Raftsman's Journal.

BY S. B. ROW. | CLEARFIELD, PA., WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1860. | VOL. 7.--NO. 13.

Raftsman's Journal.

CLEARFIELD, PA., NOV. 21, 1860.

THE CATHCART MURDER CASE.

The case of John Cathcart, charged with the murder of his wife, was again called up in the Court of Oyer and Terminer of Clearfield county, on last Wednesday, when the motion for a new trial, &c., was argued by W. A. Wallace and H. H. Swoope, Esquires, on the part of the prisoner, and by J. B. McEnally and R. J. Wallace, Esquires, on the part of the Commonwealth. On Thursday morning, His Honor, Judge Linn, rendered the decision of the Court, as follows:—

We have been moved in arrest of judgment and asked to award a new trial to the prisoner in this case for several reasons, which have been filed of record, and have been pressed upon us, by the counsel for the prisoner, not only with great zeal and ability, but also under the fullest and deepest impression of the responsibility attending their official position, and we have endeavored to give to them that serious and careful consideration which the solemn importance of this case demands. In doing so, we have tried to keep in view that the issue is one of life and death to this prisoner, and consequently we have given him the full benefit of all the doubts and presumptions which should enter into the consideration of the questions presented to us.

The reasons offered, why a new trial should be granted, are as follows:—

1st. Because there is not sufficient evidence to warrant the conviction of murder in the first degree.

In our view of the case, the main question upon which its final determination rested, was whether the act was done designedly and not by accident; and if intentionally, then whether it was done "wilfully, deliberately and with premeditation," such as accords with the provisions of the Act of 1794. And we are now asked to say in deciding, the motion for a new trial, that there was no evidence in the case that would warrant the finding of such a verdict as was rendered by the Jury. In deciding this question we are not to invade the province of the Jury, who are by law the judges of the facts—a wise provision of the law which constitutes one of the great safeguards of the accused—and we would therefore not be justifiable in granting a new trial merely because, from a view of the evidence, the minds of the Judges might have been led to a different conclusion as to his guilt or the degree thereof. Where jurors undertake to render a verdict which is manifestly contrary to the evidence, or where there is no evidence to warrant their finding, the duty of the Court to set aside the verdict and order a new trial, is quite apparent; but where there is evidence bearing upon the question, the Court will not and should not disturb the verdict merely because it may not be such as they had expected would be rendered, nor because they would have decided the question of fact differently. Even in view of the solemn consequences resulting from this verdict, we cannot say that there was not evidence in the case from which the Jury might find the existence of the requisites to murder in the first degree. The killing was not denied, nor that the deceased came to her death by the hand of the prisoner, and the question of intention, as well as of the degree of guilt, was fairly and fully submitted to the Jury for their finding—they have passed upon the question and have rendered their verdict, and the question which is now presented to us is, not whether we would have found a different verdict, but whether the verdict rendered by the Jury is a legitimate result of the determination of the questions of facts submitted to them. We will not undertake to analyze the evidence in the case, nor mention nor enumerate the facts and circumstances from which the Jury might infer an intentional killing, and the presence of malice, premeditation, &c. It is sufficient for us to say, that whilst we might have been satisfied with a verdict finding a lower degree of homicide, the Jury who have passed upon the facts, after a full argument, and a charge as favorable to the prisoner as he could reasonably ask or expect, have found otherwise, and we cannot see how we can interfere with the verdict for this reason, without a palpable violation of duty.

2d. Because the Court erred in admitting the testimony of Mrs. Ray in rebuttal of the prisoner's case, and in admitting the declarations of John Cathcart made in jail.

This was not urged in the argument and we see no reason for changing our views as to the competency of this evidence; besides, the defendant has asked us to seal a bill of exceptions, of which he may have the full benefit in a higher court, if we have erred in this behalf.

3d. The Jurors were not properly sworn.

