The Oregon Statesman.

VOL. 9. NO. 50. SALEM, OREGON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1860. WHOLE NO. 466.

DOUGLAS AND BLACK.

The controversy between these distinguished champions of their respective political creeds, is attracting a large share of public attention, and it is natural that every American citizen should feel interested in the result. In this, as in most political controversies, violent and angry partisan clamor is not likely to effect a speedy and safe solution of the question at issue. Such a consummation is to be hoped for, only through the exercise of calm reason and sober sense. It therefore becomes every American, who sincerely desires the prosperity of the country and the perpetuity of our institutions, carefully and dispassionately to consider and decide upon this the most unfortunate political controversy which has ever afflicted the nation. It is the right, nay, the *duty* of every citizen, however humble in station, or unpretending in ability, thoroughly to canvass this matter and lend his mite toward the settlement of this vexed question, and the rescuing of the nation from the distraction with which sectional animosity and partisan prejudice would seem to threaten us at no distant day. The writer of these remarks therefore does not feel that he owes any one an apology for obtruding them upon the public; but he is under the necessity of saying that he is actuated by no expectation of any personal advantage, nor any sentiment of hostility toward either of the great disputants; that he considers Judge Black a man whose great legal attainments would entitle any opinion he might express upon a question of constitutional law, to our respectful consideration; that he looks upon Mr. Douglas as a statesman, who, in times past, has faithfully labored for the good of his country, and who, if his life should be spared, will yet render still more useful and important services. Both Mr. Douglas and Mr. Black have fallen into some material errors, and it would seem to be necessary that they should be pointed out and as far as may be controverted. This we shall endeavor to do as far as possible, without intentional disparagement of either, and as impartially as human nature will allow.

Mr. Douglas asserts that Congress *has no power* under the constitution to legislate for the territories, that slavery can exist therein only by force of the territorial law, that the territorial legislature has the sole and exclusive authority to establish or prohibit slavery.

Judge Black on the other hand contends that "slavery *exists* in the territories by virtue of the constitution of the United States," and that Congress cannot intervene for its prohibition.

Each has defended his position with great ability, but both seem to be equally in error as to the power of Congress in the territories, and Judge Black commits a still graver error when he declares that "slavery exists in the territories by virtue of the constitution;" all of which we think can be made to appear.

The Constitution (art. iv) says, "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." That "needful rules and regulations" meant among the framers of the Constitution *all necessary legislation* (Congress of course being the judge of what is necessary) is proven by the following facts:

The ordinance of 1787, was in force at the time of the adoption of the constitution, was immediately afterwards reaffirmed without objection as to its constitutionality, and no one thought at that time but that Congress might rightfully exercise the same sovereignty over the common territory that each individual State exercised over its own before it became the common property of the confederacy. In the interpretation of the Constitution, as of any other law, we are bound to consider the intention and object of its framers. In this case it would appear that the fathers of the Republic in reaffirming the ordinance of '87, considered the inhabitants of the territories as owing allegiance to the Constitution and obedience to the laws of the United States, and held that Congress possessed the rightful power to compel such allegiance and obedience. The fact that the framers of the Constitution placed the territories on a level with *other property* would seem to show that they considered the Congress of the United States as the "lord paramount" of the territories, the sovereign ruler and owner, which might rightfully "*dispose of*" them in all respects according to its own good will and pleasure, without limitation or restriction except by the Constitution. The fact that they made no further mention of the subject in the Constitution is prima facie evidence that they never dreamed of such an anomalous idea as a nation owning a territory without the right to govern it. They could not and did not foresee that such a doctrine would ever be promulgated.

But it is worthy of note as we go along that the exercise of this power by Congress was made *discretionary*, apparently that there might be no useless and officious interference by the general government in merely local questions. Accordingly Congress has always exercised without question the right of sovereignty over the territories, settling up territorial governments, making them subordinate to Congressional authority, exercising a general supervision over them, and declaring in their organic acts that no law of the territorial legislature shall be valid if disapproved by Congress. In fact all precedent is in favor of the sovereignty of Congress. The ordinance of '87, the compromise measures of 1820, and the organic act of every territory from the foundation of the government down to the Kansas-Nebraska bill, including even that famous act itself, all acknowledge or assert either directly or impliedly in one form or another the sovereignty of Congress. Indeed the necessity of vesting in Congress supreme authority over the territories would seem to be apparent to the most superficial observer. The great extent of territory owned by the United States, the many diverse and even hostile races inhabiting it, the opposing interests and clashing prejudices always to be found therein, would seem to render the interference of Congress at times an absolute necessity. Let us cite a familiar instance, the case of Utah, inhabited by a community of aliens and outlaws, bitterly hostile to our government and our people, deriding the authority of our Constitution and laws, and upon all practicable occasions trampling upon both; does any American doubt that it is the clear and unmistakable duty of Congress to frame a code of laws for such a territory and enforce it at the point of the bayonet?

