

Lafayette Courier.

VOL. I. LAFAYETTE, OREGON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1866. NO. 4.

THE COURIER

ISSUED EVERY TUESDAY,
AT
LAFAYETTE,

J. H. UPTON & W. J. BOWMAN
Publishers.

J. H. UYTON : : : : : EDITOR.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

One Copy One Year, . . . \$2 50.
One Copy Six Months, . . . 1 50.

COUNTY OFFICIAL DIRECTORY.

Judge, J. W. Cowles; Commissioners, S. Bratcher, Henry Hewitt; Sheriff, L. L. Whitcomb; Clerk, S. C. Adams; Assessor, Charles Handley; Treasurer, John W. Watts; School Superintendent, Rev. John Spencer; Coroner, W. W. Brown; Surveyor, A. S. Watt.

N. T. CATON.

C. G. CURL.

CATON & CURL.

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS AT-LAW

Salem, Oregon.

Will practice in the Supreme and District Courts of Oregon.

E. C. BRADSHAW,

ATTORNEY

AND

COUNSELOR AT LAW,

SOLICITOR IN CHANCERY. WILL practice in the District and Supreme Courts of Oregon. Taxes Paid, Collections Made, and Proceeds Promptly remitted.

LAFAYETTE HOUSE

J. T. HEMBREE, : : : PRO.

KEEPS A GOOD HOUSE IN LAFAYETTE. Call on him and see.

THE COURIER

Printing

ESTABLISHMENT.

WE ARE PREPARED TO DO ALL kinds of JOB WORK at this office.

SUCH AS

BLANK DEEDS,

BONDS, MORTGAGES,

NOTES, RECEIPTS,

AND BILL HEADS;

JUSTICES', SHERIFFS' and CONSTABLES' BLANKS, &c., &c., &c.

City Market

AARON ALLEN,

WOULD ANNOUNCE TO THEIR Customers and the public generally, that they are prepared with increased facilities, to furnish

BEEF, PORK, MUTTON, VEAL, SAUS-

AGE &c., &c.,

in their various shapes and qualities None but the best and fattest stock butchered.

Give us a trial. We guarantee satisfaction. A. ALLEN. no2-9

Lafayette, January 23, 1866.

THE REASON WHY.

"Why does Kate look so pale, mother? Why are her arms so small? Why does she never smile, mother? Why do her eye-lids fall?"

Why does she walk alone, mother? As if she had no friend; Why does she sigh so oft, mother? Is she near her end?"

Why does she breathe so quick, mother? And start as if it shocked her? To hear the quick rap, mother, Of Smith, the village doctor?"

Why does he come so oft, mother? Can he prolong her days? By leaving pills and gifts, mother, And singing love-sick lays?"

'Twas but the other night, mother, When Kate lay near my heart, She urged me to be good, mother, And said we soon must part."

She said she was to go, mother, Away from home and me, And leave papa and you, mother, To dwell near by the sea.

Is it to Jordan's stormy bank, mother, Where she is to be carried?" "Shut up, shut up you little brat,— She's going to be married!"

DEATH OF THE OLDEST MAN IN THE UNITED STATES.—James McCormick, who was without doubt the oldest man in the United States, died in Newberg, N. Y., on the 11th of November, at the good old age of one hundred and fourteen years, three months and five days. He was remarkable for health and strength as for longevity, and his life was an excellent temperance argument. He was born August 6th, 1751, in the county of Cavan, Ireland. His age was accurately fixed by the fact that in the Irish Rebellion of 1798, when age became as important there as they were here during the recent draft, he was then for seven years old. In his youth he was not remarkable for anything except health and strength. He was a very early riser, often going to work before day, and coming home at night very tired he naturally sought his bed early. When a young man he lifted on one occasion a stone weighing 700 pounds. He was also quite a pedestrian in his younger days.—On one occasion he walked to Dublin from a place 86y two miles from it and the next day he walked back to the place in less than thirteen hours. If there was a fair, said he once, "within eighty miles, I went to it: for you know walking was a way we had of sailing in those days." He was not married until he was forty-five years old. He was among the last to come over, and arrived in this country in the latter part of 1815, and with the exception of three years out West, he has always lived at New Windsor.

