

TERMS FOR CLUBS:

Five copies, one year, \$13.75; Ten copies one year, \$25.00, and for any greater number at \$2.50 per annum.

Subscription must be paid strictly in advance.

New Goods—Cheap GOODS.

J. H. LEWIS

IS prepared to exhibit an excellent and carefully selected stock of

Dry Goods, Groceries, Hardware, Cutlery, Clothing, Nails.

BOOTS & SHOES.

And in fact everything in the line of

STAPLE and FANCY GOODS

usually kept in a retail Store will be found on hand and for sale as CHEAP as the CHEAPEST.

NEW GOODS! NEW GOODS!

I have just received and now opened a new and fresh stock of Spring and Summer GOODS all

Grades, Kinds, Styles, and Varieties.

Well adapted to this trade both as to price and quality. To those desiring to purchase a Spring supply, I will invite your attention, as I am determined to adapt the prices to suit the present HARD TIMES, and I ask you before purchasing to call at the

OLDBRICK CORNER.

And examine for yourselves. PRINTS at 12 1/2 cents per yard. Good quality four fourths BROWN CABOTS & SHERTINGS 16 cents. COFFEE by the sack 23 cents per pound, retail 25 cents, and all other things in proportion. Come and examine and be satisfied.

J. W. C. BELL.

NEW COLUMBIAN HOTEL.

Main St., Corvallis, Oregon.

E. S. Altree, : : Prop'r.

Board and Lodging on reasonable terms. Meals at all hours.

J. K. LERO.

PRACTICAL BARBER and HAIR DRESSER.

Independence, Oregon.

M. CANTERBURY, M. D.

PHYSICIAN & SURGEON.

DIXIE, OREGON.

Medical Examiner for Manhattan Life Insurance Co. of N. Y.

WOOL! WOOL! WOOL!!

50,000 Pounds of WOOL wanted for MITCHEL & ROSENDOFF'S, INDEPENDENCE, who have the Agency for California, will pay a higher Cash price for it than any other house in the county. MITCHEL & ROSENDOFF, smd

JONES THE JEWELER.

State Street, Salem, Oregon. It is the place to go and get your watches, clocks and jewelry repaired in good style. I warrant all my work for one year; if it is not right, I make it right.

REMEMBER THE SHOP IN THE POST OFFICE BUILDING. N. B. Fine watches repaired with the greatest care.

Dr. W. D. JEFFRIES.

PHYSICIAN. & SURGEON.

EOLA, OREGON.

Special attention given to Obstetrics and diseases of women.

McCaulley & Alexander, DENTISTS.

OFFICE on State street, over Gills' Book Store, Salem, Oregon. All operations performed by us are warranted to give satisfaction.

One of the firm may be found in our office from 8 o'clock a. m. until 4 p. m. of each day. S. D. McCAULEY, E. V. H. ALEXANDER.

WATSON & GRISWELL, Architects and Practical

HOUSE CARPENTERS,

INDEPENDENCE OREGON.

Will take Contracts for Building Houses of every description and kind, in town and country. Satisfaction guaranteed. 54

The Polk County Signal.

VOL. I.

DALLAS, OREGON, MONDAY, AUGUST 31, 1863.

NO. 24.

The Grand Jury

We give below some of the expense of the Grand Jury of this county for the last three terms.

APRIL TERM, 1867.

Table with 2 columns: Item, Amount. Includes Sheriff's fees for summoning grand jury, Grand Juror's fees, Sheriff for subpoenaing witnesses, Clerk's fees on subpoenas, Pros. Atty's fees for attendance upon, Bailiff's fees, Total \$191 10.

NOV. TERM, 1867.

Table with 2 columns: Item, Amount. Includes Fees for summoning, about \$15 00, of Grand Jurors, 97 21, Sheriff on subpoenas, 121 78, Clerk " " 12 00, Pros. Atty. attendance on 30 00, Bailiff 18 00, Total for 1867 \$263 98.

APRIL TERM 1868.

Table with 2 columns: Item, Amount. Includes Fees for summoning, about \$15 00, of Grand Jurors, 83 69, Sheriff on subpoenas, 81 95, Clerk " " 16 80, Pros. Atty. attendance on 25 00, Bailiff 15 00, Total for three terms \$622 43.