But while we deny the doctrine that the Constitution deprives Congress of the authority to legislate for the territories, and while we believe that Congress has the Constitutional power either to establish or prohibit slavery therein, we are bound to concede that, as a matter of *abstract right*, the privilege of mankind to govern themselves, or as it is expressed in the Kansas-Nebraska bill "to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way" is not dependent upon or bounded by any geographical lines or limits, and belongs as much "to the inhabitants of a territory as to those of a State." Hence we believe that *generally* the exercise of that discretionary power of legislation, which the Constitution vests in Congress, would be unwise, inexpedient, and dangerous to the peace, liberty and well being of the country. There are, however, cases wherein the exercise by Congress of its Constitutional sovereignty over the territories is a matter of prime importance and absolute necessity.

Mr. Douglas' principle of "squatter sovereignty" is, however, in accordance with the theory of our republican institutions, and is practically an assertion of the "rights of man," and so far as it can be carried out without thwarting the power of Congress to guarantee a good government and wholesome laws to the territories, is worthy of our acceptance and support. In short we acknowledge, nay, affirm, its correctness as a *general principle* of *political policy*, but deny its binding force as a principle of *Constitutional law*.

As to Mr. Black's doctrine that "slavery *exists* in the territories by virtue of the Constitution," we have but a few brief words in addition to the reasons already given in support of the sovereignty of Congress. The opinion of Chief Justice Marshall (perhaps the highest judicial authority of the United States) cited by Mr. Douglas that "slavery is a mere municipal regulation founded upon and limited by the range of the territorial laws, is certainly entitled at least to the *respect* if not to the acquiescence of all parties, and the Constitution itself is sufficiently explicit on this subject. Art. IV, amendments to the Constitution, reads: "No person shall be deprived of life, *liberty* or *property* without due process of law." Now what is due process of law for depriving a negro of *liberty* and *property?* The Constitution furnishes no such process, and it certainly looks to some legal enactment outside of, beyond, and in addition to its own provisions; and in default of such "legal process" slavery *cannot exist* under the Constitution. Nor is it possible to escape from this conclusion on the plea that the negro slave is a chattel and consequently *not* a person. For although he is *property* we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that he is a man, ignorant and degraded, it is true, but still a man, and the slaveholding States, we believe without exception, have legislated for *his protection as a man*; have made it a high crime to kill, maim, or maltreat him, and have therefore recognized him *by law*, as he is in fact, a *person*, and consequently entitled to the benefit of this provision of the Constitution. Therefore in order to enslave him in any territory of the United States there must be some positive, direct and explicit legal enactment to that effect either by Congress or by the Territorial legislature with the assent of Congress.

But let us be fairly understood. We would object to the interference of Congress either to establish, or prohibit slavery, on the ground that natural right, the theory of a democratic government, as well as the genius of our people is opposed to such interference, and in favor of leaving the whole matter in the hands of the local authorities. Still as a law-abiding and patriotic people we are bound to submit to the authority of Congress whether it intervenes for or against slavery, and we cannot consider such intervention as in any degree justifying revolutionary or rebellious turbulence, secession or disunion. Under our system of government there is ample opportunity for redress of grievances without resort to violent or extreme measures. The exciting and inflammatory appeals made by interested demagogues to sectional prejudice and tending to such ends, are equally criminal and unjustifiable in the "northern fanatic" or "southern ultraist," and it behooves all men who desire the welfare of the country to shut their ears upon both and *think for themselves*.

W. F.

LETTER FROM JACKSON COUNTY.

JACKSONVILLE, Feb. 5, 1860.

DEAR STATESMAN—I have just returned from a prospecting tour on "Gold Hill" and vicinity. All the seemingly fabulous tales that have been told and published with reference to the richness of the gold quartz discoveries in that region, are *more than true*. I saw myself not less than one hundred thousand dollars worth of the gold-bearing rock lying in the corner of one cabin, which had been taken from the ledge in the last three days. Until a day or two past, the opinion has in part prevailed that the very extreme richness was confined to the surface, or detached portions of the rock that had been thrown up, probably, from an immense distance below the surface; but they have now struck what appears to be the main ledge, and find it even more profuse in the precious metal than the detached portions had been. It defies description, and is probably very far ahead of anything ever before discovered. The estimate is that it will yield at least fifty thousand dollars to the ton. The lead where they have struck it is about twenty-two inches in width, that will pay at the above ratio. They have only just begun it; of course it is impossible to say how far it extends downward, as they have not gone further than two or three feet down, as yet.

Our ex-legislator, Suggs, *alias Arkansas traveler*, has spent most of his time in that region since the discovery, I am told, endeavoring to turn an honest penny by the retail of "rot-gut," and occasionally by the "turn of the wrist." He boasts in his cups (tin cup of Minie rifle) that he is the smartest man in southern Oregon, and Jo. Lane knows it; that if the democracy of this county do not sufficiently appreciate his talent to nominate him for the legislature, he has only to intimate to Jo. that he wants it, and he can get the Indian Superintendency. I get this from a gentleman who heard him say so, as he says; and one, too, that has no earthly interest in misrepresenting. He merely spoke of it as some gas that he had been listening to a few minutes before; said he had been entertained for an hour with boastings of this character. He (old T.) also said Lane would sooner have him than any other man in Oregon in the Senate with him; but he was too low in funds to enter the arena with so many candidates.

