

Table with subscription rates: One year \$3 50, Six months 2 00, Three months 1 00.

OFFICIAL DIRECTORY.

- List of officials for Coos County: Governor, Secretary of State, Treasurer, Supt. Public Schools, Judge, District Attorney, County Judge, Commissioners, Sheriff, Clerk, Assessor, School Superintendent, Coroner.

WRITTEN FOR THE COAST MAIL.

HISTORICAL SKETCHES

Of Oregon's Southern Coast.

NUMBER XX.

JOURNAL OF L. J. WILLIAMS—CONTINUED FROM LAST WEEK.

No further change was noticed until the winter of 1858 and 1859. During this winter I got much worse and suffered a great deal of pain. That portion of the body near where the arrow entered, became much swollen and I was obliged to keep the bed much of the time.

The pains soon subsided, the swollen parts became less inflamed, the flow of matter ceased, and in ten days I threw off rags and bandages for the first time since September 21, 1851 and stepped forth a well man.

THE COAST MAIL.



THE NEW NULLIFICATION.

SPEECH OF HON. JAMES A. GARFIELD, OF OHIO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 17, 1880.

Mr. GARFIELD: The discussion of this bill has concentrated upon two topics—the public printing and the election laws.

More than that: the Supreme Court, not only in this case but in another recent case, has made a declaration which ought to be engraven upon the minds and hearts of all the people of this country.

Now, therefore, under this decision the election laws of the United States are the laws of every State in this Union. No judge of election, no State officer or other person connected with any congressional election, no elector who offers his ballot at any such election, can with impunity lift his hand or do any act against any of the provisions of these laws.

But now a Representative, speaking for the Democratic party in this House, rises, not with the plea which he could have made with some show of plausibility last year, that the law is unconstitutional and that therefore they would not enforce it—but, with a constitutional law, declared so by the Supreme Court, covering him and filling the Republic from end to end, reaching everywhere and covering every foot of our soil where a congressional election can be held, he rises in his place and declares that the Democratic party will not execute the law nor permit it to be obeyed.

We who are the sworn law-makers of the nation, and ought to be examples of respect for and obedience to the law—we who before we took our first step in legislation swore before God and our country that we would support the supreme law of the land—we are now invited to become conspicuous leaders in the violation of the law.

Mr. Chairman, by far the most formidable danger that threatens the Republic to-day is the spirit of law-breaking which shows itself in many turbulent and alarming manifestations. The people of the Pacific Coast after two years wrestling with the spirit of communism in the city of San Francisco, have finally grappled with this lawless spirit, and the leader of it was yesterday sentenced to penal servitude as a violator of the law.

legal question may appear to persons who have been educated in a different political school—that although that court has decided the constitutionality of the law, that when we come, as legislators, to appropriate money it is our duty to say, is this law constitutional? or, if constitutional, is it a good law, and are we bound to appropriate money for it?

He undertakes, as will be seen, to throw contempt on that decision by styling it "a sort of eight-by-seven decision." I remind him that it is a seven-to-two decision, having been adopted by a larger number of the members of the court than the majority of the decisions of that tribunal.

That a law of Congress interpenetrates and becomes a part of every law of every State in this Union to which its subject matter is applicable, and is binding upon all people on every foot of our soil. This is the voice of the Constitution.

Thus he seeks to nullify the law. Thus he hopes to thwart the nation's "collected will." Does my colleague reflect that in doing this he runs the risk of vitiating every national election? Suppose his lead be followed, and the demand of citizens for supervisors and marshals is made and refused because an appropriation has not been voted.

Mr. Chairman, when I took my seat as a member of this House, I took it with all the responsibilities which the place brought upon me; and among others was my duty to keep the obligations of the law. Where the law speaks in mandatory terms to everybody else and then to me, I should deem it cowardly and dishonorable if I should skulk behind my legislative privilege for the purpose of disobeying and breaking the supreme law of the land.

The issue now made is somewhat different from that of the last season, but, in judgement, it is not less significant and dangerous. I would gladly waive any party advantage which this controversy might give for the sake of that claim and settled peace which would reign in this Hall if we all obeyed the law.

and from time to time, the judge shall appoint, and, under the seal of the court, shall commission two citizens of different political parties who are voters within the precinct where they reside, to be supervisors of the election. That law is mandatory upon the judge. Should he refuse to obey he can be impeached of high crimes and misdemeanors in office.

Again, section 2021 provides that on the application of two citizens the marshal of the United States shall appoint special deputy marshals to protect the supervisors in the execution of their duty. And the law is mandatory upon the marshal. He must obey it under the pains and penalties of the law.

Now comes one other mandatory order: in the last section of this long chapter of legislation the majestic command of the law is addressed both to Congress and the Treasury. It declares that there "shall be paid" out of the Treasury \$5 per day to these officers as compensation for their services. Here too the law is equally imperious and mandatory; it addresses itself to the conscience of every member of the House, with only this difference; we cannot be impeached for disobedience; we cannot be fined or locked up in the penitentiary for voting "no," and refusing the appropriation; we cannot be fined or imprisoned if we refuse to do our duty.

