

BY D. W. CRAIG.

TERMS—The Argus will be furnished at Three Dollars and Fifty Cents per annum, in advance, to single subscribers—Three Dollars each to clubs of ten at one office—in advance. When the money is not paid in advance, Four Dollars will be charged if paid within six months, and Five Dollars at the end of the year. Two Dollars for six months—No subscriptions received for a less period. No paper discontinued until all arrearages are paid, unless at the option of the publisher.

For the Argus.

Reform.

Reform, reform, reform! This world is in a storm; Why stand ye men like cravens by, And hear a funny female cry,— Bewail so fair a western sky— "The world's a-going wrong!" Reform! she cries, Reform! How dare you not conform To customs old and wretched grown, That, in bright ages shown, Have not at but woe this world o'erthrown! Would ye yourselves be woe!

As we hear, Reform! With coffee cold and warm; How naughty some folks really are, That would us from narcotics bar— They are the greatest fools by far That ever taught reform.

No doubt reform is fine, But coffee, that's divine, What! Coffee never made to drink! Then eyes were not made to wink— But human beings were to think— Eate peating of reform.

Reform, reform, we're told, But not with "water cold"— For should folks to that "cure" incline, Fox's knives, and quacks would cease to dine, Nor hawking nose with possum fan, Them of the health and gold.

But though reform's the cry, The pig's still in the sty; They eat the putrid carcass o'er, And feed like swine o'er stagnant gore, While the laborer pines in vain, Then ask the reason why.

Oh! to what distant shore, How high can fancy soar, To laughable to hear the "bright day," When they as blindly tread the way As millions go before.

Reformers, have good cheer, Though simpsons may sneer, For it is not our "know the way"— Cost no man's sense but hold the way— They'd live, dry up, and blow away, But never die—don't fear.

Come, then, new courage take, And though you think you're weak, For at this world as it finds no terms, That rarely is just as it seems, But mostly dread delusive dreams, That vanish ere we wake.

Reform, then, all the land, Do it with heart and hand; And, though a devil should appear For every stone in Salem here, (To us—k-e-p-o-n, and never f-a-r;— God, by reform will stand.

SALEM, Jan. 5, 1860. I. B.

For the Argus.

A Dream.

In dreams, to me a harp was given, Which poets played in other years, I struck it, music through the spheres, And, even to the gates of Heaven. I sleep'd the treasure to my heart, My little, my life, my heaven, it seem'd, And, wandering o'er the earth, I deem'd To strike it strings, some day, and start Such strains, that half the world should turn, And watch, as for a fiery dawn, Not knowing whence the fierce heat came, The souls that through their souls would burn.

MOE DELL, 1850.

For the Argus.

Apoptrophe to the Old Year. Farewell! Old Year, with all thy toil, and care, And as not part estranged; [and sorrow, Although I welcome in a new year on the morrow, With thee so long I've ranged, Through varied scenes of joy and sadness; Cords dark with grief, or bright with gladness; Pleasures mingled with pain— But we shall never meet again; Thy last legation, and friends, And we will part, Old Year, as friends.

OSAGE CITY, Dec. 31, 1859. J. D. L.

For the Argus.

Corn Can be Profitably Grown in Oregon. Ev. Argus: The experience of last season shows that this question can be affirmatively answered. Corn can be grown in Oregon, and successfully. But this fact does not preclude the necessity of a proper cultivation, and a proper variety of corn to be cultivated. We have noticed that a large crop of King Philip corn was raised last year in the vicinity of Portland.

This King Philip corn is a peculiar variety. The stalks are very small, and the ears come from them at a small distance from the ground, and the corn ripens early. The ears are long, the corn eight rows, and the corn small.

All these qualities mark it out as suited to our soil and climate. We require a corn to grow quickly, and the cob to be so small that it will dry easily, and thus save the corn from injury by mould. This corn is highly nutritious—possesses a good deal of oil—is of the flint variety, and of course will be well—making capital meal, food for man and br.

For fattening stock, it may be fed in a crude state before it becomes excessively hard, and when hard it should be boiled, or better still, ground and bolted. Experiments have proved the fact, that for fattening hogs one bushel of corn, ground and bolted in a sort of mush, will go as far as three or four bushels given to them in its natural state.

In planting King Philip corn, it can be done in drills, planting the kernels eight inches apart in the drills. On hilly land, the ground for corn ought to be plowed very deep, so as to enable it to stand the drought. The roots of corn will descend a great depth, if they can, to reach moisture. Probably the eastern mode of cultivating corn would be best here—viz: plowing and hoeing.

