

To Patrons in Arrear. We shall soon send out our annual circular to delinquent patrons. Before we do so, we hope that many now in arrears will have paid up...

After several weeks' labor, and seven days heralding by the Standard, the last number of that paper contains a low-flung letter from the Rev. C. S. Kingsley. The language used is that of the fish-market, strung together without wit, and without reference to anything but a dull attempt at blackguardism.

The county convention came off, and, by fair means, I suppose, Norris and McMillen were nominated. The election came. On the election on the first Monday in August, the county was at the polls and voted. You are at the polls and voted; but Amel Bush, editor of the "Oregon Statesman," and several political puppets of Oregon, were not at the polls.

But did not vote for either Norris or McMillen? Ah! what a sinner. Heretic, knave, hypocrite, "political parson." Did not vote for either Norris or McMillen? No, nor for any other man who had swallowed all the Bush platform, prescriptions, falsehoods and all. No, sir, crossed them all off and voted Mack, except in one instance; and in so doing, I did better than scores in this county who had helped to constitute the county convention by participating in the precinct meeting.

There are some Democrats down here that think and act for themselves. They will not go to the polls when or how they shall vote—they will be intimidated by your anathemas or excommunications—nor, if they have political sins to confess, will they come to you to kiss your toe and receive absolution at your hands. Some may, but others will not, if they do they will let you know a day or two beforehand.

Now, is not all this dignified and heightened, to fall from the lips of a clergyman? And don't it prove what the Rev. Mr. Kingsley and Advocate editor assert—that clergymen elevate and purify politics? We think the next conference that gives Mr. Kingsley an appointment to teach or preach, had better throw his letter into the form of an address to the sinners, or youth of Oregon, and adopt it. It would have a powerful influence in "elevating," "dignifying," and "converting" them.

A few other extracts and we are done with you for this time: You have long been notorious for your covert attacks upon the clergy, and it has been a source of mortification and grief to a portion of your readers and supporters.

Such "supporters" and readers, as you are we reckon—those who never pay for the paper, but "support" it by "reading" some subscriber's copy. We hear a great deal of complaint from your kind of "supporters," but are not much troubled with complaints from honest patrons. And while you are suffering intense "mortification" and "grief," we wax fat and kick in the sunshine of popular approval.

How many times have you managed to always in your paper, the case of Mr. Kalloch, always glowing over it in a precious manner, pandering to your native hatred of ministers—even pointing your issues with minutely transcribing the most obscene portions of the testimony, rendering your sheet too dirty to go within the precincts of any decent family.

Tell us, chaste, refined, and most "decent" Charles, how you came to read that "obscene," "polluted," and "dirty" "testimony"? And read it too, from a begged, borrowed, or bagged Statesman. How it must have shocked such purity as yours.—We shudder to hear that you carried it into your "family," also. If the leading and tolerably respectable Dailies of Boston and New York had known how much pains the reading of that "polluting" testimony would give you, we doubt not they would have suppressed it.

And if this testimony is so "obscene," is it not singular that Rev. (he is a "Rev.") as well as yourself) Mr. Kalloch's church should have received the author of the conduct described by that testimony back to their pulpit and their community. Are you not slandering your brother Kalloch's society, by styling his conduct as "polluting" and "obscene"? They declared it was all proper and commendable.

It did attend the meeting in question, and recorded my name among those who designed to participate in its business. Is it probable that the names would have been required to an engagement to "participate in the business" of the meeting? Such a proceeding would have been absurd. We are told that the chairman of that meeting, S. J. McCormick, Esq., a gentleman of strict veracity, says that the resolution you signed, bound you to abide by and support the nominations of the county convention. And, in not doing so, you violated your pledged word, and published yourself to be unworthy of confidence.

But you plead in full and impudent justification of your conduct, that others were as bad as you—that you did better than scores in this (your) county who helped to constitute the county convention by participating in the precinct meetings? Other men have committed robbery, theft, adultery, murder, &c. Why don't you do the same, and plead their example in justification of your crime?

Now Mr. Bush, so far as I am concerned, you may say what you please, and when you please, and where you please—confuting yourself as near to truth as your nature and habits will permit—and you will give me no cause of uneasiness. I do not wish you, however, to use me as the occasion of an onslaught upon the ministry in general. As simple C. S. Kingsley you are entirely too unimportant for notice; as Rev. C. S. Kingsley, a "vicegerent of God," even, you scarcely rise to the height where insignificant ceases. Allow us, Rev. sir, to select which of your characters we choose. It may be convenient to you to pray and preach as Rev. C. S., and cheat in politics as "C. S. Kingsley; and you may, with your acute moral sense, discern clearly the harmony of the two characters; but plain people will never understand their compatibility.