Gen. J. K. Lamerick was shot, and it is supposed mortally wounded yesterday afternoon, by a gunsmith here by the name of Wm. J. Berry. I do not know the particulars, any farther than that it occurred in Berry's house. The ball entered just below the right eye, and passed through the head, coming out at the lower end and a little back of the left ear; it was from a dragoon revolver. Lamerick has been a visitor at Berry's house for a year and a half "last past."

It was at first supposed the wound was not mortal, the ball not having passed through the brain, but it occasioned an immense loss of blood, and I hear this evening that he seems sinking rapidly, and strong doubts are entertained of his recovery.

Very little is said here about politics. It seems to be self-evident that the Lane society will have their own way in this county. I understood to-night that a duel had been arranged between Mr. O'Meara and Pat. J. Ryan. Ryan, claiming that O'Meara insulted him in presence of some ladies, by criticising something he (R.) had written in a lady's album, had challenged him to mortal combat. The challenge was accepted, as I learn, but before the thing was fully arranged, the authorities got wind of it, and late last night arrested them, and held each to bail in the sum of $5,000, to cease hostilities. The news of the arrest I learn from Judge Tolman.

Truly yours, A.

P. S. Feb. 6th, Lamerick is a shade better this morning—some hopes are entertained of his recovery.

CANYONVILLE, Feb. 7, 1860.

EDS. STATESMAN—We have just received news of a quarrel at Jacksonville, between Gen. John K. Lamerick and William J. Berry, formerly of the Willamette valley, in which Lamerick was shot—the ball entered near the nose, and came out behind one of his ears. He was alive when our informant left Jacksonville. The cause for the attack of Berry was jealousy. Berry is a married man. Lamerick was shot in Berry's house. Berry is at large under bonds of $3,000.

QUARTZ.

LETTER FROM JUDGE STRATTON.

HON. DELAZON SMITH—*Sir:* I have neither time nor inclination for an extended controversy with you through the press; but an article which appeared in the *Democrat* of Jan. 24th, I think demands a passing notice.

A letter which I wrote in that confidence upon which all gentlemen must rely, was in violation of what I have always understood to be correct in principle and manly in conduct, placed at your disposal. You assumed the right to publish and comment upon it, and I suppose I have the liberty of answering. I leave the public to judge whether or not I had the right to make the inquiry I did.

I have yet to learn that the conduct and acts of a public representative are beyond the questioning of his constituents. Had I sought the information to screen you from *merited* condemnation, does any one suppose you would have complained? No doubt you would have called me a gentleman for that, as you did Dr. Wood for making public a private correspondence. Had I not the same right to ask the information, though the answer might compromise you as a public servant? Were you not an avowed candidate for the U. S. Senate, I should not trouble myself about your character or your conduct at Washington, or elsewhere.

As a public officer, I hold myself amenable to the just criticism of my fellow-citizens for every official act, as well as for my private conduct, so far as that conduct may affect my standing and the confidence which the public ought to repose in me as a member of the bench. Have I mistaken the extent of my responsibility to my constituents, or their right of criticism? If I have not, by what rule are you exempt from the same responsibility? In your comments upon my letter, you plainly intimate that I shall be held to a strict accountability for my conduct as a judge. I submit to it, Rev. sir, most cheerfully, and I will consider myself unworthy the position which I hold, when I shall attempt to stifle inquiry into my own conduct by falsehood and reckless charges, "full of sound and fury, signifying nothing" against others.

You say that you exerted yourself in my behalf during the canvass, and impliedly assume that as a ground of complaint against me, and as giving you some claim to my forbearance. I beg pardon, sir, but I cannot admit the correctness of such a principle. But admit it, for the sake of argument, and I answer, that I exerted myself somewhat (in a small way, perhaps, compared with your great labors in my behalf) to secure your election to the United States Senate. Had I, then, no interest in the subject? Was I not in some manner responsible for your good conduct?

You would shut me and my brethren of the bench out from all participation in political affairs, and all interest in public questions; and you intimate that otherwise I might become a very partial judge in a case where your particular interests were concerned. I admit the possibility of your conclusion. I claim no exemption from the frailties of humanity; but by the "same token," sir, you may have been a very unfitting representative for me at Washington. Scrutinize my conduct as you will, but allow me the same privilege as to yourself.

The manner in which you couple the terms "slime and filth of partisan politics," is paying a very doubtful compliment to that employment in which, I believe, you have spent most of your days. You are a politician, and ought to know something of the influences of your occupation upon those who are devoted to your manner of life, and your own reputation would seem to commend the correctness of your judgment. But allow me to suggest a doubt—to your vision may not the hue of surrounding objects have taken a tinge from the color of the optics through which you have been peering?

