

THE STAR OF THE NORTH.

R. W. Weaver Proprietor.

Truth and Right—God and our Country.

(Two Dollars per Annum.)

VOLUME 2.

BLOOMSBURG, COLUMBIA COUNTY, PA., THURSDAY, DECEMBER 26, 1850.

NUMBER 48.

THE STAR OF THE NORTH

Is published every Thursday Morning, by R. W. WEAVER.
OFFICE—Up stairs in the New Brick building on the south side of Main street, third square below Market.
TERMS—Two Dollars per annum, if paid within six months from the time of subscribing; two dollars and fifty cents if not paid within the year. No subscription received for a less period than six months; no discontinuance permitted until all arrearages are paid, unless at the option of the editors.
ADVERTISEMENTS not exceeding one square, will be inserted three times for one dollar, and twenty-five cents for each additional insertion. A liberal discount will be made to those who advertise by the year.

From the Boston Chronicle.

I OWNE NO MAN A DOLLAR.

BY CHARLES P. SHIRAS.

Oh, do not envy, my own dear wife!
The wealth of our next-door neighbor,
But bid me still to be stout of heart,
And cheerfully follow my labor.
You must know, the last of those little debts
That have been our lingering sorrow
I paid this night! So we'll both go forth
And shake hands with the world to-morrow!
Oh, the debtor is but a shame-faced dog
With the creditor's name on his collar,
While I'm a king and you are a queen,
For we owe no man a dollar!

Oh, my neighbor, you saw in his coach to-day,
With his wife and his laughing daughter,
Whom we sat down at our coversboard,
To a crust and a cup of water.
I saw it at the tea-table stood in your eye,
I saw it, you tried your best to conceal it,
I know that, the contrast reached your heart,
And you could not help but feel it;
But know, now, that our scanty fare
Has freed my neck from the collar,
You'll join my laugh, and help me shout
That we owe no man a dollar!

This neighbor whose shawl has dazzled your
In fact, is a wretched debtor,
I pity him, oh, from my very heart,
And I wish that his lot were better.
Why the man is the veriest slave alive;
For his dashing wife and daughter
Will live in style though ruin should come—
So he goes like a lamb to the slaughter;
But he feels it the tighter every day,
That terrible debtor's collar!
Oh! what would he give, could he stay with
That he owed no man a dollar!

You seem amazed, but I'll tell you more;
Within two hours I met him;
Sneaking away with a frightened air
As if a fiend had beset him;
Yet he fled from a very worthy man,
Whom I met with the greatest pleasure—
Whom I called by name, and forced to stop,
Though he said he was not at leisure.
He held my last note! so I held him fast,
Till he freed my neck from the collar;
Then I showed his hand as I proudly said,
"Now, I owe no man a dollar!"

Ah! now you smile, for you feel the force
Of the truth I've been repeating;
I know that a downright honest heart
In that gentle breast was beating!
To-morrow, I'll rise with a giant's strength,
To follow my daily labor;
But ere we sleep, let us humbly pray
For our wretched next-door neighbor;
And we'll pray for the time when all shall
Be free.

From the weight of the debtor's collar;
When the poorest will lift his voice and cry
"Now I owe no man a dollar!"
Allegheny City, Penn.

CHARGE OF THE COURT

In the case of the Commonwealth vs. Dr. Wm. H. H. Crandall tried for the Murder of Elizabeth Smith in the Oyer and Terminer of Columbia county: Hon. Joseph B. Anthony, President Judge.

William H. H. Crandall stands indicted before you for the crime of murder. The indictment charges him with the offence in the following words—(Here his Honor read the material charge in the indictment.) To this indictment he has pleaded that he is "not guilty," and has put himself upon God and his country for Trial. You have been in a great measure selected by the prisoner, according to the forms of law, to decide upon his guilt or innocence. In criminal cases the Jury are the Judges of the law as well as of the facts. The court has the right constitutionally to advise you in questions of law, but the decision is left to your own judgment.

By the common law the crime with which the defendant is charged, would be murder. Sir Matthew Hale gives the following doctrine ruled by him in 1670: "If a woman be with child and any one gives her a potion to destroy the child within her, and she takes it, and it works so thoroughly that it kills her, this is murder: for it is not to cure her of a disease, but unlawfully to destroy her child; within her; and therefore he that gives a potion to this end must take the hazard, and if it kills the mother it is murder." Hale, Pleas of the Crown 423-24. See also 1 East P. C. Chapter 5 section 16.