I have used no means to elect or defeat any political candidate further than to vote for or against him. You speak falsely here, Rev. Charles.—Two years ago last spring, just before an excited election, when know-nothingism reared its hydra-head in this Territory, and threatened to overthrow the democracy, you, as preceptor of the Portland Academy, had enacted at your exhibition an original know-nothing play, in which the viva voce law, the democratic party and democratic principles, were ridiculed, democrats exhibited as demagogues and dishonest men, and know-nothings as patriots—during which a mock election was held, at which the democratic demagogues were routed, the viva voce law condemned, and know-nothing patriots triumphant. Was that "using no means to elect or defeat any candidate (or party) further than to vote?" It was prostituting your school to the service of an infamous party, and "using means" of the basest kind, which none but a very unworthy partisan would have resorted to.

You charge me with know-nothingism. I acknowledge I have been twice within a wigwag. You mistake; we have never charged you with being a know-nothing, though we had no more idea you were a democrat, or ever had more within the last three years, to break down and bury the know-nothingism, than we did the barriers of uprightness and honor in politics, than all the politicians from among the "world's" people who ever breathed the breath of life. It may be true that the ministry has contributed something towards your corruption within that time, but how can your corruption before that time be accounted for? Now, is not all this dignified and heightened, to fall from the lips of a clergyman?

And don't it prove what the Rev. Mr. Kingsley and Advocate editor assert—that clergymen elevate and purify politics? We think the next conference that gives Mr. Kingsley an appointment to teach or preach, had better throw his letter into the form of an address to the sinners, or youth of Oregon, and adopt it. It would have a powerful influence in "elevating," "dignifying," and "converting" them. You are a scholar and a gentleman, besides being a clergyman and preceptor, Rev. Charles. Your style is pure, your language chaste, and your tone high. You are a brilliant ornament to the sacred desk. Your style is peculiarly adapted to sermons and supplication, and must be grateful to the ear of Heaven. You are probably "gilded" in prayer. Your ready command of ornate language doubtless renders your "labors" effective in "seasons of revival." You are a remarkable man, Rev. Charles, and it is a great cause of rejoicing that you have consecrated yourself to the service of the Most High.

A few other extracts and we are done with you for this time: You have long been notorious for your covert attacks upon the clergy, and it has been a source of mortification and grief to a portion of your readers and supporters. Such "supporters" and readers, as you are we reckon—those who never pay for the paper, but "support" it by "reading" some subscriber's copy. We hear a great deal of complaint from your kind of "supporters," but are not much troubled with complaints from honest patrons. And while you are suffering intense "mortification" and "grief," we wax fat and kick in the sunshine of popular approval.

How many times have you managed to always in your paper, the case of Mr. Kalloch, always glowing over it in a precious manner, pandering to your native hatred of ministers—even pointing your issues with minutely transcribing the most obscene portions of the testimony, rendering your sheet too dirty to go within the precincts of any decent family. Tell us, chaste, refined, and most "decent" Charles, how you came to read that "obscene," "polluted," and "dirty" "testimony"? And read it too, from a begged, borrowed, or bagged Statesman. How it must have shocked such purity as yours.—We shudder to hear that you carried it into your "family," also. If the leading and tolerably respectable Dailies of Boston and New York had known how much pains the reading of that "polluting" testimony would give you, we doubt not they would have suppressed it.

And if this testimony is so "obscene," is it not singular that Rev. (he is a "Rev.") as well as yourself) Mr. Kalloch's church should have received the author of the conduct described by that testimony back to their pulpit and their community. Are you not slandering your brother Kalloch's society, by styling his conduct as "polluting" and "obscene"? They declared it was all proper and commendable. It did attend the meeting in question, and recorded my name among those who designed to participate in its business. Is it probable that the names would have been required to an engagement to "participate in the business" of the meeting? Such a proceeding would have been absurd. We are told that the chairman of that meeting, S. J. McCormick, Esq., a gentleman of strict veracity, says that the resolution you signed, bound you to abide by and support the nominations of the county convention. And, in not doing so, you violated your pledged word, and published yourself to be unworthy of confidence.

But you plead in full and impudent justification of your conduct, that others were as bad as you—that you did better than scores in this (your) county who helped to constitute the county convention by participating in the precinct meetings? Other men have committed robbery, theft, adultery, murder, &c. Why don't you do the same, and plead their example in justification of your crime?