A. B.

The Oregon Argus.

—A Weekly Newspaper, devoted to the Interests of the Laboring Classes, and advocating the side of Truth in every issue.—

VOL. V. OREGON CITY, OREGON, JANUARY 21, 1860. No. 41.

Ed. ARGUS: Oregon has a good soil for the vine. Those who have paid any attention to the cultivation of the grape, have been well paid for their labor.

Now is the time to prune the vines.— There are many systems of pruning, which I cannot refer to here. But a good portion of the last year's growth must be removed, in order to secure a full crop of fruit the coming season. And now is the time, too, to secure cuttings for new plants. Go to your neighbors and get cuttings embracing three buds of well-matured new wood (if you have no vines of your own). Cut them off an inch or so above and below the first and last bud; lay them into the ground till spring, covering them two or three inches with earth. In the spring plant them out in a slanting position, so that the upper bud will come just above the ground. Plant them out where you wish them to stand—10 feet apart in rows. You had best put two cuttings together—so that you can remove one, if both live. Keep the weeds from them.

Cutting the Brain.

The difficult surgical operation performed by Drs. Ryer and Sposti, recently, at the county hospital, sets popular opinion, in regard to the brain, at defiance. A man named John Wagner had been kicked by a horse with such a force as to fracture the skull, and to drive several pieces of the bone deep into the brain. The pieces remained imbedded there several days, throwing the man finally into continuous convulsions. The above named physicians being called upon, made an examination, and upon ascertaining the facts of the case, proceeded to extract the pieces of skull from the brain, and in doing so removed the injured portion in a manner that when the operation was finished an egg might have been placed in the hole without protruding above the skull and be fairly hidden from sight. All this has been done without impairing the man's mind, and the bumps there located by phrenologists, thus despoiled, exhibit no lack of powers imputed to them by those versed in that belief.

Popular opinion inculcates the belief that a loss of a portion of the brain is necessarily followed by death. But this opinion is proved incorrect by operations like this we have mentioned, and phrenologists are driven to the wall in support of their theory. We learn that several years ago a Mexican in this city had his skull broken, and the hole filled up with maggots, presenting a horrid sight when connected with the human mind as this case was. Dr. Ryer removed the maggots, and with them an additional portion of the brain from the wounded man's head, to the amount that would fill an ordinary tea-cup. Strange to say, the Mexican recovered, and his countrymen declare he is a smarter man now than he was with his first allowance of brain.

We learn that the cutting off of portions of the brain, or probing or drawing from it fragments of the skull that may be imbedded in it, is unsafe by the patient. He feels only the cutting or drawing back the skin of the head while the slicing of the brain is painless. The brain prevents the appearance of new dirty chess, cuts like it, and such operation on the former is as painless as upon the latter. The portion of the brain injured or stirred by a fragment of the skull is incapable of regaining its first state. It is spoiled material; and we learn that it is considered bad practice to do otherwise than cut it off. Occasions like this we have mentioned, present a fine opportunity for some enthusiastic theorists to present a treatise upon the brain—but we fear it to be almost if not quite an impracticable task to present a correct theory upon this organ.

—Stockton Argus.

Squatter Sovereignty Traps.

We have received advance copies of Senator Douglas' latest production in regard to squatter sovereignty in the Territories; but the discussion on that silly subject is altogether too trashy, to bestow even a paragraph upon. The question on which the people of the United States are interested now, is not one about squatters and half-breed Indians in the far-off Western Territories, but about the existence of our federal government, and the maintenance of internal peace. And let us say in this connection, to Mr. Senator Douglas, that if he and Jeff. Davis, with poor Pierce, had not conspired to repeal the Missouri Compromise, and thus to re-open the slavery agitation, we should not at this day have been menaced with such dangers as those of which the Harper's Ferry insurrection gives us warning. We want no squatter sovereignty trash.—N. Y. Herald.

A DOGFACE.—A great Virginian, (John Randolph) said of such men—pointing his long booby finger at a dogface: "Sir, I envy neither the heart nor the head of that man from the North, who comes here to defend slavery on principle."

"Procrastination is the thief of time." And, reader, you are another when you unnecessarily disturb a man of business at his work.—Lou. Journal.

Speech of Hon. Lyman Trumbull, OF ILLINOIS, At Sandusky, Ohio, last September. (Concluded.)

