

Pleasant Hill
21st June-1860

To The Hon. "Glass-Eyed-Cayuse" Senator of Fouglass, Jas. F. Gaxley
Esq.

Greeting:

It was with a high appreciation of your intentions and desires that we read your "effusion"--as you style it--in the Herald of the 19th inst. You have certainly, very appropriately named your labored effort to give us a drubbing. In owing to the broadness of your back, you could also very truthfully have said the same of your mouth, and if "effusion" be a "pouring out of water," your writing must be similar to your loud exhibitions of the "bucking cayuse" as you pour out great quantities of that liquid in trying to make yourself heard. Your "Appeal" was incorrectly named it should have been "An Effusion" or literally speaking "A pouring out of water to the voters of Lane county" as such a title would certainly have been quite as applicable.

Your lying assertion that we "opened" our "broadside" upon Col. Chapman" is in unison with your character for truthfulness. Where do you find the Col's name mentioned in the article referred to? Or in what connection does it speak of him?

We have no "private spleen" in store for that gentleman. Was it your uneasy conscience; or the force of circumstances that compelled you to come out with your name?

We said in reply to your "Appeal" that "a gentleman pocketed a very important bill," and that it was down for the purpose of forcing the election of Mr. S. but it seems that we were mistaken for on referring to the journal--page 47 it appears that you "pocketed" H. B. No. 2- A Bill to Organize County Courts" &c. and that you did not report it back till just before the close of the session; and that all your amendments--to use your own peculiar phrase, were "Squashed" You affect today that there was any "compromise", last spring to elect Williams to the Sun- etc, although you remember it perfectly well. In answer to the question of, "Will you please inform the public who it was with that the compromise was so nearly effected." It was with those who were not held by "ords irrefrayably firm." Not you, nor your kind. You were one of the loud mouthed who opposed it and worked with a desperation to defeat the county arrangement, that would have been praiseworthy in a better cause.

You say "And in writing that article my only motive was that the voters of Lane might not again be deceived upon that important question."

As Lane Co. is so needful of direction the voters thereof will no doubt appreciate your thrilling "Appeal", as we are told that notwithstanding your Soul Stirring and powerful "effusion", your kind -- in this county--have again been "deceived" into voting for and electing men, who will fail-- as did your humble servant--to support your candidates for the Senate.

No doubt but, that you and your kind will get on a big disgust at this little piece of information, but 'tis too late to scratch now.

Your charge that we consorted with publicans last spring, comes from you with a good grace, seeing you ran upon, and was elected by that ticket two years ago. Did you sell them out that they diseurd(?) you now? Perhaps if you had received that vote this spring, your majority would not have been so depreciated.

The assertion that Salem moneytribed us to defeat the "Sent of Gov't Bill", could only have been concocted by a heart base enough to be the author of your "Appeal". We said that the bill was unconstitutional that the Governor would have vetoed it, or if he had not, that the Supreme Court would have "blowed it up." If we have misstated, why do you fail to show wherein? If we have not, then why did you write such a harrowing "effusion." does it not show the low--?, base-born dog?

We came to this county twelve years ago, our interests are as nearly identified with those of Eugene City we presume as yours-- save the cheek -- it was a "hole in the ground" then. We were on the ground the day it was christened and made a town, and had the pleasure of presenting to and seeing the County Court give it the name it now bears, and in all human probability a "hole" somewhere in this county will contain us when we are only interested in the "Capital Question" of a Better Country"

We beg your pardon--my dear sir for intruding upon your precious time these few moments, and with a due appreciation of your disinterestedness, allow--me to subscribe myself, your most humble, most obedient servant.