In passing upon this alleged reason for a new trial, we have been requested by the prisoner's counsel to state the manner in which the Jurors were sworn, so that if an error has been committed, the prisoner may not be deprived of the benefit of it. To this request we cheerfully assent. None of the Jurors were sworn until the whole twelve were empannelled. The oath was then administered to them, not separately, but as many as swore by the book were asked to arise, and they were sworn thus: "You, and each of you, swear," &c., using the form of oath, and so with those who were qualified in a different form. The defendant's counsel now except to this mode of swearing the Jury, and insist that each Juror should have been sworn separately. We are aware that ordinarily this is done, but the Court were induced in this case to defer swearing the Jury until the panel was full, lest they might be obliged, on account of the rumors which might prevail throughout the country, to dismiss the Jury and continue the case. We cannot see any reason why the mode adopted is unlawful. The Jurors were by this mode severally placed under the obligation of the oath, put as effectually, to all intents and purposes, as though it had been administered to each one in succession. We cannot see how the case of the prisoner can be prejudiced by this practice. Besides, we are of opinion that the objection, being matter of form, should have been made at the time the Jury was sworn, and that it is no reason for granting a new trial. It is said by counsel that the prisoner may remain silent, take his chance of an acquittal, and after conviction, urge this objection. There are, however, irregularities which the prisoner must object to at the time or they will be considered as waived, and it seems to us that this is one of that character.

4th. During the progress of the trial and after the evidence and argument had closed, the tip-staves in charge of the Jury, both of whom were from the region where the transaction occurred, and one of whom was a witness upon the part of the Commonwealth, mixed and conversed with the Jurors.

We cannot discover from the evidence any misconduct on the part of the tip-staves or Jurors, such as would warrant the granting of a new trial, nor is there in our opinion anything in the evidence to support the next reason assigned, viz: that

5th. Whilst the cause was progressing, during the intervals between the sessions of the Court, the Jurors were accessible to outside influences, and persons actually entered their room.

6th. While the Jurors were deliberating upon their verdict, one of the tipstaves was present in the room.

The testimony of Mr. Paulhamus fully explains how this occurred, and we fail to see in the transaction anything that calls for the granting of a new trial. He merely entered the outside door, ascended the stairway, looked into the upper room occupied by the Jury, and asked for two buffalo robes which were needed by the owner of the building, and who requested the tipstave to procure them for him. No injury could possibly result to the prisoner from this, nor do we find any rule of law under which a verdict rendered under such circumstances would be set aside.

7th. Because of errors in the Court, and improper influences on the Jury.

Upon this general reason it is unnecessary to make any comment, and hence we will pass to the consideration of the 8th and last reason assigned as follows:—

8th. Because the defendant is convicted of a higher grade of murder than he can be guilty of under the testimony, and has, since the trial, discovered evidence to prove that his mind was incapable of premeditation by reason of intoxication.

This proposition has been pressed upon us with great zeal and earnestness, and calls for a careful and close examination. The first branch of it has been answered by our remarks upon the first reason assigned, and the latter clause asserts as a reason for a new trial the discovery of material evidence since the rendition of the verdict. Mr. Wharton, in his admirable treatise on American Criminal Law, at page 1030, says: "A party who seeks for a new trial on the ground of newly discovered evidence is chargeable with laches, if previous to the trial, he knew that the witness, whose testimony he seeks to introduce as newly discovered, must probably, from his continuation and employment at the time of the transaction, the subject of controversy, be conversant with the facts in relation to the transaction, and especially where, previous to the trial, the party knew, as the witness himself testifies to, what the witness could prove, although at the time of the trial, and while preparing therefor, the party had forgotten the facts." Now apply this rule to the case in hand. The prisoner, by his counsel, alleges that he can now prove by several witnesses that he was intoxicated at the time the act was committed. Giving to the prisoner the full benefit of this exception, we may not shut our eyes to the fact that from the testimony of those witnesses, the prisoner must have known at the trial, and while he was preparing for trial that those witnesses were cognizant of the facts which he desires to prove by them. They were present with him, saw him drink and fill his bottle, and the prisoner drank twice at the house of Mr. Shoff, and several times with John Gregory. Now when we consider that this all occurred on the day on which Mrs. Cathcart met her death and but a few weeks before the trial, and apply to it the rule of law which we have just quoted, can this testimony with any propriety be called "after discovered evidence?" No effort was made to procure the attendance of those witnesses, and the persons who were sworn as witnesses upon the trial, and who were present and saw the prisoner and conversed with him, or heard him converse with others, immediately or soon after the act was done, were not interrogated as to his condition at the time—whether intoxicated or sober. Thomas Cathcart testified that he was there when the gun went off; Nancy Cathcart swears that she was there a few minutes after, and other witnesses who came in during the evening, would most probably have been able to state the condition of the prisoner; but the question was not asked of any of them, so far as we remember, except Dr. Fetzer, who says that not having known the prisoner previously, he could not say whether he was intoxicated or not. But the counsel of the prisoner assert that, although the testimony might or should have been known to the prisoner at the time of the trial, yet through ignorance or forgetfulness he failed to communicate it to them. This, as will be seen by the rule already quoted, is no ground for asking a new trial. We are clearly of opinion that the prisoner has not brought his case within the rules in regard to after discovered evidence—on the contrary, we are constrained to say that if the rules of law are observed, this cannot upon any principle be called newly discovered evidence.