I am obliged to you much for your caution against "trailing the ermine of a judge," &c. Considering the *purity* and *gravity* of the character from whence such sage counsel emanates, I ought to feel its weight, and heed the advice. But did you ask yourself, Delazon, how much more culpable, in a moral point of view, I should be in the case you put, than the bacchanal who should desecrate the sacred desk with his presence, or he who should stain the robes of a Senator in wanton dalliance in Cyprian halls?

One word in regard to your statement of facts—and in this I find your candor and truthfulness quite equal to your current reputation for both. You say that "you canvassed my whole district, that you exerted yourself in my behalf to the very extent of your ability, that you found me very unpopular in those portions of the district where I was best known," &c., &c. Now for the facts as they really are: My district is composed of the counties of Benton, Lane, Umpqua, Coos and Curry. If I remember rightly, and I do not think I am mistaken, you made four speeches in my district—two in Lane and two in Benton. You passed through Umpqua county; Coos and Curry you never saw. Let us look, now, a little to the result of your herculean labors in my behalf. Benton Co., where you spoke, gave 139 odd majority against me; Lane Co., where you made your other speeches—a strong democratic county—gave only seven majority for me; Umpqua, my own county—generally pretty strongly opposition—where you did not open your mouth, gave me about 50 majority; Coos and Curry you did not even pass through, and they gave me almost a unanimous vote. Taking the figures as a premise, and the conclusion most natural would be that had you made speeches in those counties where you did not, I should have been handsomely beaten. But I will exonerate you from this conclusion. The truth is, you never mentioned my name in either of your speeches, as I can find hundreds to testify. What little was said in my behalf, I said myself.

Again, you assert that you found me very unpopular where I was best known, &c. In Lane and Benton I was comparatively a stranger. Umpqua, Coos and Curry were comprised in the district for which I had been prosecuting attorney for three years preceding the election. I was personally known to almost every man in the three counties, and the vote was more than *three* to *one* in my favor. My own precinct, Scottsburg, polled 41 votes—4 only against me—of these, two were from other parts of the county, one, my own vote, for the Col., leaving but one vote actually against me in my home precinct. Such are the facts, Rev. sir; and if you were not as destitute of shame as you are of truthfulness, you would have blushed to put forth such falsehoods. You are a lawyer, too, I believe; do you remember the maxim, "*falsum in uno, falsum in omnibus?*"

As to the naughty adjectives which you are pleased to prefix to my name, they disturb me little; it is a very old trick of your kind—very common, very *harmless*, but *very mean*.

You admit that you were pretty severely scored by my gallant competitor, Col. Kelsay. I do not doubt the fact. You are quite open to castigation at any time, on general principles, and the Col. was quite able to lay it on for you, then or now. But I do not think I ought to be held responsible for the whole of your flagellation. Were you not running a little on your own hook for the Senate?

Touching rumors of your conduct at Washington, you very coolly ask if I have not become a *particeps criminis*, by publishing the slander against you? How, and in what sense have I become a publisher? I wrote a private and confidential letter, making no charges certainly against you, but simply asking a question; your correspondent betrayed it, and you, sir, published it in your own journal, or it would never have seen the light. You published the letter for your own purpose. Do not complain of an injury of your own begetting—if any injury has been done.

You seem to felicitate yourself on the assumption that Dr. Wood's answer proves nothing. I do not so interpret it; on the contrary, I think it rather equivocal. First, Mr. Woodworth affirms that judge Crane did apply to you certain very opprobrious epithets, averring that you were in a peculiar condition at Washington, &c. He is a direct witness as to what Crane *did say*. He is a gentleman and a man of truth, as no one will question who knows him. Mr. Woodworth does not say that Dr. Wood heard the same conversation which he did, but he understood Messrs. Crane and Wood to have occupied the same state-room on the steamer, and thought Dr. Wood might have heard similar language. Dr. Wood does not say that he heard nothing of the kind—but if he did he had forgotten it (*very likely*, when it touched the honor of a Senator) as judge Crane was not in a condition to make charges. Are drunken men likely to use familiarly the names of gentlemen with whom they never associated? Will you explain, Mr. Smith, why he should have used *your* name as a bona companion? Why not Gen. Lane's or Dr. F's Beaver? Mr. Woodworth states specifically what judge Crane did say—you admit that he said something—and Dr. Wood intimated that he was drunk. You remember the old adage, "Children, fools and drunken men tell the truth."

I shall make no apologies for any part which I took in your defeat last spring. I was at Salem on other business than yours—being there, I said and did just what any citizen had a right to say and do. You affirm that I there paid the "first installment for services rendered;" if there are any other installments, my dear sir, you might as well cancel them now. Oregon will never need my poor services to defeat any pretensions which you may have hereafter to the honorable position which you once disgraced. The people will do that in a manner to leave no inference that I could have aided in the result, or stayed, if I would, your utter defeat.

