

This could not be, because the first wheat grown in Or. was by Dr. McLaughlin in 1826

WILLAMETTE FARMER

VOL. XV.

SALEM, OREGON, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1884.

NO. 51.

Correspondence.

BARROWS' BOOK.

PRINEVILLE, Or., Jan. 4, 1884.

Editor Willamette Farmer.
In the Pacific Christian Advocate of December 13th, the editor gives a criticism on Oregon by William Barrows. Although I make no claim to "great literary ability," yet I wish to notice a few points in Bro. Hines' article.

In the first place he seems to think there has not been prominence enough given to the Methodist Mission, founded by Jason Lee. Now, while I would give all honor due to the worthy members of that mission, I unhesitatingly aver that up to the time of the immigration of 1842-3-4 they never entertained an idea of American colonization on the North Pacific Coast. The evidence of this is the fact that Mr. Lee was a Canadian and had no interest in the country beyond his missionary enterprise; that he made no attempt to bring families across the mountains, but brought all his supplies and reinforcements by water. When Rev. Sam'l Parker visited the mission in 1835 he said of it: "This mission may lay the foundation for extensive usefulness. Yet there is one important desideratum—these missionaries have no wives. Christian women are very much needed to exert a Christian influence over the native women." Here was lacking the very elements of permanent American colonization. Now observe the thorough American missionary who is going to a distant part of his country: Dr. Whitman, a New Yorker, come out, he looks at the country, takes in the possibilities of the future, lays his plans, returns and brings out his family, stock and a wagon—not around the Horn but across the continent—thus blazing the route for others to follow.

Again, he says: "The first plow that broke the crust of the old barbarism came out of the hold of the May Dacre in October, 1834, and Jason Lee walked between the handles as it cleft asunder the soil of the Willamette prairie for the handful of corn that was to give bread to civilization." This may be true of barbarism, but not of the sod of the Willamette prairie. In the year 1845 John Minto and Henry Williamson harvested for Joseph Gervais, on his farm about two miles below the old Methodist mission, and he told that this was the "twenty fifth crop" that he had gathered from his farm, and that he had never known the wheat crop to fail." Now this certainly antedates the breaking of the soil by Jason Lee in 1834. Dr. McLaughlin in 1826 sowed wheat, oats and barley at Fort Vancouver, and he says in 1828 the supply was sufficient so that we were able to dispense with imported flour. (Report Pioneer Society for 1880.) An old pioneer, who came in 1843, in speaking of the Methodist mission says: "My observation was that they were not the sort of people who explore and develop the resources of a country. From my own acquaintance with them I can say that coming from the extreme East they were sectional in their sentiments and had no sympathy for the rough, warmhearted element that composed the early immigration. In fact, had a decided aversion to anything western. They came here as missionaries, just as they would have gone to any foreign country. They did not realize that they were still under the stars and stripes."

Again, Bro. Hines says: "These influences, without doubt, did more to save Oregon than any other influence that was or could be exerted. This is evident from the fact that Oregon was saved long before Dr. Whitman reached Washington." I am astonished that a man as well informed as Bro. Hines ought to be, should make such an assertion, but like many others he is laboring under the delusion that the Oregon question was settled when the Ashburton treaty was ratified. Now the facts in the case

