

Mr. Bates's Views.

In this number of the Argus will be found the views of Edward Bates on the questions that now agitate the public mind. We want every man in Oregon to read the article, and to read it with care. We consider it one of the best expositions—if not the best exposition—of the whole matter we have ever seen in print. The article was first published in the St. Louis News, an American paper. It has been copied into the Louisville Journal and other opposition papers South. With the exception of a few sentences which we would probably have worded a little differently, we consider Bates's article a model one. The New York Tribune considers it one of the best documents ever published—so we hope that such as are inclined to think us not quite "straight out" enough will look charitably upon our endorsement of Judge Bates. He is emphatically one of the clearest-headed men of the age, and no man, who has a soul and good sense, can read Bates's views without becoming a Republican. Read the article, and then get your neighbors to read it.

Bates under a Pressure.

Humanity requires that we come immediately to the relief of Edward Bates.—He is being subjected to a Pressure worse than fifteen pounds to the square inch. Our friend of the Eugene City Press is after him with a sharp stick of criticism.—The Press prints a part of Mr. Bates's views on slavery, and in the same issue gives its opinion thus:

"It seldom falls to our lot to meet with an article from so high a source, at once so replete with truth, and at the same time embodying so much of absurdity and inconsistency. It is claimed by the friends of Mr. Bates that his abilities as a judge and as an orator are of the highest stamp—qualities that we have always been willing to accord to him, as indeed, we are all the able to which he is justly entitled. But the editor of the News speaks by authority, as he professes to do, in the article alluded to, and Mr. Bates has authorized its publication to the world as his sentiments, we must come to the inevitable conclusion that either Mr. Bates is wanting in ability as a constitutional lawyer and judge; or that he has not given to the question of slavery that amount of thought and examination to which it is justly entitled."

We will now give the New York Tribune's opinion of Bates's views, just to show how doctors may differ:

"The views respecting Slavery of Edward Bates of Missouri—as authoritatively set forth by the St. Louis Evening News—will inevitably be studied and pondered by every intelligent and reflecting American. While they do not in all respects accord with our own convictions, we deem them as embodying the soundest, the clearest, the most forcible expressions yet put forth of the genuine Conservative sentiment of our country. Mr. Bates in politics belongs to the school of Henry Clay, of whom he was, while in public life thirty-odd years ago, and has remained ever since, an ardent admirer and disciple. Years ago, from a deliberate conviction that Slavery was economically a blunder and morally a wrong, he quietly emancipated his own slaves and provided for their removal to a land where they could enjoy civil equality and political freedom.—His views on the whole subject of Slavery, its extension, the rendition of fugitives, &c. are substantially those steadily cherished and repeatedly avowed by George Washington and his illustrious compatriots.—Mr. Bates differing from the Father of his Country only in giving effect to during his life to convictions of the justice and humanity of emancipation on which Gen. Washington acted at his death."

"We trust, therefore, that efforts will be made to place this exposition in the hands of every voter who can read, whether in the Free or the Slave States. We are sure it will do more to remove false impressions and correct gross misrepresentations with regard to the views and aims cherished by the Republican party, than any other paper ever yet given to the public."

As there is a pretty good prospect of the nomination of Mr. Bates for the Presidency by the Republicans, in which event the Press will probably feel as though it must reluctantly support the author of a terrible "embodiment of absurdity and inconsistency," we feel like coming to the immediate relief of the Press. We shall do this by showing that the Press, and not Mr. Bates, is in the mire.

The first Pressure to which Mr. Bates is subjected, is the following:

"How Mr. Bates is to harmonize the assertion that the 'extension of slavery is unconstitutional,' and his idea of 'except by affirmative legislation,' is to us a mystery."

If the editor of the Press had read the article he printed, he would have found no such language in it as the "extension of slavery is unconstitutional," or "except by affirmative legislation." The Press has fallen into the blunder of putting an extreme abolition sentiment ("extension of slavery is unconstitutional") and a Republican sentiment ("except by affirmative legislation") into the mouth of Mr. Bates, and then wondering how they could be reconciled. The Press would have been equally just toward Mr. Bates, if it had said—"How Mr. Bates is to harmonize the assertion that it is the duty of the General Government to make liberal appropriations to keep up the underground railroad to run off niggers from the South, and his idea of 'non-interference with slavery where it lawfully exists,' is to us a mystery"—the criticism would have been

equally legitimate with the one we are treated to.