This is not all: There is the expense on the many indictments found upon which no convictions are had. Probably one indictment in ten is sustained while the others are dismissed or the accused acquitted; and on each, the Prosecuting Atty. gets his fee, the Court is encumbered and delayed, witnesses and jurors are kept in attendance, and have to be paid. We will give one very mild case: At the last term a worthy citizen was indicted for "hog stealing"—the hog, mistakenly alleged to have been stolen by him, was worth perhaps \$3.00. He was arrested here, at Court, so there were no travelling fees—he was tried at once, and acquitted, and the county paid:

Table with 2 columns: Item, Amount. Includes Witness fees 33 00, Jury " 12 00, Clerk's " 10 20, Sheriff's " 27 65, Bailiff's " 3 00, Pros. Atty's " 10 00, Total \$95 85.

This was a case in which there was but little traveling of officers, and no delays; there are many cases of no greater foundation or importance, that have cost the county from \$5.00 to \$2000.00 dollars, and "that's the way the money goes." Is there no remedy?

Signs of the Times.

There are already many assurances of victory for the Union Democratic and Constitutional Principles candidates the approaching November.

First: The Democratic party are united, and the accessions to the party are very marked and influential.

Second: The country is weary of war and conflict in a time of peace.—The country prays for rest, and the people for that peace and quiet which never can be obtained so long as the Republican party are in power.

Third: The only sound hope for business men in the future, and for the full restoration of the Union, is in the success of the New York nominations.

Fourth: The Republicans are divided. They call each other hard names. Have no confidence in each other.—Have nominated their candidates on the sole ground of expediency, and have no bond of Union but the weak and miserable bond of hostility to the Democratic party.

NONE are so fond of secrets as those who do not intend to keep them; such persons covet secrets as a spendthrift covets money, for the purpose of circulation.

Where Gen. Hancock Stands.

The rumor having been given currency by some lellists, of course, that Gen. Hancock would not stand by the N. Y. nominations, that gentleman was written to on the subject by Mr. Glover, of St. Louis. The following is the General's reply. Read it:

Newport, R. I., July 17. S. T. Glover, Esq.—My Dear Sir:—I am greatly obliged for your favor of the 29th inst. Those who do not suppose that I acquiesce in the work of the National Democratic Convention, or that I do not sincerely desire the election of its nominee, know very little of my character, believing as I really do, that the preservation of the constitutional Government eminently depends on the success of the Democratic party in the coming election. Were I to hesitate in its candid support, I feel I should not only fail my own country, but commit a crime against my country. I never aspired to the Presidency on account of myself. I never sought its doubtful honor and certain labors and responsibilities, merely for the position. My own wish was to promote, if I could, the good of the country, and to rebuke the spirit of revolution which had invaded every sacred precinct of liberty. When, therefore, you pronounced the statements in question false, you did exactly right. Principles, and not men, is the motto for the rugged crisis in which we are now struggling. Had I been made the President I should have considered it a privilege, not a duty, to be in the country which I had proclaimed and practiced; but shall I cease to revere those principles because, by mutual political friends another has been appointed to put them into execution? Never, never. These, sir, are my sentiments, whatever interested parties may say to the contrary, and I desire that all may know and understand them. I shall ever hold in grateful remembrance the faithful friends who, hailing from every section of the Union, preferred me by their votes, and other expressions of confidence, both in and out of the Convention, and shall do them all justice to believe that they were governed by patriotic motives, that they did not propose simply to aggrandize my personal fortunes, but to save their country from the hands of those who would not suffer anything like personal preference, or I otherwise to stand between them and their sacred duty. I have the honor to be, dear sir, very respectfully yours, WINFIELD S. HANCOCK.

Good—Gen. Forrest was one of the Tennessee delegation to the National Democratic Convention.

