

THE COLUMBIAN AND DEMOCRAT, BLOOMSBURG, COLUMBIA COUNTY,

THE COLUMBIAN

Bloomsburg, Friday, Nov. 3, 1871.

One, P. HOWELL & CO., of Park Row are our only authorized Advertising Agents in New York.
CON, WERNER, Co., of 15th and Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, are our authorized Agents in Philadelphia.
C. G. MURPHY, Esq., is our authorized Agent in Baltimore.
CATHERINE D. R. FROM BURPTON STATION, going North, Eliz. P. M., Going South, A. M.

M. F. CONNER is authorized to transact any business connected with the COLUMBIAN office.

TEMPERATURE OF OCTOBER, 1871, at Bloomsburg, noted daily three times. Maximum 80° on the 21st, at 2 p. m. Minimum 30° on the 23d, and 36° at 7 A. M. Mean 51°.

We are burning M. J. D. WETHINGTON's standard White oil, and learn that he keeps a supply on hand at Northumberland. The circular with his name attached, stating he had retired from the oil trade was got up with a view to injure him, and without his knowledge or consent.

FILE AT ASHLAND.—A severe fire, attended with loss of property to the amount of \$10,000 and the death of John Catell, occasioned by the falling of a chimney, visited Ashland on the 1st ult. The sufferers by the fire were James Hetherington, Mrs. Patrick Lally, John Colligan and Christian Ruderman. This is another case of fire arising from a defective flue.

BY Divine permission the M. E. Church in Benton, will be dedicated November 12th, Rev. S. Barnes, Presiding Elder, of Danville district, and Rev. S. Creighton of Danville will officiate. Pastors and people of surrounding charges are cordially invited to attend. G. H. DAY.

OCT. 31, 1871.

THE TRIAL OF HENRY WARD, of Towanda, for the murder of his friend and guest W. E. SCHADER, will commence at Tunkhannock on the 6th of November next, before Judge Elwell. MARCY & YOST propose to publish a daily record of the proceedings of Court during the progress of the trial, printed in pamphlet form, containing everything pertaining to the case, including the testimony, speeches of counsel and charge of the Judge. Price 10 cents. Address MARCY & YOST, Tunkhannock.

Resolutions of Condolence.

The following preamble and resolutions were unanimously adopted by Catawissa Lodge, No. 308, I. O. of G., at a regular session held October 23d, 1871:

WHEREAS, God has seen fit in the disposition of his angels to send us evidence of his love and mercy in the late death of our brother W. C. PRICE;—therefore,

Resolved, That while we would humbly submit to the will of our kind and merciful Father, who doth all things well, we cannot but express our sorrow that one so recently ill of life and avert, has died.

Resolved, That this admonishes us to be also ready, knowing that in the midst of life we are in death, and that in such an hour as we think not the Son of Man cometh.

Resolved, That we deeply sympathize with the mother of our deceased Brother in this the hour of her sad bereavement, earnestly praying that she may be abundantly comforted and sustained by the Divine Spirit.

Resolved, That we will attend the funeral of our deceased Brother in a body, and that the members wear the usual badge of mourning twenty days, and that the Charter of the Lodge also be draped in mourning for the same length of time.

All are invited to copy of these resolutions be given the family of our deceased Brother, and that they be published in the *Keystone Good Templar*, and in our county papers.

L. B. KLINE,
H. J. STROUSE,
P. R. BALDY,
Catawissa, Oct. 29. Committee.

Other Bitemns.—Authority.

To the Editor of the Columbian:

Your correspondent, Mr. F., in the issue of September 28, is pleased to pay me a high compliment, by saying that a certain portion of my communication of September 15, was "ingenious and lawyer-like," though he betrays a strange confusion of thought, for so eminent a man of the bar, by immediately asking—"but is it fair?" Undoubtedly! It is true, there is a class of men, whom by a stretch of professional courtesy, we call *lawyers*, who do not hesitate to stoop to what is unfair. But Mr. F. is not of this class; and I trust that he does not regard such conduct as "lawyer-like."

In regard to "negative proposition," Mr. F. says that I "find it convenient to escape behind the *purely legal defense* that a mere denial is sufficient." Purely legal? Is it therefore wrong? Is it not legal, because it is right? But it is as much a principle in logic as in law, that the *onus probandi* rests upon the party on the affirmative side of any proposition. Why, then, should so distinguish a lawyer and a logician talk about "escaping behind" this principle? The principle is right; and should govern all logic, as well as all legal investigations.

Mr. F. calls this "negative proposition" "my final position." A slight mistake! It is *his*, not *mine*. I had said nothing about "orders in the ministry." It was he that framed the proposition—"That orders in the ministry were never authorized either by Christ or his apostles." Now if he will be kind enough to inform me first precisely what he means by the words "orders" in the ministry, and secondly what authority he has for believing that such were "authorized" by Christ or his apostles, I will then be ready to attend to the negative side of the question; and in making this suggestion, I do not merely find it convenient to *escape behind*, something, but I invoke a principle, just and right in itself, and which it is logical and lawyer-like to ignore.