It is due to candor to say that I have differed from my friends in two notable instances in which your interests were concerned.

First—knowing something of your history, as most men in Oregon do, I never had the fullest confidence that you possessed that high moral character and integrity which would carry you above all temptations, and especially as to those vices which common report and universal belief—whether just or unjust to you—has attached to your name and fame. I could not have trusted you to the extent you have been trusted by many whom you have betrayed. It required no great sagacity to predict your course. Your clerical experience gives you an unwonted command of scriptural texts, ("Wo! unto you, judges!") to understand the above, allow me to suggest another text: "But it has happened unto (you) them according to the true proverb. The dog is turned to his own vomit again, and the sow that was washed, to her wallowing in the mire."

The second instance was when you were nominated for the Senate. I thought it best that you should be elected, and so advised, as some of your friends and many of mine will declare. Not because you were my choice in any sense, or that you were in any thing fit for the place; for really, you would have been the last man I should then have selected—but because the manner of your defeat would form a precedent, wrong in principle and revolutionary in practice. If ever there was an instance in which the "rule was more honored in the breach than in the observance," it was in your case, and I feel quite willing now to submit to the better judgment of those in whose power your defeat lay.

And now, Mr. Smith, with your permission, we will part company. Prominence through the columns of newspapers gratifies no ambition of mine, and what I have now said, was only to correct your errors and justify myself. Your candid criticisms and good advice I shall always endeavor to follow; your evil example, shun.

Very resp'ly, your ob't serv't.,

R. E. STRATTON.

EUGENE CITY, Feb. 6th, 1860.

DR. W. H. R. WOOD, *Sacramento, Cal.*—*Sir:* About the first of December last I addressed a letter to you upon a subject which I supposed fair and legitimate, and in terms such as I conceived one gentleman should address another. I was informed by Mr. Woodworth, of Yreka, Cal., who gave me your name, and who supposed that you might have heard similar language to that heard by him, that you were a gentleman. I believed it, relied upon it, and in making the request which I did, I certainly thought I was only exercising a right which was common to, and belonged to every citizen of Oregon. Perhaps I was mistaken in presuming that a citizen of Oregon had a right to inquire into the conduct of our representatives at Washington. I hope my informant was not also mistaken in assigning to you the character which he did, but I must think that in this instance, you made an unwarranted use of my letter; and, upon reflection, you will. I think, agree with me. I supposed that my letter was private and confidential, until such time as I gave you authority to make it public. I most assuredly should have so regarded your answer, except upon special permission from you, as I very clearly intimated in my letter.

I still think I had a right to ask you the questions which I did. You had the same right to remain silent or answer; but I put the question to you sir; by what authority do you make a private letter public without the consent of the author? Does such a practice find sanction among those with whom you are accustomed to associate? Had your estimate of the sanctity of a private correspondence, been learned in the same school with that of your Reverend correspondent, I should have found no matter of surprise.

Permit me to believe that such principles no more find sanction in the latitude of California than they do Oregon. And I beg to assure you, that such a practice in this State finds its only precedent in the office of the *Democrat*, edited by this same Delazon Smith. I shall make no apology for giving a copy of this letter to the public, since the disposition of our former correspondence renders that course not only warrantable but necessary to explain the reasons which influenced me in addressing you.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

R. E. STRATTON.

☞ The *Oregon Statesman* of November 1st, says that over $100,000 have been expended in building, in Salem, the present season. Not a dollar of the money used has been borrowed, and not a dollar will remain unpaid when the contracts are completed. For a new country, in these hard times, this is saying a good deal, and offers substantial evidence of the "solidity" of the business men of Salem. —*Keokuk (Iowa) Journal.*

[ADVERTISEMENT.]

HOLLOWAY'S OINTMENT AND PILLS.—The skin diseases to which the *bon vivant* and man of indolent habits are peculiarly subject, as well as those scorbutic affections caused by a superabundance of salt diet and the hardships and privations of a seaman's life, are readily removed by Holloway's Ointment. The disfiguring blotches, pustules, pimples, etc., arising from suppressed prespiration or obstruction in the secretive organs, are also immediately obliterated by this purifying and beautifying agent. It has no equal as a means of clearing the complexion and relieving the skin of discolorations and excrescences. The Pills, as they carry off all inward impurities, are an important auxiliary to the Ointment in such cases. [illegible] invaluable in her private utilities.

LETTER FROM ALBANY.

ALBANY, Feb. 8, 1860.