Just before he was selected, he made the following sensible, just and spirited remarks:

"I come here," said he, "because I sympathize with this movement, and I have nowhere else to go. I claim that if I am not a loyal citizen of Tennessee and the United States, I ought to be; and, as evidence of the fact, I attach my fortunes to one of the great political parties of the Union offering me the fairest terms. I was not a secessionist. I voted against the secession of Tennessee. But when I went into the war I considered it was my duty to do my best, and I fought four years and lost all I had. Then I surrendered, and I did so in good faith. When I gave my parole of honor, I meant it, and kept it, and mean to keep it. I don't either want to go to the New York Convention, or not to go there. If you tell me to go I'll go. If you say stay at home, I'll be perfectly satisfied; for I know you are my friends and will do what is best. But I am not going to consider myself an outcast, or to ignore my duties as a representative man in the community in which I live. That community sent me here, and I come to do my best. The man who thinks I could go back upon myself, or my parole, or who distrusts my intentions, does not know me; and I will say that, if any foreign nation should levy war on the United States, I will engage to get up a bigger and better fighting command out of my gray jackets to serve under the old flag, than any Radical in America."

THE RESULT.—The wires yesterday brought the news that the Democratic Convention, assembled in New York, has nominated Ex-Gov. Horatio Seymour, of New York, for President, and General Frank P. Blair, of Missouri, for Vice President. The ticket is received by our Democratic fellow-citizens with a great deal of enthusiasm, although they did expect to see one of their own State receive the honor of the nomination. Both the nominees are creditable alike to the party and to the country and men of their stamp should be selected for the votes of the people. Their records as legislators and statesmen are honorable in the highest degree, and above reproach.—In regard to the particular faith they hold in antagonism with Grant and Colfax, we hold that each freeman and voter will judge for himself and vote accordingly.—Reading (Pa.) Times, Repub. July 9.

A man advertises for a "competent person to undertake the sale of a new medicine," and adds that "it will be profitable to the undertaker."

Was General Grant a Cotton Speculator?

We suppose it will not be disputed that when a man consents to be a candidate for the highest office in the Government, he thereby challenges a thorough scrutiny into his public and private character. If he is fit for that great position, his character will command more esteem the better it becomes known; it will be made to shine with new lustre by all the attention which it is subjected. But if there be anything in his history which he has an interest in concealing, he gives his countrymen a right to know it in all its particulars, when he asks them to elevate him to the chief post of honor in the Government.

We find in a Western paper what purports to be a transcript from the records of the Superior Court of Cincinnati. It bears such strong internal marks of genuineness that we cannot doubt that it is truly copied, and if so, it deserves all the prominence which we purpose to give it. If the friends of General Grant can prove it a forgery, we will give equal prominence to the exposure; for, although we depreciate his election, we do not wish to see him degraded. But this matter is too serious to pass unnoticed, and if his friends shall slur over or ignore it, we shall assume that they have no defense to make, and that the alleged facts are true.

In the Winter of 1862-3 General Grant was commanding in the most productive cotton region of the Southwest, and it appears from the judicial record, which we will presently insert, that his father, Jesse R. Grant, was at that time a secret partner in a cotton speculation which was transacted within General Grant's military lines. Without investing any capital, this Jesse R. Grant, the father of the General, formed a partnership with a business firm in Cincinnati for procuring cotton within General Grant's military lines and transporting it thence to the Northern market; and this secret partner was to render services of some kind which would entitle him to one fourth of the net profits of the adventure, although he supplied no money, and bore no part of the risk of what must have been regarded as a hazardous undertaking.—It appears that the service which he stipulated to perform was to procure at the headquarters of General Grant, his son, a permit to buy cotton and facilities for its transportation. The undertaking proved lucrative. So large an amount of cotton was procured and brought off that the net profits amounted to more than \$40,000, and the public would probably have never known anything of the Grant family's complicity, if the firm which furnished the capital had not refused to pay over the stipulated share of the profits. Jesse R. Grant brought a suit in the Cincinnati Courts to recover his share, and by this means the facts have come to light. We copy the record as we find it.

SUPERIOR COURT.

General Term—Jesse R. Grant vs. Mack Brothers. Judge Handley delivered the opinion. The case was reserved from special term on demurrer to the petition. The action was instituted for the settlement of a partnership account.