In regard to what Mr. F. says he believes was "intended to be an argument," he adds: "His argument has been frequently advanced, and as frequently refuted." Will Mr. F. please be kind enough to tell us where, when, by whom and how it has been refuted? If he will, he may certainly be excused from "again demolishing" it. If not, thoughtful readers will be apt to suspect that he is quite mistaken. I do not doubt Mr. F.'s veracity, yet I do not

believe the argument has ever been "refuted," or that it ever can be.

Mr. F. says I have tended to him not one single authority." If not, I am certainly mistaken, I thought I had. I did tender him something which I regard as authority. But he says that I, being a lawyer, "know the difference between an authority and a mere *obiter dictum*, and that the latter will not answer for the former." I will not say that Mr. F., being a lawyer, "finds it convenient to escape behind the purely legal defense" involved in the distinction between an authority and an *obiter dictum*; because I do not think he has succeeded in making his "escape." I admit that an *obiter dictum* is not *binding authority*; though it is authority of a certain grade, and is often quoted, both from the Bar and from the Bench. Still, if what I have quoted as authority is, in the legal sense of the phrase, a "mere *obiter dictum*," then I admit that it was not adequate authority. My quotations were from the Scriptures. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God." The scriptures are the Supreme Law to Christians. Did Mr. F. ever find an *obiter dictum* in the Constitution of the United States, or in an act of Congress?—in any organic law?—or in any legislative enactment? It is, I confess, a new idea that there are *obiter dictum* things incidentally said—in the law itself. It strikes me this is not exactly "lawyer-like."

On mature reflection, I think Mr. F. will take off this off. He will not insist that anything "written by inspiration of God," is a "mere *obiter dictum*"; and, therefore, not authority. Will he be kind enough to frankly answer me a few questions?

1. Are not the sacred writings, or Scriptures, the highest and the only binding authority in religious matters?

2. Does not the apostle Paul, in these sacred writings, distinctly and repeatedly use the words *Prophets* (Elder) and *Epikloupos* (Bishop) interchangeably, and as two names for the same office?

3. Is not this adequate "authority" for this fact? See 1 Timothy 3 and 5:17; Titus 1: 5, 7; Acts 20: 17, 28.

Do not the passages quoted by me, in my previous communication, (to wit: Acts 15: 2; 20: 17; 14: 23; and Titus 1: 13) clearly and distinctly show that there was a plurality of these officers in each church, or local congregation of Christians; and is not this adequate "authority" for this fact.

4. Is there anywhere in the Sacred Writings, the slightest hint that some of these officers possessed, by virtue of this office, greater authority than others; or that any one of them possessed any authority, by virtue of this office, outside the local congregation of which he was one of the Elders or Bishops?

In view of the fact that he has allowed that I have tendered him "not one single authority"—that the expectation that I would support my statements "by some show of authority"—*how has he been refuted?*—I have a right, I think, to insist upon an answer to at least the first three of these questions. As to the fourth, and my request for a definition of what he means by "orders" in the ministry, and his authority for believing that these "orders" have been authorized by Christ or the apostles, of course, he will answer or not, as he may deem prudent.

Very respectfully, E. E. ORVIS,
Benton, Pa., Oct. 7, 1871.

Real Helpmate.

There is much good sense and truth in the remarks of a modern author, that no man ever prospered in the world without the co-operation of his wife. If she unites in mutual endeavour, or rewards his labor with an enduring smile, with what confidence will he resort to his merchandise or his farm, fly over lands, sail upon the seas, meet difficulty and encounter danger, if he knows he is not spending his strength in vain, but that his labor will be rewarded by the sweets of home. Solitude and disappointment enter the history of a man's life, and he is but half provided for his voyage, who finds but one associate for happy hours, while for months of darkness and distress no sympathizing partner is prepared.

We agree with the Louisville Courier Journal that the administration has a queer way of showing that it is no respecter of persons—Pardoning Bowen, and prosecuting Brigham Young.

READING RAILROAD.

SUMMER ARRANGEMENT.

MONDAY, May 15, 1871.

GREAT TRUNK LINE from the North and West for Philadelphia, New York, Reading, Pittsburg, Cleveland, Columbus, Indianapolis, and St. Louis via Harrisburg for New York, as follows: At 2:45, 8:30 a. m., and 2:45 p. m., connecting with Reading, Pittsburg, and Philadelphia, and arriving at New York at 10:30 a. m., 3:30, and 9:30 p. m., respectively. Trunks and baggage free. Without change, to New York at 9:00 a. m. and 12:30 noon and 5:30 p. m., Philadelphia at 7:30, 9:30 a. m., and 3:30 p. m., sleeping cars accompany luggage and baggage free. To New York at 9:00 a. m., 12:30 noon, and 3:30 p. m., New Jersey, New England, and Boston.