I do not know why Delusion should make such a fuss over that list of stockholders. He need not be ashamed of them. He is trying to get out of being associated with Lane and Chapman and Adair, but he is only quibbling about what constitutes a stockholder. Those persons were too shrewd to sign anything, or become liable to assessment; hence, Delusion's elastic ideas of veracity enable him to say they are not *stockholders*. I think he will not deny saying that Gen. Lane ordered $250 to be paid into the concern. There is a citizen in this place who thinks it very likely that Chapman did not pay anything. He and Delusion will probably pay about the same time. He says he knows no *person* of the name of George Caunty which you published in the list. There is a wealthy individual here by the name of Linn County. Perhaps Delusion managed to bleed him for a fifty, instead of his brother George. Rumor hath it that there is to be a meeting of the stockholders here on the 22d. I presume paper is getting scarce, and the printer's wages rather burdensome on an institution that has so many mouths to feed, and that Delusion will be under the necessity of asking for a little more money just to clear up his reputation. No doubt they will advance more, rather than have the enterprise drop, and lose what they have put in already. It will doubtless startle them if they compare the books with the published statements. Fifteen hundred subscribers to begin with, and about one hundred a week ever since, make about three thousand. I believe "this is as it should be" if Delusion has told the truth. The postmaster here does not enjoy that story of the republican documents, but as I think he will try to get himself out of the matter soon, I forbear any opinion as to how the villainy was transacted. After the display Delusion has made of himself, no one can doubt that he would meddle with your papers, or violate the sanctity of private correspondence, if he had a chance to slip the seals in the post-office or out of it. He has been of late somewhat afflicted with his old malady, the "Act of God;" or as Gen. Lane called it "not in his right mind." Delusion tried to bully two of his republican neighbors, B—— and R——, into subscribing for his *family* newspaper. The result was a quarrel in which he boasted that three republicans took each three copies of it, and that one of them paid him fifty dollars to start with. So, after all his cry about coalition, it turns out that the *Delazonian* is being published with money which he has succeeded in begging from republicans, old hard ones, that boast of never having voted for a democrat in their lives. He might about as well get money from Chapman and Adair. It is nearly time he should have a meeting of the stockholders, and report the state of his "character" and his prospects for the Senate. He has concluded not to instruct the Linn representatives for Lane. This distrust of Joseph's good faith annoys him very much. He don't like the idea of being cheated, after every body has been warning him of it for a whole year. He is going to be very savage on Capt. Jno. Smith and some other persons about here. He has worse neighbors and more of them than any man in Oregon, if he is to be believed.

R.

LETTER FROM PORTLAND.

PORTLAND, Feb. 1, 1860.

EDS. STATESMAN—The *Statesman* of this week only reached Portland this morning. Your numerous subscribers and readers were disappointed in not getting the *Statesman* at the usual time—Monday evening of each week.

The news—local or otherwise—is not numerous at the present writing—yet those who are fond of fun have enjoyed the *denuemong* (countux French!) to the "big bluster" of some of those highly "meritorious individuals," who, with less irony and more truth, might be designated "seedy adventurers, who spend a lifetime as candidates for the occupancy of a poor house." The crest-fallen creatures parade the streets with a rather subdued swagger now, and look askance at those they meet, with the air of consciousness that they had found their proper level in this community. I have heard many expressions of opinion by the people of the city in regard to that interesting episode in real life which occurred here recently, and whenever the subject is mentioned, earnest inquiries are promulgated as to where that sublime set have been in the habit of burying their dead! Some of them are always the forerunner of a *sickly season* wherever they go; and doubtless have put many a poor fellow in the ground, who escaped the form of a coroner's inquest. I think they'll branch out toward the mines, if they can get away this spring.

The mines, the mines, are all the cry. Preparations for the mines, and speculations as to the best mode of getting there, and whether they will pay, absorbs the greater share of public attention. The steamboat lines to the Dalles, alive to their own interests, have already reduced the price of freight and passage, with a view of bringing the tide of travel by the river instead of over the mountains. For those determined to start early for those mines, the river is the route by all odds. They know as well as I could tell them that to start with fresh animals from the Dalles is better than half the journey performed with horses broken down by a trip, loaded, or even light, over the pack trail. The mountain road, or Barlow gate, of course is impassable now, but let me say to those con templating a trip to the mines (and I speak as one who don't care whether they go or stay at home) to wait a while. If the mines are as rich and as easy of access as reported, they will be all the better and more thoroughly developed by the middle of May, at which time they may proceed across the mountains with ease, first sending their *freight* in charge of one of their party to the Dalles, while the balance take the animals over the mountains *light*. I write as one having no interest in "steamboat lines;" but I know that Oregonians can go three or four hundred miles to those mines, and carry their muck-a-muck, and it need not cost them much money to get there—I mean when he has his horses, and flour, and bacon on hand, as is usually the case. We are soon to have some rivalry in the freight and passenger business from here to the Dalles. Parties have purchased the steam ferry-boat Independence, and will put her on the route in a week or two. Nothing like a wholesome competition in business.

Col. Chapman's young gentleman has been here for some days, packing up the remains of the old *Standard*. He expected to take up the material with him, but he left here the other day without it. What hard-hearted, inexorable men must those *** be, not to let him have it till somebody paid the money as per agreement. If old Chapman sends along the money, the "paper" will proceed to Eugene City. A rumor is current that a democratic paper is to be published at Oregon City with the type and press of the *Argus*. Whose claims to the U. S. Senate it is to advocate, does not appear. When the change occurs, perhaps we'll know.