The plaintiff avers that in December, 1862, he entered into a copartnership with defendants for the purchase of cotton in the military department of U. S. Grant; the condition of the agreement that defendants were to furnish the capital and the men to purchase and ship the cotton, and the plaintiff to procure at headquarters of General Grant a permit to purchase it, secure transportation, and such other facilities as might be consistent with the usages and interests of the army.—The plaintiff was to receive one-fourth share of the net profits of sales after deducting from gross proceeds the necessary expenses. The petition further states that there was a realized profit in defendants' favor of not less than \$40,000, and that they refuse to render an account, or pay the plaintiff his proportion.

The defendants claim that the plaintiff contributed, by his own showing, neither capital nor lawful service to the copartnership, and that their agreement to pay him a share of the profits is, therefore, without sufficient consideration.

The Court cannot presume that the plaintiff intended to allege that he undertook that which was prohibited by law. His acts and promises may have been illegal, and the partnership one for a forbidden enterprise, but in the absence of an answer so averring, the Court cannot assume it, unless the

avements are inconsistent with any theory.

The purchase of cotton in the military department commanded by General Grant was illegal, unless carried out by permission of the President, obtained through the Treasury Department. The plaintiff avers that he was to go to the headquarters of General Grant and procure a permit to purchase cotton. Whether this was expected to be obtained from the General himself, from some member of his staff, or a Treasury agent at headquarters, is not stated. Whether the plaintiff was to procure it as a personal favor, or by the use of personal influence, or in the ordinary mode of business, is not shown. The Court could not presume he was to get his permit from an officer not authorized by law to give it, or that he was to procure it as the reward of personal, political, or other illegitimate influence. They must rather infer that he proposed to solicit and procure a permit in the ordinary and proper way, from a Treasury agent having authority to issue it.

Again: It is averred that plaintiff was to and did secure transportation.—This may have been done by procuring from some quartermaster, or other officer controlling it, the improper and illegal use of Government horses and wagons, or steamboats; or, he may have hired horses and wagons from the people of the country, and secured steamboat transportation in the usual way. The mere fact that he was to secure transportation at the headquarters of General Grant is not decisive. The other item of service, the "procuring of such other facilities as might be consistent with the usages and interests of the army," is open to the same double reading. These facilities, whatever they were, may have been procured by honest or dishonest influences.

For these reasons, the defense suggested must be presented by answer.—The theory that the employment of the plaintiff was to procure the illegal cooperation of the military in a private enterprise must be alleged by sworn answer. If true, it was equally disgraceful to the defendants and the plaintiff, and, if proven, would insure the dismissal of the petition with reprobation to the two parties, upon the principle, among others, "in pari delicto, potior est conditio defendentis." Demurrer overruled and leave to answer.

Judge Storer agreed with the other members of the Court on the question of the pleadings, and felt constrained to say that the whole of the trade, as disclosed in this proceeding, was not only disgraceful, but tends directly to disgrace the country. It is the price of blood.

It appears from the opinion of Judge Handley that the firm of Mack Brothers, the defendants, ground their refusal to pay Jesse R. Grant his one fourth of the net profits, according to their agreement, on the unlawfulness of the service rendered by their silent partner. The whole Court were of the opinion that such unlawfulness would be a bar to his claim, but they said that the defendants had not proved it by sworn testimony, and gave them an opportunity to adduce such proof. This is the position in which the case stood at the date of these proceedings.

Even if it should turn out that there was a Treasury permit to give a show of legality to this cotton speculation, it must have been procured by the influence or the connivance of General Grant. There was no other man in the army to whom Jesse Grant held such relations as would have made his services in such a transaction worth one fourth of the net profits.—The defendants do not allege that the stipulated service was not rendered, but that it was not lawful. That large quantities of cotton were procured is admitted by Jesse Grant himself by the very fact of his bringing this suit. Now, what basis had he for a successful speculation of this kind? What had he to put in as an equivalent for capital? What was it in his power to do to entitle him to one fourth of the net profits without risking a dollar of his own money, although the enterprise was full of hazard? There can be but one answer—the fund on which he traded was his relationship to General Grant. What the Cincinnati firm agreed to pay him for was his supposed influence with his son. Their expectations were not disappointed; but failing in that kind of honor which prevails among thieves, they sneaked out of their engagement because the stipulated service was illegal.