are these: The Ashburton treaty settled the boundary line between Maine and Canada, but said nothing about Oregon. Benton, in Vol. 2, chapter 101, page 421, of Thirty Years in United States Senate, says: "Oregon was in dispute. The United States wished it settled. Great Britain wished that question to remain as it was; as she had possession and every day was ripening her title. Oregon was adjourned." This, remember, was in 1842. Gov. Simpson, being fully alive to the interests of his government, went to Washington that he might by his personal efforts have the Oregon question settled in Great Britain's favor. Dr. Whitman on the other hand being on the alert for the United States and being in constant communication with members of the Hudson Bay Company, was fully aware of the plans of this corporation, and in order to checkmate Gov. Simpson, undertook his perilous trip across the continent in the winter of 1842-3. "In September, 1842, Dr. Whitman was called to visit a patient at Old Fort Wallula. While at dinner the overland express from Canada arrived bringing news that the immigration from the Red river settlement was at Fort Colville. This news excited unusual joy among the guests. Whitman learned that these Red river English came on to settle in Oregon, and that at same time Gov. Simpson was to go to Washington and secure the settlement of the question as to the boundaries on the ground of the most numerous and permanent settlement in the country. Dr. Whitman with his characteristic shrewdness comprehended his intention and plainly saw that he (Gov. S.) must be fought with his own weapons. In order to do this an immigration of Americans must be brought over the Rocky mountains and the country represented at Washington by some American residing in it. Without hesitation he undertook the arduous task. The result is well known. He had brought a wagon through to Fort Boise in 1836 and had carefully viewed the way to The Dalles and was confident that teams and families could make the trip. In 1841, wagons had been brought across the Blue mountains from Fort Hall by Joe Meek and company to the Columbia, and Dr. Whitman knew that "what man had done man could do." The fact of Dr. Whitman's reaching Washington has never been denied. As to what passed between him and President Tyler and Secretary Webster, we have the testimony of A. L. Lovejoy, W. H. Gray and others, who received the account from the Doctor's own lips. But his main object in going East was to bring an emigration. I have been personally acquainted with persons who came in 1843 and they told me that it was the circulars and information which Dr. Whitman circulated that induced them to come to Oregon. He marked the route and guided them over. So well known was this fact in the Western States that Whitman and Oregon were the watchwords of the emigration of 1844, the year in which the writer came. These immigrants were not from the East, but from Missouri and the border States, where the influence of the Methodist missionaries had never been felt. But the Doctor had repeatedly passed through this section and by his representations roused the spirits of those hardy pioneers who bravely followed him, and planted the stars and stripes on the shores of the Pacific forever and aided in crushing the great monopoly. The reader will bear in mind that the heads of the American government were indifferent to the Oregon question. To them it possessed little if any importance as Benton says in Chapter 113, vol. 2: "The great event of carrying the Anglo-Saxon race to the shores of the Pacific ocean, and planting that race firmly on that sea, took place at this time, beginning in 1842 and greatly increasing in 1843. It was not the act of the government leading the people and protecting

them, but like all the other emigration's settlements on our continent, it was the act of the people going forward without aid or countenance, establishing their possession and compelling the government to follow with its shield and spread it over them. So far as the action of the government was concerned, it operated to endanger our title to the Columbia; to prevent emigrants and incur the loss of the country. The first great step in this unfortunate direction was the treaty of joint occupation, as it was called, in 1818." * * * * *

If the brother will carefully read the above author he will find that the heads of the government opposed Mr. Linn's bill as being impracticable, as the country was too remote and inaccessible to be of any benefit to the government and that instead of Oregon being saved before Dr. Whitman reached Washington in 1843, the treaty was not signed until June 15, 1846. What saved Oregon was the vast emigration of American citizens across the Rocky Mountains. In view of these facts we can plainly see that the men of great literary attainments might have written until their pens dropped from their palsied fingers and not have affected anything. There was not a man in the Methodist Mission that could have accomplished what Dr. Whitman did, and he seems to have been raised up by God for this especial purpose. Another thing: England did not ask for the Willamette valley, she wanted the Columbia for her southern boundary, claiming it by the right of discovery. Rev. Samuel Parker mentions this in his journal, chapter 18, page 265. While Oregon owes the foundation of her educational interests to the Methodist Mission, and we are willing that they should bear the palm in that respect, Brother Hines assumes a "jeetle" too much when he says they saved Oregon, and he should not let his sectarian pique blind him to the facts of history. AN OLD PIONEER.

Small Farms—Is there More Money in Them?

ROSEBURG, Jan. 24, 1884.

Editor Willamette Farmer:
I frequently see in the papers articles setting forth the advantage of running small farms and advising those who own large tracts of land to sell off a portion and try it on a small scale. These writers propose a rule for farming that would apply to any other business. The publisher of a big paper is not told to reduce his sheet to a 7x9 size; the manufacturer of the wagon or plow is not told that he can make one wagon or plow at a less proportionate cost than a hundred; for it is well known that the reverse is the case. There is no product of the garden but that can be raised more cheaply in large quantities than in small. But before this question is discussed, the advocates of small farms should agree, which I fancy they never will do, what is the proper size for a farm. My opinion is that while five acres are too much for some men, five hundred are not enough for others. That success depends to some extent on the size of the farmer as well as the farm. I am not opposed to anyone owning a little piece of land if he cannot get more; for it is better to take almost any spot of ground that he can call his own, and where he can employ himself, than to rent land and work for others as many do with frequent wanderings from place to place without aim or purpose. But I am writing against the absurd notion that there is more profit in a small farm than a large one.