The next Pressure to which Mr. Bates is subjected, is certainly execrating, and must make him cry out in the anguish of his soul, "Save! oh! save me from my friends!"

"For Mr. Bates or any other man to say that the 'Constitution does not by its proper vigor carry slavery into the Territories,' and that the idea of its sustaining it in Territories already free is 'unconstitutional,' and then talk about an 'exception by affirmative legislation,' is perfectly ridiculous and absurd. If the Constitution does not establish or sustain an institution 'by its proper vigor,' can it do it by an improper vigor? No! there is no sensible man, whether pro-slavery or anti-slavery, that cares a straw for the Constitution of his country but who will acknowledge the absurdity of such an idea."

Now let us untangle this woful snarl into which the Press has got Mr. Bates, by seeing just what Mr. Bates does say:

What the Press makes him say. "The Constitution does not by its proper vigor carry slavery into the Territories—(Here the Press is substantially correct.)—"Except by affirmative legislation."

What he does say. "Mr. Bates does not believe that the Constitution by its proper vigor carries slavery into all the Territories that may be acquired by the United States."

"He does not believe that slavery can exist in any Territory acquired by the Government of the United States, except by the positive law of Congress."

"If Congress, clearly representing the will of the country, should pass laws legalizing and protecting slave property in the Territories previously free, Mr. Bates would exercise every power lawfully in his power to carry out the law of the land." (Republican doctrine.)

We think that the Press even can now begin to see through the terrible snarl.—Mr. Bates, in the first place, stands upon the ground laid down by Lord Mansfield eighty-four years ago, and since reiterated by the Supreme Court of the United States—besides being a thousand times affirmed by Douglas and other Democratic politicians—that slavery is of such a nature that it can exist nowhere except by the force of positive law. Mr. Bates, in the next place, stands upon the doctrine enunciated by Daniel Webster, in his great debate with nullifying Calhoun, that the Constitution, "by its own proper vigor," so far from carrying slavery into Territory acquired by the United States by treaty, purchase, or conquest, doesn't even carry itself there, or institute any species of government whatever that may conflict with the government in force in said Territory before the same became the property of the United States—but he (Mr. Bates) believes that it takes a special act of Congress to inaugurate a provisional government for the same, and, in doing this, Congress may constitutionally organize just such a government as it pleases (subject only to the Constitution), either establishing or prohibiting slavery, or saying nothing about it, just as it pleases. Congress derives this power from the Constitution, which empowers it to "make all needful rules and regulations for the Territories"—leaving it wholly and entirely with Congress to judge what "rules and regulations" are "needful." Now if the Constitution had clearly specified that "protection of slave property" was one of the "needful rules" to be made in the government of Territories, the Constitution would, "of its own proper vigor," have carried slavery into the Territories, but as it has left that matter wholly to Congress, it does not "of its own proper vigor" do any such thing. The Constitution, "of its own proper vigor," protects slavery where it exists by virtue of local laws, enacted by an exercise of State sovereignty. The Constitution, by "its own proper vigor," protected the slave trade, till 1808, but the moment the clock struck twelve on the night of the thirty-first of December, 1807, the "proper vigor" of this part of the Constitution expired, and since then Congress alone is sovereign over the whole subject of the slave trade—it can either foster it or suppress it, just as it chooses. Whatever Congress does, in the exercise of discretionary power vested in it by the Constitution, is constitutional, and is done by a constitutional provision, if not by a "proper vigor" of the instrument. If the Press chooses to place itself in the unenviable position of raising such a criticism as its "improper vigor," it will be clearly constitutional for it to do so, but we certainly demur, as a Republican, against any such dogma as that the Constitution, "of its own proper vigor," places the Press in such a ridiculous attitude.