Again, we are asked to consider in deciding this motion, that a great deal of public prejudice and much excitement prevailed at the time of the trial, and that the prisoner has consequently been denied the benefit of a fair and impartial trial. We are not made aware of such a state of feeling other than by the assertions of counsel, if we except the rumors that are afloat as to the feeling in the neighborhood. The Jurors upon being called were, at the request of the prisoner's counsel, put upon their *voir dire*, and very few of them were found to have formed or expressed any opinion in reference to the guilt or innocence of the prisoner. But admitting the fact to be so, we cannot see that it affords any reason for granting a new trial. If such a state of feeling did exist, and the Court had been properly informed of the fact, they would, if the request had been made, have suspended the trial until a change of venue could be had, or some other steps taken to avoid the difficulty. But the prisoner cannot take his chance of a trial under such circumstances, and then for that reason ask the Court to set aside the verdict. This view of the case is fully sustained by the opinion of Justice Rogers in Commonwealth vs. Flanagan, 7 W. & S. 419.

We have thus expressed our views in relation to the various causes assigned for a new trial. It is with the deepest regret that we feel compelled to differ with the views of the learned counsel for the prisoner, and gladly would we have found some way of escape from the conclusions to which we have been driven by an imperative sense of duty. To deal with the life of a fellow being involves a tremendous weight of responsibility, but it is a duty which we have sworn to perform, and whilst we admit that our sympathies for the unfortunate criminal have stood up to oppose our progress in the way of duty, we have been compelled, by the stern mandate of our official obligation, to thrust them aside and fearlessly and impartially to meet this awful responsibility.

Entertaining these views, we are compelled to overrule the motion for a new trial and in arrest of judgment in this case, and judgment is therefore ordered to be entered on the indictment.

The prisoner was then requested to stand up, when the Court addressed him as follows:

JOHN CATHCART, have you anything further to say why sentence of death should not be pronounced?

Prisoner—Yes. I am not guilty of such crimes as I am charged with, before God.

DR. LITCH'S MEDICINES.—A fresh supply of these invaluable Family Medicines are for sale by M. A. Frank. Clearfield, consisting of *Pain Curer; Restorative*, a great cure for colds and cough; and *Anti-Bilious Physic*. They have been thoroughly tested in this community, and are highly approved. TRY THEM.

PROVISION AND GROCERY STORE. The undersigned keeps constantl on hand at his store room in Philipsburg Centrecounty, a full stock of Flour, Hams, Shoulders Sides, Coffee, Tea, Sugar, Rice, Molasses, &c, Also, Liquors of all kinds, Tobacco, Segars, Snuff, &c; all of which he offers to purchasers on the most advantageous terms. Give him a call, and try his articles. [mar21] ROBERT LLOYD.

GRIST AND SAW MILL FOR SALE.—The undersigned will sell at private sale his grist and saw mill on Little Clearfield creek, in New Millport, Clearfield county, Pa. The grist mill can be run by either steam or water, or by both at the same time. The machinery is all good. The location is one of the best in the county. The saw mill is in good running order and capable of sawing 4000 feet every 12 hours. There is also a dwelling house with the property. For terms, which will be moderate, apply to the subscriber, residing in New Millport.
Aug. 15, 1860-3m. MARTIN O. STIRK.

BROKE OUT IN A NEW PLACE!—IMPORTANT NOTICE TO THE RAGGED!!!—The undersigned having opened a Tailoring Establishment in Shaw's Row, in the room recently occupied by H. F. Naugle as a Jewelry Store, announces that he is now ready and willing to make *Coats, Pantaloons, Vests, &c.*, for his old customers, and as many new ones as may give him a call, after the latest and most approved styles, or after any of the old fashions, if they prefer it. By doing his work in a neat and substantial manner, and promptly fulfilling his engagements, he expects to secure a liberal share of patronage.
Jan. 18. 1860. WM. RADEBAUGH.