Although by the common law such a crime would have been murder, yet in Pennsylvania, unless the intention of the perpetrator of the mischief was to destroy the life of the mother, it would only be murder in the second degree. Where the illegal act which produces death is malicious and perpetrated with an intent to take life, the offence is murder of the first degree, and is punishable with death, but where no such intent is apparent, the crime is reduced to murder of the second degree and punished with imprisonment. The act of Assembly of 1794 on this subject says—

"All murder which shall be perpetrated by means of poison, or by lying in wait, or by any other kind of wilful, deliberate, and premeditated killing, or which shall be committed in the perpetration or attempt to perpetrate any arson, rape, robbery, or burgla-

ry, shall be deemed murder of the first degree; and all other kinds of murder shall be deemed murder of the second degree."
The counsel for the Commonwealth have candidly admitted that the facts in the case do not warrant a verdict against the prisoner of murder in the first degree, but ask you to find that he is guilty of murder in the second degree. It will not therefore be necessary for you to inquire into the distinction between murder in the first degree and murder in the second degree, because Commonwealth does not ask for the conviction of the defendant of murder in the first degree—but you will observe that the act of assembly requires that the jury before whom any person indicted for murder shall be tried, shall if they find such person guilty thereof, ascertain in their verdict whether it be murder of the first or second degree."

In proceeding to examine the evidence in the case, the jury are to presume that the prisoner is innocent of all crime, until you are satisfied beyond all reasonable doubts of his guilt. Has the evidence satisfied your consciences and your understandings that his guilt is established beyond reasonable doubt? The prisoner is entitled to any and every view of the facts consistent with his innocence, and he is entitled to an acquittal if you can take such view of the facts as will enable you to entertain reasonable doubts of his guilt; but if you are satisfied that his guilt of the offence with which he stands charged is clearly established, then it is your duty to find him guilty.

What was the cause of Elizabeth Smith's death?
In determining this question the jury will take into consideration the fact of the prisoner visiting her at Providence at the request of her mother—the meeting of the deceased with the prisoner at Mrs. Tuttle's in the Nanticoke dam—their journey to Williamsport and thence to Peter Shady's where they remained some three or four days; occupying the same room—their arrival at Bloomsburg, at Brady's inn on the 24th of July last, and their separation at this place; where he went Northward and she started in the stage to Danville and arrived the same evening at the residence of her sister Jane Gunton.

From the testimony of Dr. Updegraff it appears that when she came from Bloomsburg to her sister, she took tea at the Doctor's house, and he observed an uneasiness about her and that she was suffering pain; and drew the inference that she was perhaps in the family way. On Thursday evening she arrived at her sister's near Danville; on Saturday following she was taken very sick, and on that day, according to the testimony of her sister Jane Gunton, the abortion took place, as Elizabeth Smith afterwards told her. Her sister found her bed clothes very bloody and changed them. She testifies that she saw Elizabeth take medicine several times out of the bottle with the glass cork, which Doctor Scott testifies contained oil of sassa. On the Friday before she died, she first told her sister that she had been with child, and that the Doctor had given her medicine to produce abortion, and on Sunday afternoon told her sister she had no hopes of living at all. On Saturday, becoming worse, Doctor Updegraff was sent for, and upon visiting her and examining her situation, he told her she would not live long; and he thinks he told Elizabeth that he thought she had an abortion—she replied that she had; that she had been in the family way; that Doctor Crandall, through the solicitations of Mr. Rankin, had undertaken to produce an abortion; and that the medicine was put into her hands by Doctor Crandall with directions how to use it. She showed him some empty phials, and two partly empty. One had a glass stopper. The Doctor smelt and tasted the medicine, and he supposed it to be the essential oil of sassa. Upon inquiry by the Doctor as to what Elizabeth had done with the child, she told him she had buried it and described to him the place. The Doctor, by himself and in company afterward with several others, carefully searched for the child but could not find it. John Gunton says that Elizabeth, on Saturday before she died, told him they had killed her. He testifies this—"It was on Saturday, I think, I went to her room. 'Oh John,' she said, 'they have killed me!'"