The history of the colonies prior to the Revolutionary War, is gone into by the writer of this magazine article. It is said the colonies went to war with Great Britain for the purpose of establishing the right chiefly to regulate the slave trade; that the great complaint against the mother country was that she would not permit the colonies to regulate the African slave trade for themselves; and the writer argues to show, not that the colonies were opposed to slavery, but they were contending for the great principle of self-government, and the right to regulate the slave trade as they pleased. What a pity that some of the little modern histories were not introduced into the district schools of Vermont when the writer was a boy. He might then have found out it was because the mother country undertook to force taxes upon the people of the colonies, that they went to war; and one of the causes was that his majesty George III., forced Judges upon them, and made those Judges removable at his will, just what the author of this article did with the Kansas people in his Kansas-Nebraska bill. If his historical record be true, and the Territories of the United States are to be likened to the colonies; and if the colonies contended for the right to regulate the African slave trade, why have not the people of Kansas the same right? If the people of Kansas want slaves from Africa, why according to this reasoning have they not a right to have them? What right have you to prevent it? Was not that the question the colonies went to war about? You say you are for popular sovereignty, subject to the Constitution. What right have you to impose the Constitution upon the people of Kansas? Have the people of Kansas ever submitted to the Constitution of the United States? Is it any less a grievance to their rights of popular sovereignty, or self-government, to have a law in the shape of a Constitution put over them, than a law in the shape of an act of Congress? They have never assented to the Constitution. The States of this Union have all assented to the Constitution of the United States, but the Territories have not. The writer mistakes, I will not say falsifies, history; he may have supposed he was stating historical facts. He says Mr. Jefferson in 1784 proposed a plan for the government of the Territories, and in that plan he had a clause excluding slavery from them, which was voted out. True, but how was it voted out? There were thirteen States belonging to the Confederacy. It required a majority of the States to pass the resolution. Only ten States were represented, six voted to retain it, three against it, and one did not vote. The next year, 1785, when the writer of this article was unborn, when twelve States were represented, a motion was made to reaffirm the clause excluding slavery; eight States voted for it, and it was adopted.

Thus it appears that Mr. Jefferson himself, and a majority of the States present all along were in favor of excluding slavery from the Territories. Although the report of the committee was agreed to in 1784, the plan of government they recommended was not perfected till 1787, when what is known as the ordinance of that year was adopted, and slavery excluded from the Territory by the unanimous vote of all the States at the time represented in Congress. The writer of this article says that in no public document is the word Territory used to mean anything more than a tract of land, until after the Constitution was adopted. This is a slight mistake. The word occurs in the enabling clause of the ordinance of 1787, for the government of the Northwest Territory.

The Federal Constitution was adopted in 1789; in the same year George Washington was inaugurated first President of the United States; and one of the first acts of the first Congress was to reaffirm the ordinance of 1787. In 1800, the Territory of Indiana was organized and the clause prohibiting slavery re-affirmed. In 1805, the Territory of Michigan was organized, Thomas Jefferson being President, and the clause prohibiting slavery re-affirmed.

In 1809, the Territory of Illinois was organized, James Madison being President, and the clause prohibiting slavery re-affirmed. In 1820, James Monroe being President, the Missouri Compromise was adopted, excluding slavery from all the Territory acquired from France lying north of 36° 30'. In 1836, Andrew Jackson being President, the Territory of Wisconsin was formed, and slavery was excluded from it by the act of Congress. In 1838, Martin Van Buren being President, the Territory of Wisconsin was formed, and slavery was excluded from it by the act of Congress. In 1845, Texas was annexed, with a clause in the annexation resolution prohibiting slavery north of 36° 30'. Mr. Douglas making the proposition. In 1848, Oregon was organized, James K. Polk being President, and slavery therein was prohibited by act of Congress. With this history before you, all spread out upon the statutes of the country, what do you think of the statement that our fathers fought the battles of the Revolution to maintain the principle of allowing each community to regulate for itself the subject of slavery? When you see the men who fought the battles of the Revolution, the Commander-in-Chief, Jefferson, Madison, and all the patriots of that day participating in the passage of acts excluding slavery from the Territories, what do you think of the statement that they went to war to establish the right of the colonies to have slavery if they wanted it?

I will not detain you longer with the discussion of this magazine document. I have said enough to show that this thing called popular sovereignty, or self-government, subject to the Constitution, is an unmeaning phrase. If it means the right to do as one pleases, it would be destructive of the Con-

stitution and the Union. I have said enough to show that it is utterly impracticable, because its authors cannot carry it out. Sovereignty implies supreme power. If the Territories are sovereign, the United States government is not superior to them. They are not States, belonging to the Union. The men who advocate this doctrine are inconsistent, for they impose restrictions upon the people of the Territories. The Kansas Nebraska bill is an utter reprobation of the doctrine of popular sovereignty.