Some tell us that small farming works well in the Eastern States, but the reasons given are a little contradictory. For instance, they use more system and work a great deal harder than we do in Oregon. More labor as the result of more system. That on small farms they raise heavier crops, which double the value of land, and yet taxes are light. The truth of the matter is that the more valuable land or other property becomes the heavier the tax. Now the fact is the small farmer, (sup-

posing the farm to be ten or twelve acres) has to work under many disadvantages. He cannot afford to keep the improved machinery to raise most crops successfully. He cannot afford to keep a self-binder and thresher to harvest five acres of grain, yet he must have bread. He cannot afford to keep a mower and horse-rake to mow and rake two acres of grass, yet his stock must have hay, and consequently he is compelled to depend on the slow and tedious process of hand labor. He cannot give steady work to his team, yet he is forced to keep one. He loses time in buying and selling things by small quantities. He must have more rods of fence in proportion to the number of acres owned, and more ground used by roads, buildings and other fixtures; and has more nooks and corners for weeds to grow. He has to do nearly all his work by hand and has a hard row to hoe. These objections, and more, I have heard expressed by small farmers in the Eastern States. The idea is advanced by some that the hard labor and close economy incident to small farming tend to physical and moral development; that leisure tends to discontent and lawlessness. Such ideas may do for the theorist and non-worker, who are about as likely to practice what they preach as the doctor is to take his own prescription; and are striving to make their pathway more smooth and pleasant.

It has been proposed by others that land should be held in small tracts in order that all persons may be able to share, which they could not otherwise do, and our country is advised to adopt the plan of Russia, where it is said the land is distributed among the peasantry as their supposed needs require, the government retaining the title. That plan may be serfdom, but I trust the great American Union will never have occasion to borrow its laws from despotic Russia. No limited ownership of land would satisfy the free citizen. He must know just what is his, have full control of the same, and then he would have full scope for all his energies. There was the same complaint of land twenty years ago as we hear now; yet every man of sense knows that there was plenty of good government land then, and there is plenty even now. But every one don't want land. It is not land that keeps the hundreds of men hanging around barrooms and billiard tables in Portland. No indeed. Land is something they don't want while they can enjoy the alluring dissipations of the town. They are not hankering after a bit of prairie land in Eastern Washington, where long years hence they may reap the reward of present self-denial and deprivation. Then if one man is ready to take the chances of hunger and rags in his old age, for present gratification, who shall say that another, who is willing to go out into the wilderness and make it blossom as the rose, shall not have all the land he can pay for, as the reward of his industry and patience. C. W. SMITH.

More Tax Logic.

FOLK CO., Or., Jan. 24, 1884.

Editor Willamette Farmer:
We are glad to see the improvement of the FARMER. Its columns are well filled up with correspondence, especially on the famous "Mortgage Tax question" now before the people for consideration. We will remark, that the farmers of this county are forming clubs, where the above law, and all other political questions, will receive a thorough ventilation by the farmers themselves. In our view, most of the writers on the tax question, only write of the effects of the law and say nothing of the principle of taxation. The principle of taxation is the power of sovereignty, hence if we as a State or Nation, cannot tax foreign corporations we are not a sovereign power, and we are inclined to think that, no court in the United States, will assert that we have not the power to tax foreign corporations. Allow us to remark here, that a writer in the FARMER of the 11th of January, has some strange ideas

on the principle of taxation, but as he signs with three stars, I presume he is a capitalist instead of a farmer. Brother farmers what are we laboring for? Is not the ultimate design of our labor, money? Do not notes and accounts represent money, and is money not the best of property a man can have? Then why do people talk of not taxing invisible property? Because they desire to lay the burden of taxation on the farmers. Another idea is set forth by those writers, that is this, trying to tax notes and accounts causes people to commit perjury. Oh, yes! Moses made a great blunder, no doubt, when he promulgated that law at Mount Sinai, "thou shalt not commit perjury," at least some men seem to think so. But perhaps a way might be found yet, to keep those men from committing perjury; and still tax notes and accounts. Some time back, a writer in the Dallas Itemizer, suggested that the present laws ought to be amended, so as to compel such persons assessed, to sign his name, in full, to the printed oath or affirmation of his assessment list, because, as he says, a man who will tell a lie will not hesitate to swear to it, but he will hardly sign his name to a falsehood, for it would be too dangerous. There is evidently a wide difference between the Assessor swearing a person to his list of assessment, or the person signing his name to the oath of his assessment list.

As to the talk, of not taking out a person's indebtedness, it is all nonsense, for we remember that the supreme court of this State, decided that all indebtedness must be taken out, by the assessor, of the list of assessment. So, I believe that settles that question.

Very Respectfully,
GEO. H. ELLERS.

Make our Rivers Navigable—An Interesting Letter from an Old Steamboatman.