Some of his habits were very curious.—It was the custom in his days, as well as ours, when farmers worked in the field, to take a pail of water or some other beverage along with them to quench thirst, but he once stated that no matter how hard he worked he never experienced thirst as others did. He drank very little water or any fluid, and at his meals he was accustomed to season his food so highly with salt that no one but himself could eat it; and after his meals or during it, he seldom felt the want of drink of any kind. At one time, said he, "I was a distiller without license, and although I handled the liquor like dish-water, I never indulged to please myself or to please my friends." His food during his life was coarse but healthy. He never used tea or coffee until a year before his death, and milk he particularly disliked, believing it to be unhealthy. Potatoes, corned beef and cabbage formed the principal part of his daily diet, and he seldom had anything more than simple fare. Pies and cake he very seldom ate, caring but

little for them. In his younger days he disliked tobacco very much, and could not bear the fume of it; but when he was sixty-five years old he smoked his first pipe, and became much attached to it, and in his old age he said it was a comfort that he could no more deny himself the indulgence than he could his daily food. His hearing, sense of touch, feeling and smelling were remarkable acute, his voice was strong and clear, and he conversed with wonderful ease. No signs of second childhood, or a weakness of mind could be detected.—His memory was remarkable, and by a method of association of things, time and places he would tell very nearly every incident and the time and place of its occurrence during his life. He was never sick a day, although at times he suffered with the tooth-ache. He never applied any cure, nor did he ever have a tooth drawn, but suffered them to fall out of their own accord. At the time of his death he had only four teeth left. His eyesight, for two years previous to his death, commenced to decline, and when dissolution occurred, he was almost blind. His hair never turned gray. He was a rebel in the Irish rebellion of 1798, and was wounded in the left leg. His invariable answer to the question what he thought more than anything else caused him to live so long was temperance, exercise, plain food, regular meals, and regular hours in going to bed and getting up.

FIRST AMERICAN NEWSPAPERS.—When we look over the United States and contemplate the vast number of newspapers and periodicals, daily, weekly and monthly, and some of them two and three times a day, we can hardly realize the fact that it is but a little over a hundred years since the first newspaper of any kind on the American continent was started, and but little over half that time since the commencement of the first daily. But such is the fact. The 24th of April, 1765, was the first newspaper in the English language in the North American continent. This was the Boston News Letter—a small half-sheet, printed on piecemeal. It was a weekly newspaper, published by John Campbell, a Scotchman, who was a bookseller and a postmaster. The contents of the first number were "the queen's speech in the English Parliament, a few local articles under the Boston head, one advertisement, extracts from the London papers and four paragraphs of main news." Advertisements were inserted "at reasonable rates from two pence to five shillings." In 1721, James Franklin established a newspaper in Boston. The paper was severely critical withal, somewhat hostile to the clergy. It became unpopular, was censured and imprisoned for scandalous libel. James Franklin was strictly forbidden to issue the New England Courant without a "censorium," etc. He evaded this order of suppression by substituting his brother's name for his own. The Courant lived three years. The American Weekly Mercury of Philadelphia, issued in 1722, was the third newspaper printed in the colonies. It was made up of quaint advertisements and short paragraphs of antique news. The Pennsylvania Gazette, edited by Dr. Franklin, and published in 1759, was the next step toward journalism. In its prospectus, Franklin announces his intention to make a good readable journal, and in his ideas it is easy to see that he was far in advance for his contemporaries. His paper consisted of four small pages, and the subscription was ten shillings a year. In 1785 Thomas Fleet established the Boston Evening Post. Fleet was born in England, and learned his trade there.—He once advertised a negro woman for sale, as follows: "To be sold by the printer of this paper, the very best negro woman in town. She has had the small-pox and measles; is as hearty as a horse, as brisk as a bird, and will work like a beaver. Fleet was a humorous fellow, and made money out of his paper. The Pennsylvania Journal and Weekly Advertiser was started about 1760. At about the time of the Stamp Act, in 1765, the paper came out in mourning, with the motto: "The times are dreadful, dismal, dismal, dolorous, and dollarless." There was also a death head in one corner of the paper and under it these words: "Oh! the fatal stamp." A journal called the New York Gazette flourished a little while in 1771. It was remarkable in particular. The first daily in the United States, the Pennsylvania Packet, afterwards called the Daily Advertiser, was started in 1795 in Philadelphia.

These were the first attempts at American journalism, and, as such, are alone worthy of mention. Soon after the advent of the daily newspaper the idea of collating and digesting the news became more and more comprehensive, and from the beginning of the present century up to the present time, the American newspapers have grown steadily and rapidly, until it now represents the whole world, and is "greater than the throne" itself. Its number is almost countless, and its power for good or evil beyond calculation.—[True Flag.]

[From the Old Guard.]

Authors of the Federalist "Copperheads."