I will undertake to state what is the true theory of the government of the Territories. They are not to be likened to the colonies at all. The colonies were forever to remain dependencies of the British crown. A Territory is only to remain under Congress until it has enough population to come in and be one of the United States. Territories are like the children of a household. Do you think it wrong that children should be under the control of their parents. Would any one think it right to advocate that a child should do as he pleased, and that there was no difference between controlling a child and an adult person? For a child to be subject to his parents during minority is a very different thing from his being ever after subject to them. The colonies were forever to be under the control of the crown; the Territories under the control of the General Government until their population will justify the formation of a State government, when they become sovereign in their jurisdiction over domestic affairs.

The Constitution of the United States, fellow citizens, was not made for the Territories. It was made for the States. The preamble of the Constitution reads—"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, do ordain and establish this Constitution" "for the United States of America." It was made between the original States, and for the States. It contained provisions that the government which they created should have certain powers in regard to themselves, and certain other powers in regard to Territories. They conferred upon the government power to do things outside of the States, and exercise authority, and send men beyond the States to attend to those interests. Agents are sent to China and to England, although the Constitution of the United States does not govern in Canton or London. So with the Territories. They were outside of the States; but the Federal Government has conferred upon it the power to make all the needful rules and regulations respecting the Territories. This is the language of the Constitution. The men who made the Constitution knew they had territory. The ordinance of 1787 was adopted while the Convention to frame the Constitution was in session. Many of the members of the legislative body which passed this ordinance were members of the Constitutional Convention. Congress, when it comes to make these needful rules, should make such as are best for the interests of the people who go to Territories, and for the interests of the whole country. Is that ruling the people as the colonies were ruled? Who make the laws for the government of a Territory except it be the people who are to possess them, and it matters not whether these rules are agreed upon before or after they get to the Territory. Provision is usually made for the organization of a Territorial government while most of the persons who are expected to settle it, are still inhabitants of the States, and as such, take part in framing the rules and regulations by which they are to be governed. It is therefore no infringement of the principle of self-government for Congress, which is the representative of all the people of the Union, to prescribe the rules by which all who shall go to the Territory shall be governed, till they become numerous enough to establish rules of their own. When Congress comes to organize a Territory, one member prepares a rule fixing its boundaries. All agree to that. Another says: "I will draw up a rule for the appointment of a Governor, with the two-thirds veto power." Another says: "I will draw up a rule for the appointment of Judges." The self-governing man says: "I am for that." Another says: "I will prescribe the jurisdiction of Justices of the Peace." Popular sovereignty says: "I am for that."

And so they go on drawing up the rules. You come to the slavery question. One man says the free States are more prosperous than slave States. He draws a comparison between New York and Virginia, and finds that the land in the former is worth ten times that in the latter State. He finds slavery demoralizing, that labor is better respected, and that the poor man occupies a better position in society, where he has no negro labor to compete with. He says, "I will draw up a rule excluding slavery from these places where I and my children are to go." "Ah, but you cannot do this," is the answer. "That violates the principle of self-government." Now the self-governing man is shocked. The moment you tell him he must not reduce another man to slavery, you violate the first principles of self-government. The idea is, you must have a right to make a slave of somebody, or you cannot govern yourselves. If I had not a good deal of charity, I would think these self-governing men not sincere. [Applause.]

What does the Constitution say? It says Congress shall have power to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory. "All" means, among other things, a rule to keep negro slaves from being brought into the Territory. With Congress the power to do this rests. "Ah, but," says the slaveholder, "I have another objection. This Territory is the common property of the United States, acquired by the common blood and treasure of the people of all the States. I will go there with my negro slaves." Sixty other free white persons rise and say: "We do not want slavery there; it is prejudicial to our interests; we are going there to buy farms, and our one hundred and sixty acres