The last Salem Christian Advocate devotes two columns and a half of the editor's abusive and slang epithets to the Statesman. We say the editor's abusive and slang epithets, for "infidel," "atheist" &c. are as much his foul language as are epithets of another sort the billingsgate of another class of ruffians. The article is not strong, and presents few points, and these are made by an ignorance of, or a wilful perversion of facts.

He thinks that by personal allusions to him we thought, like the "cuttle-fish," to color the water and thus elude pursuit. Does he think his reputation could reasonably have been supposed to possess blackening properties? He says of our remarks upon his plainly implied assertion that a "true religious man" might "trail his principles in the dust and do the behests of party right or wrong?"

The meaning intended was, "those persons, or those persons professedly religious," who will trail their principles in the dust, &c., and not, that really religious men will "do wrong." The Statesman editor either knew, when he penned the above, that it was perversion, or he is very obtuse. Those who know him best, will not accuse him of the latter defect. It must be the former of which he is guilty.

The paragraph of his former article which we thus construed, we copied entire, and it is as follows: These assaults obviously intend a blow against all true religion and all true religious men, except those who will trail their principles in the dust of party, right or wrong.

The language will bear no other construction, notwithstanding his liberal accusations of "perversion." "A blow against all true religious men, except those"—those what?—those true religious men? &c. But the editor says what he intended to "mean" is "all true religious men except those" who are not religious.

If that "bull" was originally intended, there was quite a difference between his language and his "meaning." If the Statesman had made its remarks originally against the Catholic clergy—who notoriously claim to enforce spiritual dogmas, by temporal power; who not only claim, but where-soever and whenever they can, usurp temporal power. And ignoring the pretensions and efforts of Bishop Hughes, of New York and of other dignitaries of that Church.

We are no adherents of the Roman Catholic faith, were educated in the midst of strong prejudices against that Church, where "Fox book of martyrs," and kindred works, furnish all the knowledge the youth have of Catholicism; but we cannot permit this oft repeated misrepresentation of the Advocate to longer go uncontradicted. We know the Advocate editor has a most unreasonably and bitter prejudice against Catholics, but he can't be aware that representations like the above, are false. The Roman Catholic Church, of the United States does not "claim to enforce spiritual dogmas by temporal power." That old slander was effectively put to sleep by authoritative proof in a speech of Hon. John Kelly, of N. Y., in the last Congress, and, we believe also, in a speech of Hon. Jos. R. Chandler, of Pa., of the previous Congress. Bishop Hughes likewise successfully controverted it in his discussion with Rev. John Breckinridge, of the Presbyterian Church. Indeed this reiterated slander of the Advocate is so stale and stupid, that we are almost ashamed to give it a denial.

We deny, too, that in the United States, the Catholic clergy have generally inter-meddled with politics. The statement is false, and abundantly disproved by facts. The clergymen of no other denomination have meddled less with politics in the United States than have those of the Roman Catholic persuasion. Eren Bishop Hughes, here specially denounced, has in no proved instance ever interfered in an election canvass. These stale falsehoods have been gathered by the Advocate editor from know-nothing and black republican sources, where they originated in intolerant hate and reckless mendacity.

From the settlement of the Colonies to the present day no other religious denomination here have shown more—few, if any, as much—tolerance in political matters as have the Catholics, as a class. When Protestants were persecuting dissenters in New England, Catholic Maryland extended to all denominations the hand of brotherhood, and invited them to come there and worship God as best pleased them. Later, we witness Catholics, and even Catholic ministers, going the polls and voting for the Protestant nominees of their party, without objection, while at the same time we see the Catholic occasionally here and there brought forward for office failing to receive the united Protestant vote of his political party.

But did it ever occur to the editor of the Advocate that, by his own rule, this "assault" upon Bishop Hughes was "infidel," and "atheistic." If it is "atheistic" for us to demur to his intermeddling in politics, is it not equally so for him to demur in like manner to Bishop Hughes? But this mousing of "atheism" by the Advocate editor is a most contemptible species of demagoguery, beneath the character of a political thimble-rigger. He knows the meaning of the word "atheism," as well as any one, and knows it is no more properly applied where he applies it, than Mormonism would be. In what way do we complain of the interference of clergymen in matters of election and legislation constitute "atheism"? In no way but this: In the Advocate editor's vocabulary it is a terrible crime, and he thinks by parading it he can excite the prejudice of professors of religion. Very much business!