Thus he seeks to nullify the law. Thus he hopes to thwart the nation's "collected will." Does my colleague reflect that in doing this he runs the risk of vitiating every national election? Suppose his lead be followed, and the demand of citizens for supervisors and marshals is made and refused because an appropriation has not been voted.

Mr. Chairman, when I took my seat as a member of this House, I took it with all the responsibilities which the place brought upon me; and among others was my duty to keep the obligations of the law. Where the law speaks in mandatory terms to everybody else and then to me, I should deem it cowardly and dishonorable if I should skulk behind my legislative privilege for the purpose of disobeying and breaking the supreme law of the land.

The issue now made is somewhat different from that of the last season, but, in judgement, it is not less significant and dangerous. I would gladly waive any party advantage which this controversy might give for the sake of that claim and settled peace which would reign in this Hall if we all obeyed the law.

everywhere; reverence and obedience to its supreme authority. Yet the dominant party in this House virtually declares that "any part of this volume that we do not like and cannot repeal we will disobey. We have tried to repeal these election laws; we have failed because we had not the constitutional power to destroy them; the constitution says that they shall stand in their authority and power; but we, the Democratic party, in defiance of the Constitution, declare that if we cannot destroy them outright by the repeal, they shall be left to crumble into ruin by wanton and lawless neglect."

Mr. Chairman, I ask gentlemen on the other side, whether they wish to maintain this attitude in regard to the legislation of this country? Are they willing to start on a hunt through the State and determine for themselves what they will obey and what they will disobey? That is the meaning of my colleague's speech. If it means anything it means that. He is not an old Brandenburg elector, but an elector in this novel and modern sense, that he will elect what laws he will obey and what he will disobey, and in so far as his power can go, he will in fact with his spirit of disobedience all good people of this country who trust him.

I ask gentlemen whether this is a time when it is safe to disregard and weaken the authority of law. In all quarters the civil society of this country is becoming honeycombed through and through by disintegrating forces—in some States by the violation of contracts and the repudiation of debts; in others by open resistance and defiance; in still others by overturning of the constitutions and letting "the red fool-fury of the Seine" run riot among our people and build its blazing altars to the strange gods of ruin and misrule. All these things are shaking the good order of society, and threatening the foundations of our Government and our peace.

The context of last autumn made the people understand the tendencies of gentlemen on the other side. Now, this cool, calm, deliberate, assassinating of the law will not be tolerated. We have had a winter to freeze out our passion, we have had a summer to thaw out our indifference, we have had the changing circles of the year to bring us around to order and calmness, and yet all the fiery courses of the stars seem to have shed their influence on my colleague to fire him with a more desperate madness and drive his party on to a still sadder fate.

A BURLESQUE MISER.—A striking, if picturesque-looking, figure of a man can be seen in a New Jersey town. He is dressed in a canvas shirt, with two meal-bags for breeches reaching to his knees; on his head is a ragged hat, full of holes. He is "gold blind," whatever that may be; that is to say, he imagines that everything has the hue of gold; or any rate, he gathers sticks and stones, under the impression that they are coins, and boasts of his treasures hoarded in the swamps where he dwells.

Subscribe for the Coast Mail, On ly \$2 50 per annum.

The Democrats did it. Mr. Siglin's personal organ claims credit for the Democratic party for everything resulting in good for the country, while all evil results are attributed to the Republicans.

One indisputable good thing the Democrats did is this, they made all of our circulating medium of equal paying power. When they assumed control of Congress gold had one value, green-backs another, and silver with which the poor man was paid for his labor had another and a lower value than any other. To-day a dollar is a dollar, whether in gold, green-back or silver, thereby millions of dollars are saved to the men who save money to the working bees. This is something that can be appreciated because it comes home to all of us when you work in the woods or the mines your employer can't pay you a hundred dollars with ninety as he could when the Democracy assumed power, by selling his gold and paying you in subsidiary silver.

The idea of the Democrats, who wanted to repudiate the National debts, who always ridiculed and opposed the resumption act, claiming that they made our circulating medium of equal paying power, is new; it's rich, and it's characteristic of the source.

A New Industry.

The Jacksonville Sentinel of the 12th inst. says: Mr. Goddard brought in to our office last week a sample of sorghum sugar made from the early amber cane. It is very fine grained and exceedingly sweet, much resembling the finest quality of Island sugar.

Serious Accident.

A distressing accident at Goshen, Lane county, on last Sunday evening, which will probably terminate fatally to one young lady, and the severe injury to three others, Mr. and Miss Rutledge, Miss Morgan, and a gentleman whose name could not be ascertained by our correspondent, were enjoying an evening ride in a two seated carriage drawn by a span of horses.

1,482 immigrants arrived on the 17th. The total number thus far in May is 51,346—more than the number arrived in any entire month in May excepting in 1852, when 52,145 immigrants landed.