Indian agents Cain, Miller and Newcomb have been visiting our city the past week.

Yours, &c., ST. PIERRE.

MISFORTUNE AND MADNESS.—The other day an unfortunate woman was taken to the station-house in San Francisco raving mad. She was at one time worth $5,000, the whole of which [illegible]

LETTER FROM LANE COUNTY.

EUGENE CITY, Feb. 8, 1860.

EDS. STATESMAN—As I have not noticed any correspondence of late in the *Statesman* from this place, I have concluded to "drap" you a few lines, to let you know that some of us are still this side "auld cloven Clootie's haunts." Our village presents a very quiet and dull aspect at present. About the usual quantities of bad whisky are consumed daily, and men swear very hard at the still harder times. But we still hope for the good time coming when the war debt is paid.

As time wears on, it is becoming painfully evident that enough and more than enough of our patriotic citizens are willing to leave home and all its endearments, and make great personal sacrifices for the purpose of serving the dear people, by accepting at their hands the various offices to be filled at the ensuing June election. The good people of Lane county certainly will not require all these sacrifices——of some of the aspirants, at least.

Powell and Clark, who broke into the store of Mr. Dunn, at Springfield, in this county, and recently convicted of grand larceny at a special term of the Dist. Court, and sentenced by Judge Stratton to three years confinement in the penitentiary, took French leave on the night of the 27th ult. A hole was made through the outer wall of the jail, sufficiently large to admit two persons at a time, and the locks were broken from the cells—all doubtless the work of outsiders; since which time nothing has been heard of the fugitives. They are hard customers. A reward of two hundred dollars is offered for them by Sheriff McCabe. The walls of our jail are flimsy concerns, and afford little or no resistance to men operating from the outside. But the people's money has been paid for the jail, and we have the consoling reflection left us that we are not in debt on the building;—it is bad enough to have such a jail. By the way, I suppose those fine shade trees near the jail were cut down to prevent their leaves from falling on the roof, and thus causing it to decay—"perhaps."

That press and materials for the *Herald* have not yet "arriv," but are expected by the next boat, when the river rises. Gigantic preparations are being made on all sides for the issue of that journal which is to *herald* to the world the sentiments of the simon pure Democracy of old Lane—not old Jo., but Lane county; and you need not be surprised if the issue of the *Herald* is signalized by some demonstration of nature—perhaps a snow storm.

We indulge in the hope that the *Herald* will be a consistent advocate of the claims of Eugene City to public favor; as Bro. Pengra's sympathy for the imaginary sufferings of the "culled" race prevents him from noticing any thing else.

We have got tired of waiting for Congress to organize, and have organized a Congress of our own. Already we have notice of the introduction of several bills; among them one for the payment of the Oregon war debt—but you needn't say any thing about this as it might injure that patriotic enterprise of Duncan, Sherman & Co.

Yours truly, ****

EUGENE CITY, Feb. 11, 1860.

Since writing the foregoing, Powell and Clark have been recaptured. They were taken at the house of the Rev. Mr. Henderson, two miles above town, night before last. On last night, about 10 o'clock, a row occurred at our jail, in which six men were wounded, none, however, seriously, and one of the guard stationed on the outside of the jail shot himself through the foot.

The origin of the difficulty, as near as I can learn, is about as follows: for some days a report has been in circulation about town, which implicated three of our most respectable citizens as being the individuals who assisted Powell and Clark in their escape some two weeks since. This statement was made by Shirley, who is confined in jail awaiting his trial at the spring term of Court. It is said the same statement has been made by Clark since taken. On last evening, a crowd of men proceeded to the jail, for the purpose of extorting the truth from Clark and Shirley in regard to the report. A scuffle ensued in which these men were wounded by Shirley, who used a small pocket knife, the blade of which was broken. The names of the individuals wounded are as follows: Jos. Teal, Dr. Ramsay, Frank Coleman, —— Swearengen, —— Fox and W. Wilson. The guard who shot himself is George Collins. There was some excitement on the street this morning, but all is quiet now.

****

OFFICE-HOLDERS AND POLITICS.

A letter received by last mail, from a sturdy democrat, contains the following:

"Delusion takes ground, in his *powerful* sheet, similar to that taken by the San Francisco *National*—the Custom House organ—viz: that officers elected by the people ought not to meddle with politics, election of U. S. Senators, &c., &c. Collector Washington, in his paper, the San Francisco *National*, lamented that Gov. Latham should undertake to exert any influence in the election of a Senator to succeed Broderick. It was in horrible bad taste for a Governor, elected by the popular vote, to meddle with the election of a U. S. Senator by the State Legislature. The Governor of the State, and other officers who owe their position to the direct votes of the people, ought to leave the Legislature to the control of the Federal appointees, the Collectors of Customs, Indian Agents, &c.