CANBY, Or., Jan. 27, 1884.

Editor Willamette Farmer:
Having of late years become a farmer and still later a subscriber to your valuable paper, I feel that I would like to say something, if perchance it might in any way tend to bring about or be the means of helping to bring about, some competition in the transportation business of the Willamette valley in particular.

I will preface what I would say on the subject, by stating that I have been a steamboatman for the last thirty years, twenty-three of which was on the Ohio, Mississippi and their tributaries, the remaining seven on the Willamette and Columbia rivers. In all my experience I have never known or heard of a company being allowed to place a tax of fifty cents per ton on all freights and ten cents per head on all passengers passing a given point on a navigable river till I came to Oregon and found it to be the case on the Willamette river.

Now, this is virtually laying an embargo on the business of the river from Eugene to Portland, by the companies tax imposed at the locks, all independent boats are virtually shut out of the river and the bulk of the business driven to the railroads of said companies. The company by the aid of the tax at the locks are enabled, and such was the case when I came to Oregon, in 1877, to put the rate on freights and passengers so low that independent boats could not make a living after paying said tax, and they continued the above policy till all independent boats were driven off the river, now what do we find to be the case. Freights are put up to over one hundred per cent, especially on the majority of people who do not have ten tons or over to ship at one time. Who is to blame for this state of affairs, the people's representatives in Congress or the people themselves? I think if our Representatives had properly brought this matter before Congress the difficulty would long since have been remedied by the government condemning, and paying for and making free said locks for the proper use of transportation on the

Willamette river, as was done in the case of the Louisville and Portland canal around the falls of the Ohio river at Louisville, Kentucky. When I first steambated, the tax at the last named locks was twenty-five cents per ton, passengers free. The government condemned them and put the tax at ten cents per ton for a year or two, but finally made them free, and so they remain. So the locks around the rapids on the Mississippi river are free also, enabling all men, who feel so disposed, to put on boats and compete for honorable business; why not on the Willamette? Echo answers, why? Because a corporation wishes to monopolize not only the carrying business of the Willamette river and valley, but the whole northwest coast, also, why not let them sell all the dry goods and groceries one is just as fair as the other. In reading over an article in the issue of the 25th, entitled "A Pleasant Meeting of the Salem Grange," I notice the matter of co-operation was pleasantly, and I hope profitably, discussed. Though not a Granger myself, yet I feel a growing interest in all their proceedings as far as I understand them, for I am sure they are driving at honorable ends, and have the good of the whole country at heart. Now, while on the subject of co-operation and transportation, do not let the matter drop with a passing notice, but keep the ball rolling, compel our Representatives to do their duty by urging the government to take notice of the matter and see that all navigable rivers are made free to the people. Let petitions be circulated by every Grange through every neighborhood till all the people sign it, and send it to our agents or Representatives in Congress; and see that corporations as well as individuals are kept within their own proper sphere. Do not sit with folded hands and see designing men bind you hand and foot as has been going on for several years past. Let corporations build railroads and steamboats and run them, but do not permit them to prohibit others from doing so likewise. This is a supposed free country, and let us see to it that it is one in deed as well as name. There is much more that might be said, but till some one else takes up the cue I will drop the subject.

While the mortgage tax law is being so extensively discussed let all our interests receive a like notice. This is a particularly favorable time to bring the matter before Congress, while the revenues are so much in excess of the country's needs, and Congressmen are worrying as to what shall be done with the surplus. Do not let them say as one of old, that they will have to build greater barns wherein to stow their goods till this matter is attended to, till the beautiful Willamette is made a free navigable river as the lovers of the country say it shall be. And that no State or individual shall lay an embargo on the business of any navigable river within the United States.

JNO. P. COULTER.

Fir and Cedar Posts.

SALEM, Or., Jan. 24, 1884.

Editor Willamette Farmer:
In the fall of 1881 I built a piece of post and board fence on the flat sixty rods west of the Inside asylum, the posts are fir, the fence still stands there although the wind blew a part of it over this week, the posts being rotted off. I noticed some of the post were rotted off two years ago. In the year 1874 having occasion to build a considerable board fence on my own place, and having been told that cedar posts would last "forever" I thought it would be best to get cedar, so went to Cedar Camp, thirty miles from here, cut and split them myself that I might get none but what were good, and drew them home. Set them in the ground that summer, fall and winter. Now, after standing in the ground nine years, quite a number of them are rotted completely off, and some thus rotted are from the heart of tree, having no sap in them.

DEXTER FIELD.