This transaction suggests some very painful inquiries, Jesse Grant being self-convicted of trading on his son's

RATES OF ADVERTISING

One square—ten lines or less—first insertion, \$3.00. Each additional insertion, \$1. A liberal deduction will be made with yearly advertisements, or persons advertising largely. Legal notices taken at their current value. Communications of a personal character will be charged half advertising rates. Blanks of every description furnished at low rates on short notice. Legal and transient advertisements must be paid for in advance to insure their publication. Advertisements not marked the length of time for which they are to be published, will be inserted until forbidden and charged accordingly. All advertising bills must be paid quarterly.

influence in one cotton speculation, how can it be known that he has not done the same thing, with equal claims to profit, in many others? As he had an equivalent for capital, he could easily be a silent partner in twenty such speculations as in one. The extent of his partners' transactions must have been limited by the amount of their capital, or by the amount they were willing to risk. But Jesse Grant, who risked nothing, was under no such limitation in working the rich placer which he had discovered within the military lines of his son. His other partners may have kept the honor of thieves, so that as little is known of their transactions as would have been known of this one, if the firm of Mack Brothers had stood by their bargain.—Jesse Grant long ago gave up the tannery at Galena, and changed his residence to Covington, Kentucky—a convenient point for speculations like the one which has been exposed. It seems that he made no money by this cotton speculation; did he gain the means of retirement from the tanning business by others? Even if Treasury permits were in some cases procured, by whose influence other than his son's could Jesse Grant have procured them?—What, besides his relationship, could have rendered his services so very valuable that sharp business men deigned to pay for them as high a price? We look to the Republican press for answers.—New York World, July 25th.

A WOMAN KILLS HER HUSBAND

TO SAVE HER OWN AND HER CHILDREN'S LIVES.—The Big Sandy (Ky.) Herald of June 18, says: "Sunday last a man named Clarke, who lives near Keeser's Rocks, came to town and got drunk, went home, and began abusing his family, and kept it up until a late hour in the night, beating his wife, threatening to shoot her, the children, or some one else, before the next day. He put a gun into the mouth of one of the children and threatened to shoot him, but an older boy knocked the gun away and took it from him. He then sent another child somewhere in the neighborhood of his house to get another gun he had left there loaded, at the time avowing that he would kill some one. While the child was gone, he pulled his bed upon the floor and laid down, when the mother, for fear of her life or that of her children, seized an axe and struck him several blows, the first of which proved fatal, he not moving after being struck.

"The woman and her family were arrested and brought into town on Monday, and examined before Judge Norris. The evidence proved that the act was done to save herself and children from murder, and they were discharged."

KILLED BY A PANTHER

—As we go to press, we learn the particulars of a very sad accident which occurred at Smithfield, on Thursday, of this week. A little girl four years of age, daughter of Mr. Patison, was playing a short distance from the house, and when within plain view of home, was attacked by a panther. The child was caught by the back of the neck, and a mouthful of flesh taken out, killing her almost instantly. A party of ten men started at once in pursuit of the panther, but we have not heard the result of the hunt. We hope he may be captured.—Eugene Journal.

Radical papers are having a great

deal to say about the New York riots of 1863, charging that Gov. Seymour incited the violence and took no measures to suppress it. To nail the lie, we quote from the Albany Evening Journal, a radical newspaper comments made immediately after the draft riots in the city of New York, and while all the facts, were fresh in the public mind:

"Governor Seymour, in so promptly declaring the city in a State of insurrection contributed largely to the suppression of the mob. It gave immediate legal efficiency to the military arm, and enabled the civil authorities to use that power with terrible effect. It showed, also, that it was Governor Seymour's purpose to show no quarter to the ruffians who seized upon the occasion of popular excitement to rob and murder. The exercise or the power thus called into service was effective. The insurrection has been quelled.—The mob has been overpowered. Law and order have triumphed, and the riotously disposed everywhere have received a lesson which they will not soon forget."

Get your Blanks at the SIGNAL Office.