$10.00!!—RAYMOND'S PATENT SEWING MACHINE FOR TEN DOLLARS, will Fell, Gather, or do any kind of family sewing—and so simple that any lady can learn to operate on it in half an hour. It will make one thousand stitches in a minute, and for its superiority in every respect, it took the First Premium at the Maine State Fair over all other Sewing Machines. A large number have been sold and are now in use in this borough (Brookville) and vicinity, and are pronounced the simplest and best machine ever invented—superior to most of the high priced sewing machines.

The undersigned having purchased the Right from the Patentee, to sell these machines in the counties of Jefferson, Clearfield, Elk, and Forest, are now ready to fill orders for the same in the above district. Orders for machines will be filled in the order of their reception. Persons wishing machines should send in their orders immediately, as we have over 30 machines already ordered in advance of our supply. Township rights for sale. All applications for machines or township rights by letter or otherwise, should be addressed to
A. B. M'LAIN & CO.,
Aug. 15, 1860-tf. Brookville, Jefferson co., Pa.

Russell McMurray

RESPECTFULLY INVITES THE ATTENTION OF HIS

Old Customers, and others,

to his Large and well selected Stock of

Fall and Winter Goods,

WHICH HE OFFERS VERY LOW FOR

CASH.

He also continues to deal in

Lumber of all kinds,

In any way to suit customers. The highest market price will be paid for all kinds of grain.

Come and see for yourselves.

New Washington, November 1, 1860-6m.

FALL 1860. | THE FIRST ARRIVAL OF | WINTER 1860.

Fall and Winter Goods,

AT THE OLD STAND OF

REED, WEAVER & CO.,

Market St., 2 doors North of the Court House,

WHERE they are just opening an unusually

It is probable that the case will be taken to the Supreme Court by the prisoner's counsel, upon exceptions to the ruling of the Court during the trial, and for which a Bill has been sealed.

The Russian government has ordered the clergy in Poland not to urge the people to total abstinence, because the revenue from taxes on spirits may be dimished. They are, however, allowed to enlarge in general terms on the blessings of temperance.

An old doctor said that people who were prompt in their payment always recovered in their sickness, as they were good customers, and physicians could not afford to lose them. A good hint and a sensible doctor.

"Boy, where does this road go to?" "I don't think it goes anywhere. I always sees um here every morning."

NULLIFICATION.

It is a suggestive circumstance that the famous South Carolina Nullification ordinance of 1832 followed, like the present secession movements, immediately upon a Presidential election. It was adopted on the 24th of November, within a fortnight after the re-election of Gen. Jackson, by a Convention called for that purpose, by an act of the Legislature passed at a special session.

This ordinance, after setting forth in a preamble, that under color of laying duties and imposts on foreign imports, Congress had passed certain acts really intended for the protection of domestic manufactures, and, in so doing, had exceeded its just powers, proceeds to declare all such acts, and especially the Tariff acts of 1828 and 1832 "null, void, and no law," and not binding on the officers or citizens of South Carolina. All bonds given, or to be given, for duties, under those acts, were declared void and also all legal proceedings commenced for their collection. It was further made the duty of the Legistature to adopt all such measures as might be necessary to give effect to the ordinance and to prevent, after the 1st of February following, the collection of any duties under the acts above nullified. No appeal was to be allowed from the State Courts to the Supreme Court of the United States in any case in which the validity of the ordinance should be drawn in question. All State officers were required to take an oath to support the ordinance and the acts of the Legislature passed in pursuance of it, and all citizens were enjoined to give their aid in carrying such laws into effect.

The ordinance further declared that any attempt on the part of the Government of the United States to reduce the State to obedience, or the passage of any act of Congress authorizing the employment of a military or naval force aginst the State, or closing the ports, or obstructing the commerce of South Carolina, or otherwise intended to enforce the nullified acts, would be considered as inconsistent with the further continuance of South Carolina in the Union, and that, considering them absolved from all further obligation to maintain their political connection with the people of the other States, they would forthwith proceed to organize a separate Government and to assume entire independence.

This ordinance reached Washington simultaneously with the meeting of Congress. The President briefly alluded to it in his annual message, promising a special message, should the persistence of South Carolina render it necessary to appeal to Congress for additional powers. Meanwhile, on the 10th of December he issued his famous proclamation, in which he argued the question with the Nullifiers on Constitutional grounds; adjured the people of South Carolina not to be led by demagogues to their destruction; held out a modification of the tariff as the probable result of the approaching extinguishment of the public debt, and expressed his determination to execute the laws, and to sustain the Union.