It is not true to the extent the Statesman wags, that the clergy of the north are involved in politics; they are not "throughout the north" prostituting the pulpit to political harangues; they have not by "thousands" given themselves up to the pursuit of politics. We aver that all that is true and notorious. The simple issue we make against the Statesman, is involved in this question: Can ministers engage in public or political affairs without corrupting the pulpit and endangering the interests of the country? We maintain they can; the Statesman, as we understand, supports the negative. We have not said or argued that they could not so do. We have said, and still maintain, that as a rule, with few exceptions, where ministers have turned politicians they have exhibited less faith, less honor, and less conscientiousness than is possessed by other classes.

The ministry of almost all churches in Oregon, has been remarkably free from political intermeddling, and therefore this onslaught is in bad time, as well as in bad taste. In this county there are not less than half a dozen active, bitter, malignant, and not very scrupulous clerical politicians and enemies of the Democratic party. In this county there are three that we know of; and in other parts of the Territory they are found.

When ministers of an early day made speeches against the tyranny of Great Britain, mingling freely in politics, and speeches, and sought to promote, by their prayers, and speeches, and sermons, the cause of American liberty, there was no such "base and cry" as is presented. Are you ignorant of history, or do you wilfully mistake? At the time of the revolution, Rev. John Wesley came to America as the paid agent of the British Government, to endeavor to persuade the colonies to succumb to the mother country, and bow submissively to the yoke of Britain. And he did labor in "speeches," exhortation, sermon and prayer, for "the tyranny of Great Britain" and against "the cause of American liberty." The torjion of Bishop Abney was so offensively preached that he was compelled to secrete himself in the forests of Delaware to save his life from the fury of a patriot mob. Was the editor of the Advocate ignorant of these facts when he penned the above?

But the editor of the Advocate still falsely insists that we have a spleen against ministers as such. The wish is the father of the impudent assertion. He wishes in his time-serving soul that it was so, that he could seek to array them, as a class, against us, and not only them, but church members also. It is a favorite weapon of his, brought to bear on others than ourselves, to threaten with the canny of "religious men." If the pope of Rome claimed all the power the Advocate editor asserts he does, he would not claim to have more complete control over his followers, than the editor's threats of "the influence of his friends" imply that he exerts over them. As we before said this is a favorite weapon of his, not seldom resorted to. Once for all, we say, we entertain not one particle of hostile feeling towards clergymen, as such, and respect as highly as we do members of any profession, those of them who respect themselves and their calling.

But the main trouble with the editor of the Advocate is, our strictures upon partisan clergymen reach him—his remonstrance is but the fluttering of a wounded bird. Impatient at the restraint his trimming propensities place the fanatic idols of his heart under, and longing with all earnestness for the day when it will be prudent and expedient to promulge them, he occasionally boils over when his horns are trodden upon. Disclaim it as he may, "things terrene" are dominant in his affections, and "at the very instant he is disclaiming against the mammon of this world (including the mammon of politics) he is hunting after it with a step as steady as time, and an appetite as keen as death."

Leland writes, or rather dates, a letter from Yamhill, in which he says, "the next election in Yamhill will find the two portions of the Democratic party of the county that have been lately arrayed against each other, acting together, as in times past; and fighting shoulder to shoulder in defence of the principles of the National Democracy."

"National Democracy" voted for Lawson, and the entire black republican ticket. At the next election the democrats are to "fight shoulder to shoulder" with the Lawson softs, are they? That is to say, the softs will consent that they may if they (the softs) succeed in getting the candidates. But when the democrats secure the nominees, as they did in Yamhill this year, the softs will go with the black republicans, as they did then. We suppress that the democrats of Yamhill will support the Lawson "National Democrats" to make nominations for them after they have supported such nominations awhile. The rule of the Sacramento County democracy is a good one.

"THE IMPERIENCE OF THE DEVIL."—One would think from reading the Standard that Leland, who supported Lawson and voted against Lane, was the special friend and champion of Gen. Lane—that he had a power of attorney to look after his interests, and a general commission of guardianship over him. We fancy we hear the General exclaiming, "can't the miserable cur be kicked off?"

TROUT.—A party went from this place last week to Alicaw to fish for trout, remaining over night—"camping out." They took along plenty of blankets and some "tonic," to keep off the cold. They caught about one hundred and seventy-five trout, besides having a good deal of "fun." The trout we saw; the fun we take the party's word for. Through the kindness of John Byrne, "not a bad fellow," we were favored with some fine samples of the fish.