now. It is a very different thing to be in favor of non-intervention now, and when you pledged yourselves to it. Slavery was then excluded by law from all the Territories of the United States. You have broken down the barriers; and now you modestly cry out, "Non-intervention!" Having entered and taken your neighbor's house by violence, you modestly step to the door and tell him, "Sir, be quiet; let us have non-intervention." Get out of the house and give him possession, and then make your proposition. Withdraw from the Territories with your Kansas-Nebraska bill and your Dred Scott decision, and then we will hear your proposition of non-intervention. I trust the people of this country will be worth ten dollars an acre if you do not go there with your negroes. But if you do it, it will not be worth three dollars. We want emigration to go there, and know if you go there with your negroes, foreign population and people of the free States will stay away. Your institution is debasing and demoralizing political, morally, and every other way." Another one says: "The thing is wrong.—We have slavery in the States, it is true; we do not propose to interfere with it there; but I don't believe there is a slave State which would introduce slavery if it were now free." A white man from the South who owns no slaves comes up and says: "I see the people who do not own slaves get along better than we of the South; and I do not want slaves in the Territory." So nineteen-twentieths of the people of the South, and the whole population of the North, are opposed to extending slavery into the new Territory, seeing that we are not to be benefited by it. Now the rule comes to be fixed. How shall we fix it?—You popular sovereignty men say you will fix a rule for the benefit of one man, and we are called hard names because we want to legislate for the benefit of fifty-nine. How can you refuse to adopt a rule which shall conserve the interests of the fifty-nine?

I would like to ask you who are living in this flourishing State—this wealthy and great State—what has been blessed with prosperity ever since the Territorial Government was formed, and who have built up these large cities upon the borders of the State, whether there is a man of you who can lay his hand upon his heart and say, "I am sorry that Jefferson, Washington, and those old patriots, excluded slavery from Ohio?" Is there a man here who would rise and heap such curses on his ancestors for keeping Ohio free, as he is now ready to heap upon Republicans for wishing to keep Kansas free for his children, as his fathers kept Ohio free for him? If you believe your fathers were right in preserving this great North-west to freedom, how dare you do less for your children than your fathers did for you? I dare not. I never will. [Applause.]

Slavery is no domestic question. It is a matter affecting the whole nation. Are we not all interested in the prosperity and growth of this great country? Is it not of importance to you, citizens of Ohio, whether the fertile plains and beautiful villages of the West shall be settled and inhabited by millions of freemen, and saved for the benefit of free labor; or whether they shall be covered over with the black pall of negro slavery? Is it of no importance to you whether we shall have flourishing States like Illinois and Iowa, or whether those States shall go to ruin and decay, as the Carolinas and Virginia? I take no pleasure in referring to these things. I would that the Carolinas were as prosperous as Michigan, Illinois, or Ohio. Yet the great fact stands out that they are not. They have been blessed with a fertile soil, and why is it that they have not prospered as the States with which they have been contrasted? Under what policy have we grown to the greatness to which we have attained? I ask you under what? Was it not under the policy of settling our Territories with free men, and increasing the number of free States? It is true, slave States have been admitted into the Union, but these were framed from Territories which were slaveholding at the time of acquisition.

[Here, the speaker said, let me correct a mistake which occurs in the statements made by Judge Ranney, who is a candidate for Governor of Ohio. I do this not from any desire to interfere in your local politics, but simply to set correctly before the people the historical fact referred to. Mr. Ranney states that Virginia, in ceding the Northwest Territory to the United States, provided in her deed of cession that that Territory should be free. Now this is wholly incorrect. The deed of cession provided that the inhabitants should be secure in all their rights and privileges; and indeed it was thought by many that this provision precluded Congress from keeping slavery out. It was the ordinance of 1787 which excluded slavery from the Northwest Territory.]

It is under this policy of dedicating the country to freedom that we have grown to our present magnitude. The territory of the United States is now several times as large as it was at the peace of 1783. The number of States is almost three times as great as it was at that period, and the population is nearly ten times as numerous as it was at the close of the Revolutionary War. We have made this great progress in about eighty years; and I ask why, under the same policy, the Republic might not be still further extended if we were wise enough to adhere to the Constitution, as our fathers made it, to preserve all its checks and balances, to keep intact the powers of the Federal and State governments, and all their subdivisions of power. This is the policy of the Republican party. The popular-sovereignty principle has been tried in Kansas, and has resulted in strife, bloodshed, and commotion. Do you want to continue this strife? Why did you, popular-sovereignty men, intervene to disturb the slavery question in 1854? Ah, but you say you are for non-intervention