The appearance of Elizabeth Smith after her death—the hardness of her breasts; and the bloodiness of her bed—have been testified to by Martha Saunders and Susan Fitzmons. Many physicians have also been fully examined on the question whether sassa might or ought not to be used when a woman is pregnant; and how far it is proper to use it as a medicine in menstrual obstructions. All the evidence which the jury may believe applicable to the question, what caused the death of Elizabeth Smith? will be carefully considered, and you will determine whether her death was caused by sassa, or by sassa and other noxious ingredients.

Did the prisoner cause the death of Elizabeth Smith?
If the jury are satisfied that her death was caused by sassa, or sassa and the other ingredients set forth in the indictment, the next inquiry will be for you to determine whether the prisoner caused her death. This is a fact for you to decide, exclusively; and in so doing, you are to take into careful consideration all the facts and circumstances detailed in evidence. In addition to what we have already referred to, in considering the evidence as to the cause of her death we would call attention of the jury to the written prescription given her by the Doctor as

to the mode and manner of administering the medicine, and his denial to her mother on his return home that he had seen Elizabeth—telling her that he was at Pittsburgh, and that her daughter he had not seen.

It is said, however, that all Elizabeth Smith said about her pregnancy, her abortion, and about Doctor Crandall's giving her medicine to cause it, is erroneous—that her riding through the country with the Doctor, without the knowledge of her parents—the very weak and imbecile condition of her body—the taking of medicine under the direction of the Doctor and by his written prescription; was merely to cure her suppressed menstruation—that she underwent all the pain and anguish which she suffered for weeks, away from home and relatives part of the time—that her death, in fine, was caused by persevering in following the prescription of her physician in an obstruction of the menses. Was not she on her death bed when she told Doctor Updegraff, her sister, and her brother-in-law of her situation? Would it not be singular if at such a time she would falsify? Did she not tell Doctor Updegraff that she had been pregnant and had lost her child? Did she not tell him that Doctor Crandall had given her medicine to produce an abortion? Did not Doctor Updegraff find her situation such as to be satisfied that she told him the truth? When the Rev. Mr. Elsegood visited her on Sunday he impressed upon her mind the importance of dismissing all hope of recovery, and she exclaimed despairingly to her sister "Oh Jane, must I die?" Were all these declarations of a dying woman shortly to appear before her God & who was told by her professional attendant that she would not live long; that the great probability was she would die; devoid of truth? If you reject the dying declarations of Elizabeth Smith, then you have not sufficient evidence of the guilt of the prisoner to render a verdict against him. But if, on the contrary, you are well satisfied that he caused her death by unlawful means, by administering sassa to her to procure an abortion; then, unless there are other reasons to justify his acquittal, you ought to find him guilty.

It has been very ably contended by the learned counsel of the prisoner that there is not sufficient evidence that Elizabeth Smith made the declarations testified to, under a sense of impending death. Lord Chief Baron Eyre lays down the law that to make dying declarations evidence, they must be made in extremity when the party is at the point of death and every hope of this world is gone—when every motive of falsehood is silenced, and the mind is induced by the most powerful considerations to speak the truth. A situation so solemn and so awful is considered by the law as creating an obligation equal to that which is imposed by a positive oath in a court of Justice. Greenleaf, in his valuable treatise on Evidence, lays it down that "it is enough if it satisfactorily appears in any mode that the dying declarations were made under a sense of impending death; whether it be directly proved by the express language of the declarant, or be inferred from her evident danger, or the opinions of the medical or other attendants stated to her, or from her conduct or other circumstances of the case; all of which are resorted to in order to ascertain the state of the declarant's mind."

The court in the first place determine whether these dying declarations shall or shall not be admitted to go to the jury. But after the evidence is admitted by the court, its credibility is entirely within the province of the jury, who, of course, are at liberty to weigh all the circumstances under which the declarations were made, including those already proved to the court; and to give the testimony only such credit as upon the whole they may think it deserves." Greenleaf 110.

The jury in the present case will inquire whether the deceased was in such a situation and under such circumstances, as created an obligation upon her mind to state the truth, equal to that which is imposed by a positive oath in a court of Justice—whether she made the statements which have been testified to, under the sense of impending death; and after ascertaining what declarations, if any, were thus made; the jury must determine upon their credibility and put whatever reliance you may be satisfied ought to be placed upon them.