SMILKAMEN MINES.—Through the kindness of Cris Taylor, Esq., of this city, we are put in possession of the following information from the new mines north: Dr. J. N. Bell had lately arrived at the Dalles and brings news of the most favorable character. He prospected seven days, and brings with him some rich specimens—has two kinds of gold, hill gold and river gold, which he washed out himself. He took up dirt from the bottom of the river, and in six pans he washed out \$150. He prospected eight or ten miles along the river, and reports the mines good so far as he has prospected. About fifty miners were in that section. The weather was very cold.

GOOSE WHEAT.—Some time since we received a sack of Goosewheat flour from Mr. F. N. Woodworth, of Howell Prairie, Marion county, together with a sample of the wheat itself. All that we can say of its merits now is that it makes most excellent pudding.

LATER FROM THE EAST.

NO SPEAKER YET.

The President's Message Delivered.

The steamer Panama reached Portland Tuesday last at 4 P. M., with dates from St. Louis to the 29th December, and from Washington to the 27th. Nothing has been done in Congress, and the news of the country is remarkably dull.

On the 24th a ballot for speaker was taken with the following result: Sherman 102, Scott 83, Gilmer 14, scattering 11. Adjourned till Tuesday, December 27.

Senator Seward had arrived at New York from Europe.

The President sent his annual message in to Congress on the 27th December.

We will publish the message next week.

Slater on Steam.

The Union editor has found out since the Old Brown affair that slavery is like steam—it must be confined. Hear him:

"The engineer, who, seeing there was danger of an explosion from excess of steam, instead of leaving open the usual avenues of escape to the surplus steam, closed them up, even weighting down the safety valves, philosophizing that steam was a dangerous element and therefore must be confined.—The result was as might have been expected, a most terrific explosion. So with southern society; if it is dangerously constituted, there is greater necessity for its dispersion (we do not mean increase) for like steam, the more it is dispersed, the less will be the danger of explosion."

We hope Slater wouldn't have had that signacious engineer blow off that "surplus steam" right into the cabin, and scald all the passengers? If he would have had it let off in a direction in which it wouldn't hurt anybody, it's all right. We are perfectly willing that the 'surplus steam' of slavery should be 'dispersed' into Africa, or into the ocean, or wherever the Union chooses, so it isn't 'dispersed' into the Territories, or the free States, to the great damage of the white race. We, as a Republican, are willing that slavery should 'blow off' just as much as it pleases, so that it doesn't 'blow off' toward us. We allow the same license to a polcat, but we are not 'democratic' enough to suppose the thing has any right to 'blow off' under our bed-room—while Slater's logic, and sense of duty, would probably lead him to view a similar operation in one corner of his sanctum as purely a 'necessary' 'democratic' 'dispersion,' that 'lessened the danger of an explosion.'

It's about time Slater had an office.

Livingstone.

Those who have read Dr. Livingstone's Travels in Africa, will be interested by the fact that he has returned to his old field of labor, with his family, a brother, and several more missionaries. When last heard from, he had ascended the Zambesi as far as Tete in a small steamer. The Zambesi was found to be a difficult stream to navigate, and from Tete the missionaries were preparing for an overland journey into the interior. The Portuguese authorities at Tete were having a terrible war with the natives in that vicinity.

We intend, on a future occasion, to have something to say upon the prospects opened up by Livingstone's explorations in Africa for drying up the slave trade and knocking slavery into 'pi' everywhere by legitimate commerce. We believe that Livingstone, during his sixteen years of travel in Africa, has brought to light the fulcrum on which humanitarians can place their lever, and produce the greatest social revolution ever brought about. Africa, we fully believe, contains her own cure, and if her resources are once developed by a proper direction of her present uneducated labor, she may 'serve' the world and 'rule' its commerce at the same time.

THUNDER.—One Buras writes from Iowa to the editor of the Democrat for information about Oregon. Delusion gives three or four columns in reply, and sends him the Democrat. Among other questions, Buras asks whether we have much thunder and lightning in Oregon. He will judge by the Democrat that we have terrible 'thunder' here, but very little lightning. Delusion very properly tells him we have a God in Oregon as elsewhere. If Delusion had forgotten to mention this, the poor man would naturally have inferred, from the general run of the Democrat, that there wasn't any God in Oregon.

