

Sunday Morning News, N.Y.

The Texan Letter about Parkman Murder.

We received, yesterday, the following letter from a distinguished lawyer of Texas, relative to the letter signed "Oronoka," published some time ago, in the Delta, in which the writer confesses that he was the murderer of Dr. Parkman.

It will be seen that the distinguished legal gentleman referred to attaches great importance to this letter. As anything relating to this mysterious tragedy possesses interest, and may be valuable, we give the letter of our correspondent entire.

DEAR SIR: I notice in the last Weekly Delta a letter signed "Oronoka," purporting to have been written "near Washington, Texas, Dec. 28, 1850." (I suppose the year is a typographical error) and your remarks on the same. I feel no interest in this matter other than every friend to the cause of humanity and justice should feel.

We can conceive of no spring of human action that would induce a friend of Dr. Webster, residing near Washington, to write such a letter. He must first believe that the Doctor was guilty, or he would not so readily attempt to give a false scent to public inquiry.

I shall write to J. Lancaster, Esq. Editor of the Texas Ranger, requesting him to institute an inquiry into the matter among the citizens of Washington County, to ascertain if any of them recollect of a stranger's inquiring for paper to write a letter about the 28th Dec. last.

Your obedient servant, T. H. J. H.

of an unnatural des... will on the 23rd... the... Can we safely do... Each other to... the case frequently

The Webster Verdict.

ARE LAWS MADE FOR THE PROTECTION OF CRIMINALS?—We have read with no ordinary interest, the numerous strictures of the public press in various parts of the country, upon the action of the jury which pronounced against Prof. Webster the verdict of guilty of murder, in the case of Dr. Parkman. They are almost unanimous in the condemnation of that verdict, and yet strange to say, they are almost unanimous in expressions of belief that Webster is guilty.

God knows, we would be the last to add a single pang to the suffering of those who have been made to mourn through the acts of this guilty man; but we honestly believe that the jury gave their verdict according to their conscientious conviction, drawn from the evidence on the trial, and on no other ground.

It may be possible that some men, acting as counsel for the prisoner, might, by arrant sophistry, and false hypothesis, clothed in eloquence, have so "lied like truth," as to compel an unrighteous verdict; but we believe that Messrs. Sohler and Merrick did all that honest men could do for their client, and we find nothing, either during or since the trial, to induce us to believe the verdict rendered, as either unrighteous, or at variance with evidence.

It seems to us, that Professor Webster stands not only convicted on evidence, but, self-accused before the world. He has not denied the commission of the bloody crime with which he stands charged—in his own remarks before the court, he did not even attempt to enter upon a defence, his sole complaint was, that his counsel had not so mystified and distorted the evidence before the court, as to pervert the truth, and blind the eyes of the jury.

We would be merciful, yet we would be just. We are opponents of the death penalty, as a principle, yet we are advocates of the law as it stands, and especially do we applaud the jury, who, in rendering a verdict of guilty against Professor Webster, outraged nothing but their own manly sympathies.

Conclusion. Late... treatise as a