WASHINGTON TERRITORY ELECTION.—Gov. Stevens is elected by about five hundred majority in the Territory. The vote in Vancouver precinct stood, Stevens, 160, Abernethy 12. Stevens majority in Clark County is 232. His majority in the river counties is about 850. On the Sound it will probably be 150, or 200.

ILLNESS OF DR. McLEOD.—We learn that Dr. McLaughlin, of Oregon City, has been quite ill recently, and on Thursday of last week it was thought could not survive. He however revived, and at last advices was a little better. He is about eighty years of age. He has acted a prominent part in the settlement of Oregon, and we should deeply regret to hear of his demise.

Geer, of Fruit Farm, has our thanks for several varieties of early apples. To-day we publish a letter upon the subject of a State Constitution for the Territory of Oregon, from the pen of Mr. B. Robinson, of Benton County. We have before published articles from his pen, and have several years known him as a vigorous and correct thinker. He was a candidate upon the democratic ticket in Benton for the constitutional convention, but was beaten by the abolition, soft, and know-nothing fusion there. We suppose he has more intelligence, and capacity for framing a constitution than the whole hybrid ticket ran against him—probably ten times as much.

A paragraph, prepared during our absence some weeks since, was published in the Statesman, stating that it was proposed in Kansas to form a constitution which should be silent on the slavery question, leaving that to be disposed of by the subsequent legislature, and inquiring if the slavery question could not be treated in the same way in Oregon. For ourselves, we are opposed to that course. We hope to see the question definitely settled by the constitution, and not left open for perpetual war in the State legislature, and consequently before the people at every election of a legislature. We trust two provisions will be submitted, one constituting Oregon a slave, and the other a free State; whichever receives a majority of the votes to become a part of the constitution.

DEED.—Suddenly, at Olympia, June 29th, James Dorr, Esq., son of the late James Dorr, late of the city of Wisconsin, aged 28 years.—Pinner & Deane.

Persons whose brains are perforated with an ounce of lead, "propelled" by about the same quantity of powder, usually die quite "suddenly." The Kentucky democrats have nominated Hon. James B. Clay, of Fayette county, (son of Henry Clay) for Congress, in the Ashland District. We are informed that P. P. Prim, of Jackson County, member of the Convention, does stand on the platform of the democratic party of the Territory. His name should be added to the list of democratic members.

POST-OFFICE, JACKSONVILLE, O. T. June 20th, 1857. Mr. BUSH—B. H. Quigley does not take his Statesman out of the office. He has recently moved to California, as I learn—he has taken his paper until he returns to your, W. M. HOFFMAN, Ass't. Postmaster.

B. H. Quigley owes \$20 subscription to the Statesman, having taken it since 1853, and having never paid anything. CONTESTED SEAT.—A correspondent writing from the South, says: "There will be a contest in Coos county for the Convention, between Lookhart and Marple. I think that the Convention ought to give the vote to Marple. The question turns upon the vote of Johnson's precinct. Lookhart, as auditor, threw it out in the canvass, on the ground that the election was not established: yet before the election, he wrote a letter to the voters of that precinct, authorizing them to vote for him, and they would be received. Along with this he sent election notices. Lookhart is a Western Reserve (Ohio) man, and Marple is a native of the East. Marple is a true democrat, and an old line whig, but voted the democratic ticket."

DEATH OF PRATT, THE MORMON ELDER.—Parley P. Pratt was killed lately at Van Buren, Arkansas, by the husband of a woman whom he had seduced. Next to Brigham Young, Pratt was the ablest of the Mormon leaders. Mr. Pratt, we believe, was not one of the original Josephite Mormons, but emigrated from the East to California, where, it is said, he was a member of the original Vigilance committee. He then joined the Mormons at Great Salt Lake. His travels and exertions through the whole of Great Britain, Denmark, Sweden and a part of Germany. Pratt having seduced Mrs. H. McLean of New Orleans, and deserting her husband and starting for Utah, was killed on the 14th by McLean. The Utah was in California when he heard of his wife's elopement, but came home and followed them as far as Cherokee Nation, where he overtook them. Pratt he arrested for larceny, in stealing the clothes of the children who had been taken away from McLean's wife. He intended to have Pratt taken to Van Buren, Ark., and legally punished, but it appears that from some cause he thought proper to take the law into his own hands, and kill Pratt before reaching that point.

A College of Agriculture has been established in Michigan on an handsome farm of 700 acres. It has an endowment of \$50,000, and in each of the last two years the Legislature has given it \$20,000. Students are admitted without fee, but are obliged to labor three hours each day.