MURDER IN POLK.—Edward Robison, well known in Oregon as "Mountain Robison," we learn from the Statesman, was killed in a drunken row by an Irishman, in Spring Valley, Jan. 19. He left considerable property in Polk county. Robison was from London, England.

COALS TO NEWCASTLE.—The publisher of the Democrat advertises for 'fowls' in payment for subscription. We thought, from the large quantity Delusion is sending off every week, that they were already overstocked with fowls.

UPPER WILLAMETTE.—The steamer Surprise, Capt. Geo. Jerome, leaves for Corvallis to-day, at 2 P. M. The steamer Elk, Capt. G. A. Poase, will resume her regular trips to the head of navigation, on Monday, at 2 P. M.

TEMPERANCE ADDRESS.—We learn that A. Holbrook, Esq., will deliver an address on Temperance, at the Methodist Church in this city, on Tuesday evening next, Jan. 31. All are invited to attend.

To Geo. Hoyt, Esq., Clerk of the steamer Express, we are indebted for the first copy of the President's Message.

Views of Edward Bates on the Slavery Question.

Slavery not Beneficial Socially, Politically, or Religiously.—Mr. Bates does not believe that "African slavery is the cornerstone of liberty."

He does not believe that African slavery is a beneficial institution, either in a social, political or religious sense. Not in a social sense, because it sets at naught the family relation and separates man and wife, parents and children, at the caprice, or on the necessity of owners; not in a political sense, because it is productive of discords between nations that tolerate it, and nations that do not, and because it is liable to panics, commotions, insurrections and massacres, and has ended often in bloody revolutions; not in a religious sense, because it slights the mind against knowledge, makes the word of God a sealed book to the slave, and gives his body to the service of a human master, whereas the body of every created being should be freely given to the service of God.

Its Extension Unconstitutional except by Affirmative Legislation.—Because Mr. Bates does not believe that slavery is a beneficial institution, either in a social, political, or religious sense, he is unalterably opposed to its extension into Territories already free. Mr. Bates in his political creed is a Henry Clay White; and Mr. Clay declared that "his right arm should drop from his shoulder before he would vote to extend slavery over one foot of Territory already free." Mr. Bates heartily endorses that sentiment and holds to that creed.

Mr. Bates does not believe that the Constitution, by its proper vigor, carries slavery into all the Territories that may be acquired by the United States. He believes that freedom is the rule, and slavery the exception. He does not believe that slavery can exist in any Territory acquired by the government of the United States, except by the positive law of Congress. That positive law Mr. Bates would not be in favor of passing, because, for reasons already given, he is opposed to the extension of slavery into Territory already free.

Distinction between Slave and other Property Coeval with the Government.—If it be held that this extension of slave property from the territory "acquired by the common blood and treasure of the Union" establishes an invidious distinction between two sections of the Union—that it denies to the South rights that are freely given to the North—Mr. Bates does not emphatically think that it has any such effect. The distinction complained of is coeval with the Government. It is no new thing, no modern hardship—in fact, no hardship at all. The localizing of slavery, the prohibition of its emigrating and establishing itself in free territory, was embodied in the compact of the Union at the beginning. But for this limitation the slave States got far more than an equivalent in being allowed in the National Congress and in Presidential elections three votes for every five slaves. Slaves do not vote, but their masters vote for them. The votes of two men of the South count as much as the votes of five men in the free States.

Citizen of New York Possessing Right of Property not held by a Virginian.—Why should this be so? If slaves are only property, as the Southern man will say, why should not the Northern man's property vote for it? It is only property. When the slaveholder is disposed to complain, therefore, that a distinction is made against him—that he cannot go into the common territory of the country and take his property, the citizen of the free State can reply: "It is not like my property that you want to take, but it is property that votes—a half vote in my own—it is property that makes me inferior to you in our relations to the Federal Government, and that is not fair when we come to occupy what has been bought by 'the common blood and treasure of the Union.'"