This point has been dwelt on at great length by the counsel for the prisoner, and they have strenuously contended that her declarations were not such as ought to be received. Without going minutely into the testimony, it is only necessary for us to state to the jury that from the declarations of the deceased on Saturday and Sunday before her death, the court considered itself bound to submit those declarations to the jury; believing that they were made by her under a sense of impending death, and we have heard nothing to shake our confidence in that opinion. John Gunton testified that she said on Saturday "Oh John, they have killed me!"—that Dan Rankin had bribed Doctor Crandall to fetch her away—that he fetched her away from Nanticoke dam to Bloomsburg—that he had persuaded her to come away, and had given her all the medicine she had with her—that the medicine he gave her was for the purpose of bringing the child away from her; and that it had done it—it had the effect. "She said the child came away from her on Saturday after the Thursday she came to my house."

The Rev. Mr. Elsegood went to see the deceased on Sunday morning at the request of Doctor Updegraff, who testifies that he wished a minister to be called in; as she said she could not think of dying, and that she was unprepared to leave the world. The minister told her he was very low and perhaps would not recover. Then she uttered an exclamation to her sister "Oh Jane, must I die?" and she frequently reiterated the same remark and said in a despairing manner that she could not die. Mr. Elsegood approached her bed and impressed upon her the importance of dismissing from her mind all hopes of recovery.

Her sister was her nurse and almost constantly by her bedside on Sunday; and in that afternoon Mrs. Gunton asked her if she was willing to die. She said "Yes—she thought it was hard to die for that cause." She said the medicine was given to her by Doctor Crandall to produce abortion—that it took place on the Saturday week previous to her death—that on that day her bed clothes were much discolored and bloody. On that same Sunday afternoon, she testifies, her sister told her she had no hopes at all of living.

Doctor Updegraff swears that when he first visited her he considered her dangerous—that he supposed she had an abortion—that the probability was she would not get over it, and if she had any thing to communicate to her friends she had better do so soon. While he was with her she would exclaim "my God, Doctor, is it possible that I must die?" On their first interview on Saturday morning the Dr. says after he told her she was dangerously ill, she replied that she had every confidence in him as a physician and was certain he could save her life. On Sunday afternoon, (the Doctor says in his cross examination,) when she was in a dying state—when her extremities were getting cold, and gangrene had commenced its work Elizabeth indulged the hope of getting better and asked him if he did not think she was better, but he forgave the reply he made. Much reliance is placed by the counsel for the prisoner on the testimony of Doctor Updegraff to show that the deceased had hopes of recovery until Sunday afternoon, but where testimony of different witnesses is variant, the court cannot rely upon the testimony of one and reject the others; but if satisfied that the weight of evidence shows that the deceased had no hopes of living at all, and had dismissed from her mind all hopes of recovery, we must submit her dying declarations to the jury, in order that they may weigh all the circumstances under which the declarations were made, and give them such credibility as they think is merited.

The counsel for the prisoner then called upon the court to decide that we have no jurisdiction to try him, and have attempted, without effect, to prevent upon the court to determine that question in favor of the prisoner. His Honor Judge Lewis, in his treatise on Criminal Law, page 408, says—"It is the duty of the court to expound the law to the jury, and that exposition ought to be received, unless the jury conscientiously believe it to be wrong, in which case they are not bound. In a criminal case the jury are the judges of the law and the fact." The learned gentlemen who are concerned for the prisoner, as soon as the court decide a question of law against them, turn to the jury and say the court has decided erroneously. You Gentlemen of the jury, are judges of the law as well as the facts, and therefore every important question of law as well of fact is fully before you for your decision. If you conscientiously believe that the court is wrong, then you have a right to decide; and if you are of opinion that you have no jurisdiction to try the prisoner your verdict ought to be not guilty. In Greenleaf on Evidence, § 49 note 1 is contained the following remarks of that eminent, that talented man Justice Story—"Here His Honor read the extract from Justice Story, which we expected to have obtained in time for this place. Strange to tell, the work is not in the town. If you receive it in time, we will give it on our inside."

What are the facts in the present case on this question of jurisdiction?

On the 3d of May 1750 the legislature erected a portion of Columbia county into a separate county to be called "Montour." The county of Montour by virtue of the act was authorized to elect county officers at the election in October 1850. All suits pending in the Court of Common Pleas where the defendant resided in Montour county were to be removed on the first day of November last. On that day the county of Montour was to be considered organized, and by the 13th section of the act "all writs and legal proceedings shall be issued and conducted in the same manner as though this act had not been passed until the first day of November (then) next, at which time all records and proceedings properly belonging to the county of Montour, shall be transmitted to the proper officers in the said county, and proceeded upon by the proper authorities of the county of Montour."