THE GOLD PRODUCTION.—The steadiness of the product of gold in California and Australia, for several years past, is very remarkable. That of Australia has been quite uniform at any rate, being about \$10,000,000 annually. California has ranged from fifty to fifty-five millions. On the whole the indications seem to warrant the belief that the production of gold has been nearly, if not fully, reached in both countries.

POLK COUNTY, July 11, 1857. Mr. BUSH—Sir: If you think the receipt which I send to you below, is deserving a place in your paper, publish it. To prevent smut in wheat, take a large wash tub, or any other vessel that is water tight, and bore a three-quarters anger hole near the bottom, plug it tight, place the tub on a bench, fill it three-fourths full of water, and dissolve 21 ounces of blue vitriol in six gallons of water; when the vitriol is dissolved, put a small quantity of wheat into the water, stir it well, and skim off every thing that floats, and thus continue as long you have water above the wheat as to float the trash, then place another vessel under your tub, draw the plug, and let the water all run from the wheat; when drained sufficiently, remove the wheat that is washed to some convenient place. I put it into a box, then pour the water back into the tub, and when you add more water, add also to every gallon, not less than two and a quarter ounces of vitriol, but more if it suits you.

From two years' experience, I am convinced that washing wheat in this manner will prevent smut. Yours, with respect, ISAAC BACELL.

Mr. BUSH—You will oblige me by making public the fact that I decline the re-appointment tendered to me by the President; and that I am only awaiting the appointment of a successor that I may retire from office. The Supreme Court, which convenes on the 6th of August, will bring together the judges and attorneys of the Territory; and it is desirable that measures should then be taken to secure the appointment of some Oregon lawyer to fill the vacancy. CYRUS OLNEY.

Rev. Henry Ward Beecher performed the ceremony of immersion on Wednesday last week.—New York Daily Book.

We hardly think the world would be the loser if the Rev. H. W. B. were to perform the ceremony again with a big stoned tick to his neck.—Louisville Journal.

Corvallis, July 12, 1857. EDITOR STATESMAN—Sir: I am informed that previous to the late election, an effort was made by the opponents of the Democratic party in Lane County, to defeat J. W. Mack, the member elected from that county, and knowing well where they could get aid and comfort, they applied to some of the Avery clan in this county. The circumstances are these: "Three years ago this spring, Mr. Mack was resident of this county, and owing to the fact that J. C. Avery had no military shoulder to and had become a personal enemy of his, without any cause, and also owing to the fact, (as he then thought,) but now knows that Avery's Democracy was unsound, he came to the conclusion not to vote for Avery, but to vote blank; he was however prevailed upon to vote for Avery, and voted in the following manner. A bet had been made that the north precinct in this county would give Avery a majority over St. Clair. In order to make the bet sure, and to give Avery strength in that precinct, I induced Mr. Mack, with some ten others, who reside in the Corvallis precinct, to vote in the north precinct. Some of them wanted to vote for the precinct officers, and Mr. Mack was one of the number. Avery headed the ticket that year. I therefore cut Avery's name off from the ticket Mr. Mack intended to vote, as well as one or two others, and they voted a single vote for Avery in the north precinct, preserving the remainder of the tickets to vote in this precinct after they had written the names of the precinct officers on the same. Mr. Mack accordingly voted as I have stated. I am turned to testify to you in any time. I am told that Mr. Hasbrook, a resident of Lane county, who is known to be a rank abolitionist, and perhaps a disunionist, came into this town before the late election and was advised by Slater of the chance they had to vilify Mr. Mack, and between themselves and others of the same class, (all abolitionists together, though some of them are not honest enough to say so,) concocted a series of charges to be used against Mr. Mack, and which were used against him and which I know to be unqualifiedly false—in fact a batch of abolition lies, such as they like to beumbt those with who are opposed to their sectional, disorganizing, disunion policy. "Who so toucheth pitch will be defiled therewith in any time." I am told that Mr. Hasbrook, a resident of Lane county, who is known to be a rank abolitionist, and perhaps a disunionist, came into this town before the late election and was advised by Slater of the chance they had to vilify Mr. Mack, and between themselves and others of the same class, (all abolitionists together, though some of them are not honest enough to say so,) concocted a series of charges to be used against Mr. Mack, and which were used against him and which I know to be unqualifiedly false—in fact a batch of abolition lies, such as they like to beumbt those with who are opposed to their sectional, disorganizing, disunion policy.