This proclamation did not seem to produce much effect on the nullifiers. The South Carolina Legislature proceeded to pass acts to carry the ordinance into effect, and to organize forces to the extent of 10,000 volunteers, and provide military means for resisting any exercise of force on the part of the U. States. Early in Jan., President Jackson sent a message to Congress setting forth these facts. In consequence of this message, and the recommendation contained in it, Congress proceeded to pass an act commonly known as "The Force bill." This bill authorized the President, whenever, in consequence of unlawful combinations and obstructions in any collection district, it became impracticable to collect the revenue in the ordinary way, to remove the Custom-House to some secure place within the District, either on land or on board a vessel, at which all ships arriving should be detained till the duties were paid, and to employ the land and naval forces of the United States, or the militia, to repel any attack upon the Custom-House so established, or any attempt to interrupt the officers in the discharge of their duties; also, restricting to the Courts of the United States any suits in relation to anything done under this law, and authorizing the President to employ the forces of the United States to uphold those Courts in the exclusive exercise of this authority.

Things looked for a little while exceedingly squally. We had as much speechifying, volunteering, cockade mounting, and as many rumors of foreign aid then as now. The whole thing, however, soon proved a mere bubble. The nullifiers took advantage of the passage of the compromise tariff to back out of their false position, and luckily for that time any collision with the General Government was prevented.—*New York Tribune.*

Lousiana does not take kindly to the secesion business. We give a special telegraphic dispatch from New Orleans saying that the thing is a failure there. How could it be otherwise? What would be the future of New Orleans without the Union? All that she is she owes to the blessings of this great confederacy. Cut off the free States from her, and the Mississippi would fail to bring her its present tide of commerce and wealth and population. Aside from this, Louisana has grown up to strength and prosperity under the wings of the Union, as she could not else have grown, and it is rather hard in these new States to talk of rebellion. In the case of Florida, secession would be ridiculous, for were she once to get out of the Union, she has not population enough to get back again as a State, and would have to remain in territorial pupilage, subject to settlement by northern men. The manifestations of disunion at this time are nearly all in the Gulf States. Delaware Maryland, Kentucky, Tennessee, Missouri, North Carolina and Virginia, remain firm for the Union.—*North American.*

WHAT THEY DRINK.—An analysis of drinks sold in the groggeries, gives the following result: Four parts camphene, three parts molasses. The other part is a compound of forty per cent whisky, blue vitriol and an imitation of Cayenne pepper. The brandy, gin and whisky, are all of nearly the same consistency. The difference being in a slight variation of parts to affect the desired taste and color. For instance, a great quantity of molasses and tobacco juice are present in the brandy, and more vitriol in the whisky. We recommend these beverages to persons who desire to stop drinking. We pledge our reputation for scientific knowledge, that he who continues in the daily use of these liquids, will stop drinking in a very short time.

THE SECESSION MOVEMENT.

A citizen of South Carolina has sent to the Washington *Constitution* the following as one of the proposed forms of declaration of independence, to be submitted to the Convention which is to meet on the 17th of December:

PROPOSED DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the laws of Nature and Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that although all men are created wholly unequal, mentally, morally, and physically, yet they are equally entitled, under every civilized government, to the full protection of their lives, persons, and property, for which protection governments are solely instituted among men, deriving their just powers solely from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter, or to abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly, all experience hath shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer while ills are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a *long train of abuses and usurpations*, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their *right*, it is their *duty*, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security. Such has been the patient sufferance of the Southern States of this Union, and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their present system of Federal Government. The history of the present Northern States is a history of repeated injuries, insults, and usurpations, and having a direct object in the establishment of an absolute tyranny over the Southern States. To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid world:

1st. The Northern States of this Union have for many long years warred against our peculiar institution of slavery, under the dictates of a relentless fanaticism, which declares that institution to be a moral sin, whilst we hold it a Divine institution, established by God himself, in the following decree enunciated to Moses on Mt. Sinai: "Both thy bondmen and thy bondmaids which thou shalt have shall be of the heathen that are round about you; of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids; moreover, of the children of the strangers that sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, and they shall be your possession; ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession; they shall be your bondmen forever." And we further hold that this Divinely established institution was always sanctified by our Savior and his Apostles.