On the 5th of August 1850 Elizabeth Smith died at the township of Mahoning, in that part of Columbia county which was erected into the county of Montour. A few days afterwards Wm. H. H. Crandall was arrested in Luzerne county on a charge of having caused her death by administering sassa, to produce abortion; and brought to the jail of Columbia county, for all that time there was no jail, no sheriff, no county officers of any description in Montour county. At the August Oyer and Terminer of Columbia county an indictment was presented to the Grand Jury and found a True Bill. The prisoner was brought before the court of Columbia county and, upon being arraigned, pleaded not guilty to the indictment. On

the 20th of November 1850 the prisoner being brought into court, and you being called upon to administer the oath, and affirming "so well and truly try and true deliverance make between the Commonwealth and the prisoner of the bar; and a true verdict give according to your evidence."

It was shown in evidence that Elizabeth Smith died on the 5th of August 1850 in Mahoning township, Montour county; and the counsel for the defendant contends that these facts ousted the jurisdiction of this Court. The rule of law with respect to trial for offences is that the offender should be tried, in cases of murder, in the county where the death happened. When Elizabeth Smith died, what county had jurisdiction of the offence with which the prisoner is charged? Was it not Columbia county? No other county then had any jurisdiction over him. Montour county only existed in name—there was no officer to execute process, no jail to receive him, no authority to try him; and even on this very day we have no evidence before us that there are Executive officers duly qualified within the county of Montour. By the act of July 2d 1839, for the election of Prothonotaries, Clerks, Recorders and Registers, it is declared that no commission shall issue within the lapse of thirty days after the election, and shall commence and take effect from the first day of December next after such election. By the 7th and 8th sections of the act of erecting Montour county, the officers required by law to give security for the faithful discharge of their duties must do so before they can enter on the execution thereof; and the Sheriff, Coroner and other officers of the county of Columbia shall continue to exercise the duties of their respective offices within the county of Montour as heretofore, until similar officers shall be elected and qualified to act within said county. What is to be done with the prisoner at the bar? An indictment has been found by the Grand Jury of Columbia County against him and he has pleaded to that indictment. The county of Montour, when the offence is alleged to have been committed, was neither organized for legislative, executive or judicial purposes; and now must the prisoner be kept in the jail of Columbia county till the county of Montour becomes organized and authorized to try him? Or is he entitled to a speedy public trial by a jury of the vicinage?—A jury of that county which was duly organized for judicial purposes at the time of trial. Will it be pretended that Montour county is now in a situation to try the prisoner? What sheriff is to take charge of him?—What jail is to hold him?—What Clerk is there of the Oyer and Terminer in Montour county? We have no court in Montour county at this time that can try him. The defendant is entitled by the Constitution to a speedy and public trial. And so early as the year 1785, an act was passed declaring that "if any person shall be committed for treason or felony and shall not be indicted & tried some time in the next term, session of Oyer and Terminer &c, or other court where the offence is properly cognizable after such commitment; it shall and may be lawful for the Judges or Justices thereof, and they are hereby required, upon the last day of the term, session or court, to set at liberty the prisoner upon bail, and if such prisoner shall not be indicted and tried the second term, session or court after his or her commitment, unless the delay happen on the application, or with the consent of the defendant, or upon the trial shall be acquitted, he shall be discharged from imprisonment."

The second term will in a day or two have ended; and if we are not competent to try the prisoner, he must under the above section be discharged. If the offence is not properly cognizable by this court, we have no right to restrain him of his liberty, and he can go without delay. Suppose the legislature, instead of fixing the third Monday of December 1850 for holding court in the new county of Montour, had declared that now should be held there till December 1851; must the prisoner be incarcerated till that period in our jail, or would he be entitled to his discharge? The constitution says he shall have a speedy and public trial, and yet the legislature say he shall not. By deciding that the offence is properly cognizable before this court, now sitting in Columbia county which had full jurisdiction of the offence when it was committed and which has not, in our opinion, been taken away by the act of May 3d 1850 erecting Montour county, we carry out the spirit of the constitution and the act of 1785, and do not deprive the prisoner of any right or any privilege awarded to him by the constitution and laws of his country.