"Who so toucheth pitch will be defiled therewith in any time." I am told that Mr. Hasbrook, a resident of Lane county, who is known to be a rank abolitionist, and perhaps a disunionist, came into this town before the late election and was advised by Slater of the chance they had to vilify Mr. Mack, and between themselves and others of the same class, (all abolitionists together, though some of them are not honest enough to say so,) concocted a series of charges to be used against Mr. Mack, and which were used against him and which I know to be unqualifiedly false—in fact a batch of abolition lies, such as they like to beumbt those with who are opposed to their sectional, disorganizing, disunion policy. He who wars with skunks must expect to catch some of the odor. Ditto with abolitionists and sore-heads. They did not succeed in defeating him however, for the Democracy of Lane county know the tricks of the trade, and gave them the confidence they deserve, that is none at all.

Know Mr. Mack to be a sound Democrat, and an honest man, and they knew it too, and I kept their machinations as secret as possible from me, knowing that in justice to Mr. Mack, I would be in duty bound to expose them. Their slanders were used in the eastern parts of the county, (Lane,) as far from Mr. Mack's precinct as possible, that he might not be able to know of and defend himself against them, and he never did. Nothing of it until told by a friend at Eugene City on the 4th day of July. It is thus they fight in darkness and at a distance. But Mr. Mack has taken an honorable course, stood square upon the Salem resolutions during the canvass, and while he continues to do so, can bid defiance to all the lying, chisnery, and chisnery of the powers of abolitionists, black-republicans and sore-headed (Anti) Democrats can bring against him. Yours in haste, A. J. THAYER.

ALBANY, O. T., July 11, 1857. Mr. BUSH—Dear Sir: As there was a request made by a farmer in your columns of the 7th inst., that some one would give him some information how to get rid of smut in wheat, to which I thought I would give you my experience in that line, which you can publish if you think it is worth publishing. I took some wheat that was badly smutted, and washed it, and put it in barrels, and covered it with water, and dissolved some blue vitriol in hot water, and put in, as near as I could guess, about one pound of it to six bushels of wheat, then stirred it up well, and let it stand about twenty-four hours in the water. I then took it out and sowed it on fallow ground put in good order, and harvested it well, (about the last of October, I think,) and it came up and looked well; but the winter killed a little of it, and in what there was left, (which was an average crop) there was hardly a head of smut to be found.

I have heard other farmers speak of trying the same experiment (some of them in a little different form) with about the same effect. I took some of the same kind of wheat and cleaned it clean, but did not wash it, and sowed it by the side of the other, on the same kind of ground, on the same day, and the product was about one fifth smut.

I also had some of the stubble ground from the above seed was taken from, plowed and put in good order, and the next day I sowed it in the same kind of wheat, and after washing or vitriol, and it was so smutted that it was not worth cutting. Yours, truly, D. B. WARREN.

A Sum for Amateur Agriculturists. A player at ninepins won the first roll so much money as he had in his pocket; the second roll he won the cube of what he had in his pocket; and the third roll he won the square of all he had. Query, how much did he have when he commenced to play? Lane Co., July 9th, 1857. W. J.

THE OLDEST MAN IN AMERICA.—A correspondent of the Nashville Standard says, there is now living Murray county, Georgia, on the waters of Holly Creek, a revolutionary veteran who has attained the age of one hundred and thirty-four. His name is John Hames. He is known throughout the region in which he lives by the appellation of "Gran' Sir Hames." Gran' Sir is contracted for Grandfather, and he is now in the eightieth century. I enquired of an oldish friend of about sixty if he knew him? "Oh, yes," I know him," said he; "he is my grandfather's grandfather." John Hames was born in Mecklenburg county, Virginia, and was a lad ten years old when Washington was at his death. He was thirty-two when Braddock met his disastrous defeat on the Monongahela. He, with several of his neighbors set forth to join the headstrong and ill-fated commander, but after several days' march, were turned back by the news of his overthrow. He emigrated to South Carolina nearly a hundred years ago. He is in thirteen counties, and has been present during the war of independence, and in skirmishes and encounters with Indians, with Tories and with British hordes beyond memory. He was with Gates at Camden, with Morgan at Cowpens, with Green at Hillsboro' and Eutaw, and with Marion in many a bold rush into a camp or redoubt quarters.

