

Indian Disturbances--Trinidad Correspondence, &c.

Editors ALTA CALIFORNIA.—Your correspondent W. V. H., after giving you a report about the killing of a white man, with the euphonic sobriquet of Sheep Jack, by the Indians on Salmon River, and of the subsequent killing of two whites by folks of their own color, all in the most approved and business-like style, winds up by saying, very modestly, yet very confidently,

"Most of these difficulties have originated with Col. McKee, our Indian Agent; he, knowing nothing of their character, habits, or dispositions, made treaties and promises ad libitum with an interpreter, who understood little more. The time for the fulfillment of these pledges having expired, without their being fulfilled, the Indians have become not only distrustful but belligerent."

Now, I think your correspondent is at fault, both as regards his information and his logic. It so happens that the murder of "Sheep Jack" occurred some distance up the Salmon River (a considerable affluent of the Klamath,) a part of the country which Col. McKee never set foot in. After visiting, cancelling, and treating with the tribes on the Klamath, the season was too far advanced, and the snow too deep to admit of his crossing the Salmon and Trinity mountains; consequently with the tribes on Salmon River, he made no treaties whatever, promised them no supplies, and should not be subject to such calumnious and slanderous aspersions as are at least insinuated by W. V. H.

While delayed by the high waters at Durkee's ferry on the Klamath, in November last Col. McKee met a gentleman who had a trading post some ten or twenty miles up the Salmon River, in the neighborhood of a rancheria of Indians—received as friendly; and to assist their remaining so peaceful from him for distribution among them, as a token of good will from their great Father at Washington, several hundred pounds of flour, sending them word that, if possible, visit their country the present summer or fall.

The tribes on the Klamath, with whom treaties were made, remained quiet and friendly, and no serious difficulties have occurred in that quarter from that day to this, so far as the public here have information.

In the last narrative, the miners all along the Klamath were at work contentedly, and without apprehension. If difficulties should unhappily occur, there are four chances out of five that the whites will have been the aggressors. Perfect safety and quiet can, however, scarcely be expected on that frontier, until two, perhaps three, small military posts shall be established.

If the Indians, with whom treaties have been made, should become "not only distrustful but belligerent," because of the non-fulfillment of "the bargain" on our part, where will the blame or responsibility lie? Upon the agent of the United States, who, all admit, was eminently fortunate and successful in restoring peace to that frontier, or upon the politicians of California, here and at Washington, who have steadily opposed and delayed the ratification of the treaties, with the miserable hope of thereby making for themselves or "his party" some little political capital?

If Indian difficulties shall again become the order of the day, the business of the industrious miner and trader on the frontier be disturbed or broken up, and the State again involved in another pretty little war debt of half a million or so, upon whom will be the responsibility? I mistake the intelligence of the people of this State, if they do not read the politicians a lesson upon this and other subjects of public interest before the "ides of March." '52.

SHASTA.

Money Lost.—Democratic Delegates from New