Day tickets, 40¢ each, all trains between Williamsport, New York and Philadelphia.

Trains run through by night. GEO. WEBB, Sept. 25, 1871.

INVALID ABUSED.—Nothing can be more cruel than to deceive the sick and ailing. Yet to do this is literally a business. The plan for grafting and swindling in the sale of species which have stood the test of social standing, by the medical profession, and by the rank and file of the public, is a serious evil.

S. J. SMITH.—The *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin* of yesterday quotes Dr. J. E. SOHOOGARIN, Principal, or Dr. O. A. MCGREGOR, Secretary, orange Grove, Oct. 25, 1871.

TRUCKEE RAILROAD.

DEATHS.

STROH—In Catawissa, very suddenly, of her husband, Mr. GEORGE STROH, on Tuesday, Oct. 22d, Mrs. MARIE STROH, of Montoursville, Conyngham, Pa.

WALTER—BIRMINGHAM—on the 3rd of October, 1871, by Peter Stroh, J. P., at the residence of the bride's parents, in Tunkhannock, Mr. and Mrs. J. P. WALTER.

Resolved, That while we would humbly submit to the will of our kind and merciful Father, who doth all things well, we cannot but express our sorrow that one so recently ill of life and avert, has died.

Resolved, That this admonishes us to be also ready, knowing that in the midst of life we are in death, and that in such an hour as we think not the Son of Man cometh.

All are invited to copy of these resolutions be given the family of our deceased Brother, and that they be published in the *Keystone Good Templar*, and in our county papers.

L. B. KLINE,
H. J. STROUSE,
P. R. BALDY,
Catawissa, Oct. 29. Committee.

Other Bitemns.—Authority.

To the Editor of the Columbian:

Your correspondent, Mr. F., in the issue of September 28, is pleased to pay me a high compliment, by saying that a certain portion of my communication of September 15, was "ingenious and lawyer-like," though he betrays a strange confusion of thought, for so eminent a man of the bar, by immediately asking—"but is it fair?" Undoubtedly!

It is true, there is a class of men, whom by a stretch of professional courtesy, we call *lawyers*, who do not hesitate to stoop to what is unfair. But Mr. F. is not of this class;

and I trust that he does not regard such conduct as "lawyer-like."

In regard to what Mr. F. says he believes was "intended to be an argument," he adds: "His argument has been frequently advanced, and as frequently refuted."

Will Mr. F. please be kind enough to tell us where, when, by whom and how it has been refuted?

If he will, he may certainly be excused from "again demolishing" it.

If not, thoughtful readers will be apt to suspect that he is quite mistaken. I do not

doubt Mr. F.'s veracity, yet I do not

believe the argument has ever been "refuted," or that it ever can be.

Mr. F. says I have tended to him not one single authority." If not, I am

certainly mistaken, I thought I had.

I did tender him something which I

regard as authority. But he says that I, being a lawyer, "know the difference

between an authority and a mere *obiter dictum*,

and that the latter will not answer for the former." I will not say

that Mr. F., being a lawyer, "finds it convenient to escape behind the purely

legal defense" involved in the distinction between an authority and an *obiter dictum*;

because I do not think he has

succeeded in making his "escape."

I admit that an *obiter dictum* is not *binding authority*;

though it is authority of a certain grade, and is often quoted, both from the Bar and from the Bench.

Still, if what I have quoted as authority

is, in the legal sense of the phrase, a "mere *obiter dictum*," then I admit that it was not adequate authority.

My quotations were from the Scriptures.

All Scripture is given by inspiration of God."

The scriptures are the Supreme Law to Christians.

Did Mr. F. ever find an *obiter dictum*

in the Constitution of the United States,

or in any organic law?

Or in any legislative enactment?

If he will, he may certainly be excused from "again demolishing" it.

If not, thoughtful readers will be apt to suspect that he is quite mistaken. I do not

doubt Mr. F.'s veracity, yet I do not

believe the argument has ever been "refuted," or that it ever can be.

Mr. F. says I have tended to him not one single authority." If not, I am

certainly mistaken, I thought I had.

I did tender him something which I

regard as authority. But he says that I, being a lawyer, "know the difference

between an authority and a mere *obiter dictum*,

and that the latter will not answer for the former."

I will not say that Mr. F., being a lawyer, "finds it convenient to escape behind the purely

legal defense" involved in the distinction between an authority and an *obiter dictum*;

because I do not think he has

succeeded in making his "escape."

I admit that an *obiter dictum* is not *binding authority*;

though it is authority of a certain grade, and is often quoted, both from the Bar and from the Bench.

Still, if what I have quoted as authority

is, in the legal sense of the phrase, a "mere *obiter dictum*," then I admit that it was not adequate authority.

My quotations were from the Scriptures.

All Scripture is given by inspiration of God."

The