A question has been raised whether the prisoner in the capacity of physician did not administer the medicine to the deceased for the purpose of curing her of suppressed menses. If he did so and was mistaken as to the nature of her complaint, it is decided that his intentions were good; and if his design was to administer medicine for her benefit, and contrary to his expectations the patient dies this would be neither murder nor manslaughter, but misadventure. But on the contrary, if the physician knew that the deceased was pregnant, and administered the medicine for the purpose of destroying the child in her womb—then, as the deceased declared, he gave her the medicine to produce abortion—and if the medicine taken by her through his directions produced the desired effect, and in consequence of such abortion the life of Elizabeth Smith was forfeit, then the prisoner would be guilty of murder in the second degree.

This cause has been so fully and ably argued by the counsel, that it cannot be expected for the court to extend their remarks further. You are the appropriate tribunal to decide the law and the facts. You will carefully and diligently examine all the evidence in the case, and after resolving all reasonable doubts in favor of the accused, you have a solemn duty to perform; and we feel confident that it will be performed to the best of your judgment and abilities. Your duty to the prisoner, to the Commonwealth, to yourselves and to God, imperiously demand that you divest yourselves of every prejudice—every partiality—every other motive than Justice and Truth.

If you acquit the prisoner you will return a general verdict of not guilty. But if you shall find the prisoner guilty of murder, it will be necessary that you state in your finding that it is murder in the second degree.

HOW MANY WIVES MAY A MORMON HAVE?
—This question has been debated, and it has been asserted that a Mormon was restricted to one wife like all good Christians. But a correspondent of the Philadelphia Inquirer, who writes from the Great Salt Lake, puts a different face upon the matter:

An impression exists abroad respecting the number of wives which each Mormon is allowed, and which may not be amiss to make a few remarks upon. I have made inquiry of those who know, and I find that each member as well as the head of the church, is privileged to make as many wives as he can decently support—that is if all parties concerned are agreed—and to each he has to be formally married in accordance with the law, in such case made and provided. I have not a word to say in defence of this odious and demoralizing feature—but merely state the facts.

A young lady stepped into the store of a merchant by the name of Wade, and very innocently said she would like to be weighed (Wade). "Really, I am sorry," said he; "but my wife would tell you that you were too late by a couple of years."

It is said that a proposition will be urged upon the New York Legislature to remove the seat of government from Albany to New York city.

Don't Warr—Never put off till to-morrow what you can do to-day, said an advising mother to her child.

"Well, then, mamma, let us eat the cranberry pie that's in the safe," was the child's precocious reply.

How true the saying, "that all manner of crimes may be proved against the unfortunate; but the successful never sin."

"Is that Barum?" said a young lady as a man of large proportions advanced to the front of the stage. "What does he play on?" inquired her still younger companion. "He plays upon the people," growled out the gruff voice of an old gentleman a few seats off.

"I am so tired," said the big wheel to the little one. "Who spoke?" said the little wheel to the ear. "Not me—I always hold my tongue," said the ear turning round the corner.—Boston Post.

The Spirit of the 19th Century is to make money; yet trying to do so without advertising in the newspapers, is like using a new pump without throwing in a little water to start it.

"Where are you going?" said George Selwyn to an acquaintance. "To see a friend!" "Well, I will go with you, for I never saw one yet."

The only capital punishment the ladies are in favor of, is hanging around their necks. Capital enough.

Nature is spoken of in the feminine gender, because she is so extravagant in rich carpets, drapery, dress and periphery.

An honest farmer thus writes to the Chairman of an English agricultural society—"Gentlemen, please put me down in your list of cattle for a bull."

A late English writer, in speaking of the United States says: "It is the land of large farms and thinly peopled graveyards."

Elihu Barritt says that the best cough drops for young ladies are to drop the practice of dressing thin when they go out in the night air.

The man with a "brick in his hat" was in town on Thanksgiving day. He swore he'd rather have a bottle of the "real sing" than all the newspapers in the world. Happy Freeman.

Two dramatists of the feminine gender, had an "affair of honor" in N. York city recently—one flourished a bowie knife and the other pulled hair. The hair puller was victorious.

An Ark is being built by a man down East, in anticipation of the next flood—of tears had by his wife, when he refuses to take her to the opera. He thinks he can weather the storm.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF HUMAN LIFE.