The distinction between free and slave property is, as before stated, as old as the Constitution itself. If there were no Territories at all, the same distinction would exist. A citizen of New York can carry all his property with him, and hold it. A citizen of Virginia cannot remove to the State of Ohio and carry all his property with him, and hold it. He couldn't do it ten years ago, nor twenty years ago, nor at any time since Ohio existed as a state in the Union. Why is this so? Does not the Constitution prevail equally over all the Union? Does not the very language of the second section of the 17th article of the Constitution of the United States declare that "the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States?"

Slavery is not Protected by the Constitution, but by Local Law.—Yet we find that citizens of Massachusetts possess, and have possessed for over fifty years, certain privileges in the matter of changing their domicils, which the citizens of Virginia do not possess. One can go to Ohio and carry his property and keep it. The other cannot. And yet demagogues would have Southern men believe that no discrimination against their property ought to exist, or ever did exist, and that to enforce such discrimination in the settlement of new States would be to establish a distinction between certain classes of property which the South cannot, in honor, submit to!

If slavery cannot go into the free States and maintain itself, why should it expect to go into free Territories and maintain itself, there being in either case local laws to protect it? Is not the Constitution of the United States as vigorous, as comprehensive, and as just in Ohio as it is in Kansas? Does it not regard the property—the vested rights—of all citizens, in all places of the Republic, as equally sacred? If slavery is national—if it exists in the Constitution itself—how can the Constitution permit an owner of such property to be despoiled of it in a free State any more than in a free Territory? Can a State be permitted to nullify the rights of man in property that is recognized in the Constitution of the United States, and the Federal Government have no right to interfere? Of course not, for the Constitution says that "the United States shall guarantee to every State a Republican form of government." But such a State government, despoiling a man of his right, would not be republican but despotic. It is clear that if slavery be the rule—if it be national—if it exists in the Constitution, and is carried wherever the Constitution prevails—that it is as sacred in Ohio as in Kansas and as firmly to be upheld in either as on the banks of the

Savanne. Wherever the flag of the Union floats there every citizen is entitled to protection in all his rights that are national and constitutional. Such would be the case with regard to slave property if slavery is national.

The Discrimination never thought of as a Hardship by the South.—But this is not so. It is not claimed, even by the South, and never has been, that a slave owner has a right to remove with his negroes to a free State, and call upon the United States Government to protect him in his property. Yet his right to go to a free State is as perfect, under the United States Constitution, as it is to go to a free Territory. Was Kansas acquired by "the common blood and treasure of the Union"? So was Iowa—and what right has Iowa, any more than Kansas, to discriminate against slave property so as to deprive citizens of any portion of the Union of their national and constitutional rights? This discrimination against slave property as regards emigration into free States, we have thus shown, has always existed, and never by the South been considered a hardship. And why? Because, perhaps, the citizens of the slave States felt, the privilege to vote on their slaves, that species of property had obtained a peculiar and transcendent advantage over all other property in the Union, that more than compensates for its one restriction, to wit: that it should not enter into and establish itself in free States.

If the South is tired of this discrimination against slave property, which has existed since the government was established, and desires it abandoned, then the South should propose to abandon also the privilege that such property enjoys. Surely it is only fair that property should, in point of fact, become equal before it claims to go as equal into common territory of the Union. If the South decline the one how can it fairly claim the other?

The South in Honor Bound to the Original Restrictions Imposed by Law.—Mr. Bates does not, therefore, regard the non-admission of slavery into the territories of the Union as establishing a distinction between property, but simply as maintaining a distinction already established, willingly assented to by the South at the formation of the Government and ever since. It is only at the instance of mischievous demagogues that the South is now tempted to change its position and abandon the liberal and traditional compromise of the Constitution. As a true and upright citizen, who loves his country's well kept faith as he does his own private honor, Mr. Bates opposes the attempt of Southern fanatics to make slavery overleap its original rights, limitations, and relations to other property of the Union.

Inasmuch as the entire Democratic party of the free States are as decidedly opposed as even the Republican party, to the extension of slavery over territory previously free, it is quite evident that Congress will never intervene to protect slave property in the Territories. Such being the fact, those Southern men, who object to Mr. Bates as a slavery restrictionist, might well ask themselves whether more of honor or advantage is gained by asking what cannot be had, and submitting to the fatal necessity of denial and defeat; or asking only that the present limits, privileges, and guarantees of slavery be maintained, and obtaining it with the cheerful and hearty concurrence of nine tenths of all parties in the Union.