try will intervene until all these Territories which have once been dedicated to freedom shall again become free. And I am therefore in favor of the old doctrine of excluding slavery from the Territories by act of Congress. If that cannot be done, let the Territorial Legislature exclude it, if it will. The Republican policy is to use all the means within its power to keep slavery from spreading into the free Territories—your popular-sovereignty men claim to be opposed to spreading slavery. Do you believe if the Republican party had been in power there would have been any effort to get slavery into Kansas, or to revive the African slave trade? You are upholding and strengthening the hands of the party who are laboring in the slave interest.—Are you in favor of the equal administration of the laws of the country? Do you not know if a negro escapes from a Southern State the whole power of the Federal Government is put in requisition for his capture? Is not the telegraph used, and the army and navy put in requisition because a negro is loose in Boston? How is it, when Congress declares the African slave trade piracy, and that the parties engaged in it shall be hung, and that a cargo of slaves from Africa can be landed on our Southern coast and marched through a State in chains? Where then are your United States Marshals, your army and navy? These Africans cannot be seen; they cannot be found. But a single negro running away, if he gets as far as Boston, can be found without any difficulty.

I do not say Mr. Buchanan is in favor of the African slave trade, or that this is the case with the Democratic party of the North; but I do say, and do believe, popular-sovereignty men, that you are strengthening the hands of a party which is in favor of it, and the men in office, who will not execute the laws of the country against it. If you would stop these things, and bring the Government back to the doctrine of the Fathers, why not unite with the Republican party and accomplish the object? I have endeavored to state truly our position and that of our opponents. I have endeavored to show you that this thing called popular sovereignty is unmeaning, and that the only true theory of the Government is that advocated by the Republican party; and that the power of the government of the Territories is in Congress, and is to be exercised, during the Territorial existence, to promote the interests of the people who settle the Territories, and the general welfare of the great body of the people of the Union.

A Democratic Confab. It is not an unusual thing for those whose cars happen to be in the vicinity of locomotive confabs, now-a-days, to hear something like the following: Dem. No. 1.—"Well, this is glorious news from Harper's Ferry?" Dem. No. 2.—"Glorious! It's turning our Kansas outrages on the Black Republicans completely." Dem. No. 1.—"Well, it is, and we must charge it upon them. If we keep up the cry strong we'll scare away from their party a good many timid Republicans, I tell you."

Dem. No. 2.—"There couldn't possibly anything better than this have happened for us at this time. Coming on the very heels of the Ohio, Iowa, Minnesota and Pennsylvania elections, if we use well, we ought to break their forces." Dem. No. 1.—"That's so. But we must charge on them strong. Put Brown, Seward, Lincoln, Chase, Garrison and Smith, all in the same boat. They put us through on Kansas and we'll pay them for it."

Dem. No. 2.—"But, I say, Old Brown's game, isn't he? At any rate he has given us a lift we couldn't have got any other way." Business engagements at this point called these two honest Democrats away, each one no doubt heartily ashamed of himself for the contemptible part he has borne in the conversation. In view of this interchange of opinion, what are the "glorious principles of the Democracy?"

Mr. Milburn, in "Ten Years of Preacher Life," says: "I confess to a grateful love of log cabins, and am much inclined to the belief that their humble roofs have sheltered a greater amount of health, content, happiness, and virtue, than any other style of domestic architecture."

It may be interesting to note that during the siege of Sebastopol, extending over a period of eleven months, the enormous quantity of 2,775,360 lbs., or 1239 tons, of gunpowder was expended by the English alone; 2076 tons of shot and shell were fired from 476 pieces of ordnance, of which only 11 burst, and 269 were rendered unserviceable.

An old toper, in the last stages of the dropsy, was told by his physician that nothing would save him but being 'tapped.' His son, a witty little slaver, objected to this operation, saying—"Daddy, daddy, don't submit to it, for you know there never was anything tapped in our house that lasted more than a week."

Human hair varies from the 250th to the 600th part of an inch in thickness. The fibre of the coarsest wool is about the 500th part of an inch in diameter. Silk-worm's silk is about the 5000th part of an inch thick; but the spider's line is six times finer, and a single pound of this delicate substance would be sufficient to encompass the globe.

Brown being asked what was the first thing necessary toward winning the love of a woman, answered, "An opportunity."

ADVERTISING RATES. One square (12 lines or less, by letter measure) one insertion, \$2.00 " " two insertions, 4.00 " " Each subsequent insertion, 1.50 Reasonable deductions to those who advertise by the year. JOB PRINTING. THE PROPRIETOR OF THE ARGUS IS HAPPY to inform the public that he has just received a large stock of JOB TYPE and other new printing material, and will be in the ready receipt of additions suited to all the requirements of the locality. HANDBILLS, POSTERS, BLANKS, CARDS, CIRCULARS, PAMPHLET-WORK and other kinds, done to order, on short notice.