All who believe in State sovereignty, in the subordination of the federal government to the restrictions imposed upon it by the constitution, and in the rights of the States to protect their own institutions and laws from any and every aggression whatever, even from the federal government, are called "Copperheads." Taking this definition, it would be easy to show that all the leading statesmen of our country, from the foundation of the union down to the election of Lincoln, were "Copperheads." But our present purpose is to show that the writers of the Federalist, Hamilton and Madison especially, were "Copperheads." On the questions debated the federalist may be considered as the very highest authority, next to the Constitution itself. Indeed, the work is a commentary upon the Constitution, written by the framers of the instrument for the purpose of procuring its adoption by the States. In this work Alexander Hamilton, who was of all the men of that time, most favorable to a strong federal government, pointed out the impolicy and the crime of any attempt on the part of the General Government to coerce the States by the powers of war. In one of his letters to the people of New York, he says:

"This exceptional principle, (allowing the federal government to coerce the States as States,) may as truly as emphatically be styled the parent of anarchy. It has been seen that delinquencies in the members of the union are its natural and necessary offspring; and that whenever they happen, the only constitutional remedy is force, and the immediate effect of the use of it, civil war. It remains to inquire how far so doing an engine of government, in its application to us, would even be capable of answering its end. If there should not be a large army constantly at the disposal of the National Government, it would either not be able to employ force at all, or when this could be done, it would amount to a war between parts of the confederacy, concerning the infractions of a league, in which the strongest combination would be most likely to prevail, whether it consisted of those who supported or those who resisted the general authority.—It would rarely happen that the delinquencies to be redressed would be confined to a single member, and if there were more than one who had neglected their duty similarity of situation would induce them to unite for common defense. Independent of this motive of sympathy, if a large and influential State should happen to be the aggressive member, it would commonly have weight enough with its neighbors to win over some of them as associates to its cause. * * * If associates could not be found at home, recourse would be had to the aid of foreign powers who would seldom be disinclined to encourage the discussions of a confederacy,

from the firm union of which they had so much to fear. When the sword is once drawn, the passions of men observe no bounds of moderation. The suggestions of wounded pride, the instigations irritated resentments, would be apt to carry the States against which arms of the union were exerted, to any extremes necessary to avenge the affront, or to avoid the disgrace of submission. The first war of this kind would probably terminate in a dissolution of the union. This may be considered as the violent death of the confederacy. * * * It seems to require no pains to prove that the States ought not to prefer a national constitution, which could only be kept in motion by the instrumentality of a large standing army, continually on foot to execute the ordinary requirements or decrees of the government. Such a scheme, if practicable, would instantly degenerate into a military despotism; but it would be found in every light impracticable. * * * Even in those confederacies which have been composed of members smaller than many of our counties, the principle of legislation for sovereign States, supported by military coercion, has never been found effective. It has rarely been attempted to be employed but against the weaker members; and in most instances attempts to coerce the refractory and disobedient have been the signals of bloody wars, in which one half of the confederacy has displayed its banners against the other half."—[Federalist, No. XVI.]

In the Constitutional Convention of the State of New York, Mr. Hamilton spoke at length on the unreasonableness of the States entertaining fears that the federal government would ever attempt to use military force against the States as political communities. He said: "The States can never lose their powers till the whole people of America are robbed of their liberties. These must go together; they must support each other, or meet a common fate."

Could Alex. Hamilton have come back to this world any time during the administration of Abraham Lincoln, and repeated the words he addressed to the people of New York, to persuade them to adopt the federal constitution, he would have been seized and plunged into a loathsome bastille as a "Copperhead" and a "sympathizer with rebellion." The editor of the magazine had hard work to keep out of prison for saying things even less condemnatory of the crime of state coercion by military power. We had upon our track not only all the war-hounds of the republican party, but also thousands of Lincolnized democrats and ignoramuses, who were oblivious of every sentiment and principle of government established here by our fathers. But why do we bring forth this language of Hamilton now, when it is claimed that the war is ended? Simply to vindicate a grand principle of freedom, and of the federal union, which was thrown down by the war, and which must be set up again before the union can be restored. There is a party of pure-minded men and patriots yet left, who are for "the Union as it was, and the Constitution as it is." Indeed all who are not so are impostors, traitors, and revolutionists. And there can be no restoration of the union until the despotic principle on which the war was based is abandoned. The blatant joy of these ignoramuses who tell us the union is restored, is senseless.—Not only is the union not yet restored, but the foundation on which it was built is destroyed. It was built upon the grand principle of consent—it can never be brought back upon any other. An involuntary system of government can bear no likeness to the old union. The system of force is the one our fathers nobly resisted and overthrew in this country, when they laid the foundations of the glorious union, which would have stood, in all its beauty and glory to-day, but for the fell spirit of abolitionism. We cannot restore to life the hundreds of thousands of brave men slain in the negro-equalizing war; but all else which that war has done must be obliterated, before the union can be restored. Especially must the principles of government which the war produced be abandoned. To this

[Continued next issue.]