W. W. Bristow

Pleasant Hill. Or

21st June 1860

To the Hon. ⁶⁵ "Blap-tyen-Cayuse" Senator
of Douglas, Jas. T. Gayley Esq. Secretary.
It was with ~~feeling~~ a high appreciation
of your intentions and desires that we
read your "effusion"-- as you style it--
in the Herald of the 19th inst. You
have certainly, very ^{appropriately} ~~properly~~ named
your labored effort to give us a ~~double~~
=bing, In owing to the broadness of
your back, you could also very ~~truly~~
truthfully have said the same of
your mouth, and if "effusion" be
a "pouring out of water", your writing
must be similar to your loud ex-
hibitions of the "bucking cyrus" as you
poured out great quantities of that ^{liquid} ~~stuff~~
~~stuff~~ in trying to make your self heard
Your "Appeal" was incorrectly named.

it should have been "An Effusion"
or literally speaking "A pouring out
of water to the voters of Seane county
as such. A title would certainly have
been quite as applicable.

Good ~~being~~ assertion that we "opened"
our "broadside" upon Col. Chapman, is
in unison with your character for
truthfulness. Where do you find the

Col's name mentioned in the ~~front~~
~~side~~ article referred to? Or in what
connection does it speak of kind?

We have no "private skeletons" in store for
that gentleman. Was it your uneasy
conscience, or the force of circumstances
that compelled you to come out with
your name?

We said in reply to your "Appeal"
that "a gentleman pocketed a very impor-
tant bill," and that it was done for the
purpose of forcing the election of Mr. S.

but it seems that we were mistaken
for on referring to the journal - page 47
~~we find~~ it appears that you "pocketed"
"B. B. No. 2. A Bill to Organize County
Courts" &c. and that you did not report
it back till just before the close of
the session, and that all your amendments
- to use your own peculiar phrase, were
"knashed".

You affect to deny
that there was any "compromise", last
spring ~~the~~ electing Williams to the Sen-
ate, ~~but~~ although you remember it
perfectly well. In answer to the ques-
tion of, "Will you please inform the
public who it was with that the com-
promise was so nearly effected", the answer
before the adjournment" it was with
those who were not held by "Evils
irrefragably firm?" Not you, nor your
kind. You were one of the loud
mouthed who opposed it and worked
with a desperation to defeat the com-

arrangements? That would have been
praiseworthy in a better cause.

You say "And in writing that article
my only motive was that the voters of Iowa
might not again be deceived upon this
important question".

As Iowa Co. is so needful of direction
~~the~~ the voters thereof will "doubtless"
appreciate your thrilling "Appeal",
as we are told that notwithstanding
your ~~at~~ soul stirring and powerful
"effusion", your kind - in this country
have again been "deceived" into ~~voting~~
voting for and electing men, who will
fail - as did your humble servant -
to support your candidates for this time.

No doubt but, that you and your kind
will get on a big chagrin at this little
piece of information, but 'tis too late
to scratch ~~tickets~~ now.

Your charge that we consorted with
republicans last spring, comes from

you with a good grace. Seeing you
ran upon, and was elected by that
ticket two years ago. Did you sell
them out that they deceived you now?
Perhaps if you had received that vote
this spring, your majority would not
have been so depreciated.

~~The~~ assertion that I told Money
bribed us to defeat the "Rent of
Gov't Bill", could only have been
concocted by a heart-lease enough
to be the author of ~~an~~ your ~~th~~
ing "Appeal". We ~~stated~~ said
that the bill was unconstitutional
that the Governor would have vetoed
it, or if he had not, that the Supreme
Court would have blown it up."

If we have mistated, why
do you fail to show wherein?
If we have not, then why
did you write such a harrowing

"effusion": does it not show the low
-lying, base-born dog?

We came to this County twelve
years ago, our interests are as
nearly identified with ^{those of} anyone
City we presume as pres-~~erve~~
the sheek it was a "hole in the
ground" then. We were on the
ground the day it was christened
and made a town, and had the
pleasure of presenting to and
seeing the County Court give it
the name it now bears, and
in all human probability
a "hole" somewhere in this County
will contain us when we are
only interested in the "Capital
Penetration" of a Better Country.

We beg your pardon My dear
sir for intruding upon your precious
time these few moments.

and with a due appreciation
of your disinterestedness, allow
me to subscribe myself, your
most humble, most obedient
servant.

J. W. Bristow