Hardin K. Runnels of Boston, Bowie county, has received the democratic nomination for Governor of Texas, against Sam Houston, who proposes to stump the State as a K. N. candidate. As the people of Oregon appear now to have determined on ushering into existence another infant State, let not a few words from one who has witnessed the birth of other States, be here thought amiss. The organic laws of a State ought, far above all others, to be thoroughly digested, and carefully fitted together, so that no alteration or amendment, for many years, would be needed. They are mainly designed to put up checks and bars against that fifth legislation so characteristic of the American people, and so very costly and harassing to the industrious and sober-minded portions of community. Being once well ordered, it is much the best that they should be both difficult, and costly of change; for then there would be inducement and time for reflection before measures could be rashly taken, which must eventually be discredited and change. And now let it be understood, that it is not the intention of the obscure individual here writing to give a syllabus of, or glance at, all the locks that should be turned against hasty, and overmuch legislation; but merely to give a souvenir of a few things that may be novel in such cases, or upon which there may be diversity of public opinion. And this by no means comes from a feeling of superiority to the late election, but from a damper on that, but that there may be agitation of these matters amongst the people, in order that the representatives elect may catch the will of their respective constituency previous to meeting in convention.

It is customary in the States to subject voters to a military service, and to capitation tax in the shape of road labor or otherwise; and this is all right, for every individual owes something for the protection of his personal rights; but at the same time he ought to have extended to him the right of suffrage. Hereafter Oregon would be proud of having been first in the Union to abolish the poll tax. This restriction should be extended to the Celtic-saxon race. Let the Negro, Indian, John Chinan, and their Octons or more, go to their equals where they can enjoy all the privileges of society without stint. A residence of six months ought to be sufficient to entitle a new comer to vote. That will conduce as much as any thing else to bring citizens into the country.

Biennial sessions are often enough, and should be limited to forty, or sixty days. The Legislature should have nothing to do with divorce cases; they clearly belong to the Judiciary. And why, anyhow, should one hundred be set to the work of an individual? Neither should the Legislature have anything to do with road cases; let them go to the County Courts. The number of Representatives ought to be limited to forty or fifty; and the Senate to half as many as the House. All future States ought to take warning from the multitude of folly carried into the Massachusetts House by its 438 members. The Legislature should have power to run the State into debt more than fifty thousand dollars. They should be restricted in granting corporate powers. Too many corporations are dangerous to the liberties of the people. Their multitude of hired agents will, as they have done in other States, corrupt legislation. No Bank should ever be established in Oregon.

THE GOVERNOR ought to have a veto on the acts of the Legislature, which it should require a two-thirds vote of both Houses to override. Vetoes have done much good to the Union, and have never been known to do any harm, only in the imagination of disappointed politicians. The Governor's salary should not exceed one thousand dollars. Patriotism should make up the balance. If any one thing is worth more, indeed all officers of the nascent state ought to be made to draw largely upon that virtue, because the people will be very hard run for several years to pay as heavy a tax as that now upon them. Until the year 1856 the Governor of Rhode Island, with a population three times as large as that of Oregon, served for a salary of \$400, which is recently raised to \$1000. Vermont has a population of \$30,000; eight times that Oregon contains, and her Ryland Fletcher, in next October, receives the last of his \$750 salary. And taking together all the necessities of living there, and here, there is but little difference.

JUDICIARY. In 1817 the State of Mississippi was the first to make the Judiciary elective by the people at the polls. Since that time other States have adopted the same method. So far all appear to be well pleased with the workings of the plan. The term of office for Judges should not exceed nine years. Life estates in office are becoming more and more odious to the American people.—Judges of the Supreme Court ought to perform Circuit duties for at least the first twenty years. The Judges too will have to be recommended to draw largely upon their fund of patriotism. That is one of the best items in the world for the citizens of a weak State to possess. Oregon is not destined to be a populous State; and its growth will be slow.

SLAVERY. Negro slavery cannot exist in Oregon. The soil and climate both forbid its being carried to any considerable extent whatever. In order to insure a continuous and good field service here, hands would have to be well clad from toe to crown, else in a short time they would be stiffened up with rheumatism and other maladies so that they would be rather a drag than a profit to the farmer. It is a well demonstrated fact that a cold Samba can neither more nor work briskly. It is also well established that a shrewd Dinah is the most worthless of all degraded property. Out door laborers could go no part of the year without good shoes or boots. Every thing becomes so dry, hard and sharp in the summer, that bare feet cannot go to.

But suppose laborers could here go as thinly clad as in Louisiana or Texas, which of the great staples of the country could they be set to making at a profit to the master? Not cotton, not rice, not tobacco, not hemp, not sugar, and scarcely hard corn enough to feed themselves. Here the case is narrowed down to the single article of wheat, and that would require so much teamage to be kept up the whole year for the labor