At fourteen years of age, I entered a dry good store as a clerk. I had been a very active boy. The sedentary station, probably caused me to become dyspeptic. I was troubled with flatulency and belching, and thought it useful to eat mentha to expel the air from the stomach. My mother said I had consumption of the lungs, and ordered a low diet. After several years, without change, I thought they misinterpreted my case. I eat more, and passed on to mature age and was troubled, not only with flatulency and belching, but with much pain in the stomach; and Doctors advised me to take salutaris or sassa, to neutralize the acid, and peppermint to ease the pain. I followed this prescription and continued to eat heartily. If I did not take regular meals, at regular times, I was greatly distressed. My countenance was pale and sickly as usual. I continued this course without much change till about forty years of age. I then ruminated upon the subject and the thought occurred, that I eat more than the stomach could digest properly, which caused the pain and flatulency. I resolved, at once to eat half meals and try the experiment. When I left the table with half a meal it was painful to my feelings. Between ten and twelve o'clock I found it necessary to eat a cracker or two, till my stomach formed to the change. I soon found that I had discovered the true cause of my ill health, and had no trouble of belching and pain in the stomach and my countenance became healthy.

I required great watchfulness and self-denial, to leave the table with half a meal and a good appetite; but I persevered, and became confirmed and satisfied that I had adopted the true course. Half an hour after eating, when digestion has begun, the hungry feeling ceases, if not eat a cracker or two, till the habit is fully established. This course I have pursued for the latter half of my years and I have enjoyed improved health, vigor, and comfort. I am obliged, however, to watch my appetite and not indulge in it, for it would lead me astray, as I have found, when I have incautiously eaten a very little too much. I am not sensible that my faculties are impaired now, at four score years. If I take cold, it leaves me in a quarter of the time it did in early life. I formerly ate supper and suffered if I did not get an early breakfast. I now take a light meal at ten to five to six o'clock, and breakfast at seven to eight o'clock, without any inequitable venience from hunger, after fourteen hours of abstinence. When I ate more, as I formerly did, if I lost a meal, I did not recover for a fortnight. Now, if I lose a meal, I feel no cramp and little inconvenience from it. This course has proved to me to be the true philosophy of life and health. Except for this; I should have been mouldering in the grave twenty years ago.

If the stomach is stimulated too high by eating and drinking, it flags as much below when empty, and causes pain in both extremes. If you eat but little, the stomach is at ease and quiet. I drink water only; and do not use tobacco, use any intoxicating liquors, nor any narcotics. I do not eat to feel any fullness, but merely to check the hollow feeling. If those who had suffered as I did, read this, and are willing to practise self-denial in eating, they may profit by it as I have done. The stomach should not be idle nor loaded, but uniform meals are the best course.

If necessary, eat two or three crackers between meals, till the habit of eating half-meals is established. This is condemned by many—the error is in eating too large a lunch, and not by eating little. If you tell your friend that he eats too much he is offended.

More persons die by eating and drinking too much, than from any other cause. Many would live on a hundred years, by this regimen, as the antediluvian did, who only ate vegetables. Children should be taught to eat as little as they will be satisfied with, and plain food will accomplish this best. If you are troubled with belching, it is a proof that you have eaten too much for the stomach to digest properly. If the food is properly digested, the wind will pass down. Thus it is a good test.

I write this on the impromptu of friends who think others may profit by it. When I was a boy, there were no meat markets but in large cities, and every one provided salt beef and pork for the summer. They ate pork and potatoes one day and potatoes and pork the next. They then ate to live; now they live to eat, and must have delicacies from the four quarters of the globe for a meal.

DAVID TOMERSON,
Schenectady, Nov., 1850.

ASHES ARE DEODORIZERS.—It is a fact of which few persons are aware, that both wood and coal ashes are disinfectants for animal and vegetable odors, when brought into contact with them. So effectual are they for this purpose, that human feces when buried in them, at once cease to give off any offensive smell. This property renders them of much value for city, or even country privies, where it is an object to use these rich manures.

In consequence of the presence of so large a quantity of the alkalies, washing, a portion of the incipients, for forming ammonia is driven off, and for the reason charred fuel, as wood coal, or half burned coal, is better. But in the absence of these ashes may form an economical, and in most cases, an entirely convenient substitute.

The ashes from a small single grate have been found sufficient to neutralize the effluvia from the feces of a family of a dozen persons. Here is a triple benefit: procurable gratuitously—a benefit to the health, the comfort, and to the wealth of the community.