The Kansas-Nebraska Bill Rendering the Introduction of Slavery into Territories Impossible.—If the National Democracy offer more to the South, we know they offer what they cannot give. The history of Kansas is too recent and too instructive, in which we see the most violent pro-slavery Democrats, as they professed themselves, after getting men and money from the South by hundreds and by thousands, to save Kansas to the South, suddenly become free Democrats when they found success doubtful under the pro-slavery banner, and sought office as free Democrats, unflinchingly declaring that slavery never had been an issue in Kansas! The principle of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, in the shape of squatter sovereignty, has rendered the introduction of slavery into Territories impossible; and the passage of that bill is the work of the National Democracy. Mr. Bates not only holds as a principle that which the Democracy have established as a fact. The question of slavery extension is no longer before the people. It is discussed now only as an abstraction.

If Mr. Bates does not believe slavery to be a wise and useful institution—if he is opposed to its extension into Territories already free—he nevertheless just as firmly adheres to the rights of property in slaves in all the States where slavery exists, and will go just so far to protect the rights of States in that species of property, as long as those States choose to keep it, as any man living.

Favors the Principles of the Fugitive Slave Law.—Mr. Bates believes in the unqualified right of the owner to recover his slaves if they escape to a free State; and if President, he would execute the fugitive slave law, if the army and navy of the government were equal to the task. And if the fugitive slave law should be repealed, or should be found inadequate to the service of returning absconding slaves to their masters, Mr. Bates would urgently recommend to Congress to pass some law that would more certainly and more acceptably carry out the constitutional guarantees of the rights of Southern slaveholders. He would consider the Union a broken compact if these plain guarantees were denied by the deliberate and persevering action of any part of the Confederacy.

If Congress, clearly representing the will of the country, should pass laws legalizing and protecting slave property in Territories previously free, Mr. Bates would execute those laws as promptly as any other laws of the land. If a Territory should organize into a State, with a sufficient population to justify its admission, and present a constitution tolerating slavery, Mr. Bates would not oppose the admission of such a State because it had a pro-slavery Constitution.

Rejoices that Missouri is Becoming a Free State.—His creed is, that every State has a right to say how much it wants of African slavery, and how long it wants it, and how to get rid of it when its people are tired of it. He does not regard it as a perpetual institution, but as, in its very nature, abnormal and evanescent, changing rapidly under the influence of climates, commerce, civilization, religion, laws. He knows, (and is glad to know it), that Missouri is rapidly becoming a free State; and

he does not deplore the fact that it is by transportation and not by emancipation that the State is so rapidly becoming free; for he knows that the emancipation of the slaves to remain in this country and mix with the whites is abhorrent and intolerable. And to send them abroad by sudden and total exodus, is beyond the means of any government. What is beyond his own wisdom he leaves to the inscrutable ways and infinite wisdom of God. The rapid and peaceful extinction of slavery that is going on in Missouri, without aid of "Emancipation Parties," and without the heat and acrimony of domestic discord, is entirely in accordance with the views and feelings of Mr. Bates. While Mr. Bates is glad to see slavery declining in Missouri, other strong Opponents are sorry to witness the same.

Slavery Beyond the Reach of Demagogues—Free Labor Bound to Become Dominant.—Mr. Bates finds no cause of discord between himself and that pro-slavery neighbor on account of this difference; for he knows that neither the wish of the one nor the sorrow of the other, will quicken or delay the inevitable consummation that is ahead. Mr. Bates regards the fate of slavery as out of the domain of demagogues—utterly beyond their reach—and impelled by that power that brings the times and seasons to their appointed course, and rolls up the Heavens as a scroll, when He has done up the wondrous panorama. By his own example he has shown that he prefers to live by his own labor, and not on the labor of slaves. But he claims to be, in this particular, only "a law unto himself."

