British Minister to this country, because of his having withheld from President Buchanan the information that Sir William G. Ouseley had succeeded in negotiating a treaty with Nicaragua.

A special meeting of the Cabinet was held, Feb. 23d, on Mexican Affairs.—The question of the immediate recognition of the Juarez Government in Mexico was discussed, without any absolute agreement being come to as to the policy to be pursued. It is pretty well decided, however, that the Juarez Government will be officially recognized, so soon as Senor Mala, the Envoy from Juarez, presents his credentials. He is, so far, unaccountably absent.

Fayette McMullan has resigned the Governorship of Washington Territory.

The Washington States says: "We have reliable information that it was determined at a recent Cabinet meeting, not to recall Messrs. Dallas and Mason from their respective missions."

An appropriation of \$2,000 has been voted by the Missouri Senate in behalf of the Mount Vernon fund.

Information has been received at Washington of the ratification by Nicaragua of the Cas-Vicari treaty. It secures important facilities to the United States in transporting munitions of war and mails, and the right to interpose, by force for protecting the same. It gives no exclusive preference to any one transit company, and any which may be established is forbidden to declare dividends exceeding fifteen per cent.

The Secretary of the Interior has asked Congress for an appropriation of \$20,000 for taking the census of Kansas, with the view of its admission into the Union, in accordance with the recommendations of the President in his Annual Message.

The aggregate number of passengers arrived in the United States from foreign countries, by sea from Sept. 30, 1813, to Dec. 31, 1858, is 4,052,000; nearly 2,500,000 of whom were males.

The Kansas Legislature has adjourned.—Among its last acts was the passage of a general amnesty bill, granting pardon to all persons in custody, and immunity from prosecution on account of past disturbances in Southern Kansas.—The bill received the approval of the Governor.

District Judge.—A dispatch, Feb. 18, from Washington, says that Commissioner Hendricks of the Land Office in Washington City will probably be appointed U. S. District Judge for Oregon. That would be a triumph of Lane over the clique.—Didn't Jo and Delusion pledge themselves to go for some clique, and haven't Jo and Delusion sold out all their old friends at Salem to get their seats as Senators?

Jo Lane and Delusion took their seats in the Senate, Feb. 14th. Lane drew the long term, which expires March 4, 1861, while Delusion drew the short term, which expired in three weeks after he took his seat. About the first vote Lane gave was to exclude Lane and McCary from their seats as Senators from Indiana.—How Delusion voted, we do not know.—The next vote was on a motion to postpone the homestead bill, a Republican measure, which the sectionalists were anxious to defeat; Lane voted with the sectionalists and Delusion with the Republicans.

Issue.—Now that we have three representatives at Washington, the issue here is, shall the Lane party or the clique party have a majority in this representation. Lane is already fixed, and is determined, now that he has bought over Delusion by promises, that he shall be re-elected by the approaching Legislature. In that case he and Smith will be a unit against the clique, while Grover, if returned, will be a mere cipher, as he is but little force anyhow. On the other hand, the clique want to re-elect Grover and send Neasmith or Harding to the Senate, in place of Delusion so as to have a majority against Lane. Groves has tried to occupy his usual stride of the fence position during the family quarrel—that is, ostensibly so—so as to render himself an acceptable compromise candidate on which both factions can unite. He has, however, fully posted "Dear Bush" confidentially, all the time while in Washington.