"So Delusion thinks our Judges, whom the people have elected, ought not to trouble themselves about the selection of Senators, but should leave all such matters to such Federal office-holders, appointed by the President, as Jo. Lane sees fit to place in power in Oregon. Delusion gave his sanction and consent to the election of U. S. Dist. Judge Deady, at the Eugene Convention, as a delegate to Charleston, with instructions to vote for Lane; but Judges Stratton and Boise must confine their action to the courts.

"I see that the bills to pay the Oregon war debt, and to increase Judge Deady's salary, were both introduced by old "God bless you" on the same day. As the Judge has no war scrip, old Jo. seems determined that he shall have the expectation of something in lieu of it. Both bills are of course all bunkum, and the most transparent gammon.

"I inferred from what I heard Mosher say at Eugene last fall, that Lane don't care to have Deady's bill go through; but he will comply with his promises so far as to give D. to understand that he is in earnest, and active in its support."

DOMESTIC LIFE.—He cannot be an unhappy man who has the love and smile of a woman to accompany him in every department of life. The world may look dark and cheerless without—enemies may gather in his path—but when he returns to the fireside, and feels the tender love of woman, he forgets his cares and troubles, and is a comparatively happy man. He is but half prepared for the journey of life who takes not with him that friend who will forsake him in no emergency—who will divide his sorrows, increase his joys, lift the veil from his heart, and throw sunshine amid the darkest scenes. No, that man cannot be miserable who has such a companion, be he ever so poor, despised and trodden upon by the world.

☞ The Memphis (Tenn.) *Argus*, an excellent and well conducted newspaper, independent in its politics, has come out for Territorial popular sovereignty as expounded and understood by Senator Douglas.

GEN. LANE ON THE PACIFIC RAILROAD.

General Joseph Lane, formerly of Indiana, and now of Oregon, is a candidate for the nomination at Charleston. He lives on the Pacific; he made a speech recently in the Senate, which was evidently a bid for Southern votes at Charleston. We have no fault to find with General Lane; he has a right to be President of the United States "*if he can get elected.*" Our object in referring to his candidacy is to explain a remarkable paper which we have received from Washington. It comes to us under the frank of the Hon. J. C. Burch, member of Congress from California. It is a printed circular, issued from the "office of the Pacific Railroad convention, New York city." It accompanies the proceedings of the recent Pacific Railroad convention held in the city of San Francisco, convened by the authority of the legislature of California, a memorial to the President, and a draft of a bill embodying the general features of the memorial. The circular sets forth the objects of the memorial, &c., and then says:

"To the accomplishment of this end your cooperation, aid, support, and encouragement is most earnestly desired and solicited. I shall be glad to learn your views, and to receive any advice or suggestions you may please to make on the subject, and any aid you can render by letters to the members of your Congressional district or other influential persons, will be thankfully received and duly appreciated."

The circular then gives a list of names by which the plan is indorsed, and we notice that the name "Gen. Lane," though printed in the circular, bears *four very distinct marks of the pen with ink across it.*

Now, we are for a Pacific railroad—and that, too in the shortest possible time. We regret that the representative of this Congressional district is a gentleman not *very* likely to be influenced by any letters we might write to him. But, inasmuch as any "advice or suggestions" by us will, we are assured, be "thankfully received and duly appreciated," we beg leave to suggest—that the erasure which we have mentioned of the name of General Lane is calculated to cause in our mind the apprehension that a gentleman *so distinguished as he is—does not approve the plan*; and that, though representing *a State fully as interested in the speedy construction of a railroad to the Pacific as California*, he sees in the "plan" something so violative of the constitution—of a strict construction of the constitution—that he is compelled to withhold from it his support and "endorsement." Inasmuch as General Lane *may* be the nominee of the Charleston convention; and it will be our duty, as well as our pleasure to support him for the Presidency, we do not feel prepared to give our "co-operation, aid, support, and encouragement" to a proposition from an "endorsement" of which so *brilliant a statesman* and such *a profound constitutional lawyer as General Lane* has withdrawn his name!

If our "co-operation, aid," etc., be of any value to the Pacific railroad project, we insist upon being informed whether General Lane is *for* or against the proposed "*plan*," and we suggest that the agents of the Pacific railroad convention will explain the causes *which compelled them to erase General Lane's name from the list* of endorsers of their proposed scheme. Until that is explained we must decline writing any letters to the representative of our Congressional district.—*Chicago (Ill.) Times.*

THE SOCIETY ISLANDS AND THEIR ORANGE TRADE.—Since the discovery of gold in California, a large trade in oranges has sprung up between that country and the Society Islands, where this delicious fruit grows in great profusion. Most of the oranges come from the islands of the group—Tahiti, (where the French have a garrison,) Hauhina and Roetea. About five million oranges are annually exported, for which about $7 50 per thousand is paid, delivered on board ship. The trade is in the hands of a few foreign merchants at Papute, on Tahiti, who take foreign goods in exchange for the fruit, which is gathered and brought to them by the natives. The oranges are passed down from the trees by youngsters, and gathered by the women into baskets, made of the leaves of the cocoa-nut tree, and thence to the place at which the vessel is l