The Necessity of Procuring Foreign Territory for Colonizing Free Blacks.—He would never under any circumstances countenance a National organization having in view the interference with slavery in the States. The entire function of the Federal Government in regard to slavery, in his opinion, should be to protect it where it is—not to extend it where it is not—and, so far as policy and ability may allow, to help those States to get clear of it that may wish to do so, by the procurement of Foreign Territory suitable to the ready and cheap colonization of free blacks, already become a grievous nuisance to every State of the Union, both free and slave. This is a national nuisance, and should begin to find a national remedy. The policy already broached in some States of selling again into slavery the free blacks whom humane or grateful masters have emancipated, unless those freed persons leave the State—when, indeed, all the slave States and many of the free, prohibit their entrance within their limits under heavy penalties is, in the highest degree, cruel. It is barbarous. And it would disgrace the American Government in the face of Christendom to permit such a policy to prevail, from the lack of its own intervention to procure a suitable home for these sorely hunted and distressed freemen of a well worked and faithful servile race.

SENATOR SEWARD AND HARPER'S FERRY.

—The Paris correspondent of the New York Times announces the arrival of the Hon. Wm. H. Seward at that city, and adds:—

"Mr. Seward indignantly denies ever having even heard of the projected assault on at Harper's Ferry, and, although he recollects having received a call from a man known as Col. Forbes, there was no mention made of such an attempt at insurrection. Col. Forbes asked him for means for another object, which he refused, and that was all he ever saw of the individual in question. Mr. Seward will return home in the steamer Arago, in December."

THANKS.—We are under especial obligations to Cris Taylor, Esq., Agent of Tracy & Co.'s Express, in this city, for late papers, &c., and also to Dr. Noble, of this city, for late California papers.

MARRIED:

Thursday, Dec. 22, 1859, at the residence of Francis Tubert, by Rev. Clinton Kelley, Mr. N. N. MATLOCK to Miss SARAH C. CHAMBERLAIN, of Clackamas county.

Dec. 22, by Rev. L. L. Rowland, in Monmouth, Mr. Geo. W. Row and Miss Nancy A. Murphy.

Dec. 22, by Rev. T. H. Small, Mr. King Hubbard to Miss Julia A. Griffith, all of Marion.

Dec. 22, by the same, Mr. Amos Gleason to Miss Jane A. Johnson, daughter of Rev. Neil Johnson, all of Marion.

DIED:

Dec. 25, 1859, infant son of John and Mary Ellen Hunt, of Marion county.

In San Francisco, January 12, of typhoid fever, John, son of Bartholomew and Lucinda White, of Polk county, Oregon, aged 6 years and 2 months.

Administrator's Notice.

NOTICE is hereby given that letters of administration have been granted to the undersigned by the county court of Clackamas county, on the estate of Pleasant Saunders, dec'd, late of said county. All persons indebted to said estate are required to make immediate payment, and all persons having claims against said estate, and all persons having claims against said estate, and all persons having claims against said estate, are invited to present them to me, soon to as the law directs, within one year from this date.

FRANCIS T. HOWARD, Ad'r.

D. D. STEPHENSON,

DENTIST, Has removed his office to the City Book Store, where he is prepared to do all work in his line. He has also an assortment of Patent Medicines, which can be had at Portland prices, and Dentifrice, that he will warrant not to injure the teeth, but make the breath sweet and all persons having claims against said estate, and all persons having claims against said estate, and all persons having claims against said estate, are invited to present them to me, soon to as the law directs, within one year from this date.

Fancy Soaps and Perfumery, and various other notions that are so much needed here. Oregon City, Jan. 21, 1860.

SAMUEL P. DUZAN,

House Carpenter,

Jobber and Turner.

SHOP near ROSSI & Co.'s FOUNDRY.

PAVONAGE OF OREGON CITY AND neighborhood respectfully solicited. Oregon City, Jan. 21, 1860. 418

Removal.

THE CITY BOOK STORE

HAS BEEN REMOVED OPPOSITE its old stand, on the corner where the Main Street House. Jan. 21, 1860.

Look Here!

ANY ONE who wishes to exchange an improved CLAIM for other property can have an opportunity, by addressing a note to "EXCHANGE," Oregon City Post Office.