2d. A large number of Northern States have nullified the Constitution of the present Union by passing laws to prevent the fulfillment of that Constitution, which declares that fugitive slaves shall be delivered up to their owners, the principle of which fugitive slave law has the express and sacred sanction of St. Paul the Apostle.

3d. The Northern States of this Union have declared that the people of the Southern States shall not emigrate with their property into the Territories, which rightfully belong to them equally with the North; and that the people of the South shall not have their property protected by the Federal Government, when such protection is (of all governments) the sole end and object of all government.

4th. Those Northern States have, by a relentless and unscrupulous majority, constantly imposed heavy taxes, not simply without, but directly against our representation and our consent in the general Congress, by levying onerous and excessive duties upon goods imported in return for, and purchased by, our cotton, rice, and tobacco, and in order to expend vast sums at the North in improving and fortifying their own harbors, towns and cities, at the evident and direct expense of the products and labor of the South.

5th. Those Northern States have elected by an overwhelming sectional vote a President and Vice President, both from their own section of the country, in direct opposition to our wishes and our protests, neither of whom have received one single vote from our section, and whose express creed is that "there is an irrepressible conflict against slavery, which can never cease until slavery is extinguished."

We have for long years, in vain, appealed to their sense of justice and of common right; we have conjured them by the ties of our common kindred to disavow and abandon these usurpations which are calculated to inevitably destroy our connections and our Union. But they have been deaf to the voice of justice, of honor, and of consanguinity. We must, therefore, acquiesce in the necessity which denounces our separation; and hold them, as we hold the rest of mankind, enemies in war—in peace, friends.

We, therefore, the representatives of the people of the State of South Carolina in convention assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the World for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the name and by the authority of the good people of this State, solemnly publish and declare that the State of South Carolina is, and of right ought to be, a free and independent State; that it is absolved from all allegiance to this Union; and that all political connection between it and the Northern States is and ought to be totally dissolved; and that as a free and independent State, it has the full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and to do all other acts and things which an independent State may of right do. And, for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

The Kent county, Delaware, Court has sentenced John R. Hamilton, convicted of killing his wife, to pay a fine of $4,000, to stand in the pillory one hour, receive sixty lashes, and imprisonment for life.

He who takes an eel by the tail is sure to come off empty handed.

WALKING A RAFT.

There was a fellow once stepped out of the door at a tavern on the Mississippi, meaning to walk a mile up the shore to the next tavern. Just at the landing there lay a big raft, one of the regular old fashioned whalers—a raft a mile long.

Well, the fellow heard the landlord say the raft was a mile long, and he said to himself, "I will go forth and see this great wonder, and let my eyes behold the timbers which the hand of man hath hewn." So he got on at the lower end, and began to ambulate over the wood in pretty fair time. But just as he got started the raft started too, and as he walked up the river, it walked down, both travelling at the same rate. When he got to the end of the sticks, he found they were pretty near ashore, and in sight of a tavern; so he landed, and walked straight into the bar-room. "Fill me some of the best." The general sameness of things made him a little aback, but he looked the landlord steady in the face, and settled it in his own way.

"Publican," said he, "are you gifted with a twin brother, who keeps a similar sized tavern, with a duplicate wife, a comporting woodpile, and corresponding circus bill, a mile from here?"

The tavern keeper was fond of fun, and accordingly said it was just so.

"And, publican, have you among your dry goods for the entertainment of man and horse any whiskey of the same size of that of your brother's?"

And the tavern man said, that from the rising of the sun even to the going down of the same he had.

They took the drinks, when the stranger said, "Publican, that twin brother of yours is a fine young man—a very fine man, indeed. But do you know, I'm afraid that he suffers a good deal with the Chicago diphtheria?"

"And what's that?" asked the toddysticker.

"It's when the truth settles so firm in a man that none of it ever comes out. Common doctors, of the catnip sort, call it lyin'. When I left your brother's confectionary, there was a raft at his door, which he swore his life to was a mile long. Well, publican, I walked that 'ere raft from bill to tail, from his door to yours. Now, I know my time, an' I'm just as good for myself as for a hoss, and better for *that* than any man ever you *did* see. I always walk a mile in exactly twenty minutes, on a good road, and I'll be busted with an overloaded Injun gun if I've been more'n ten minutes coming here, steppin' over the blamed logs at that."

STORY OF A FRENCH GIRL.—The New York correspondent of the *Boston Traveler* writes: "A short time since one of the many agents that are abroad selecting musical talent for America, sent on to the care of Adams & Co.'s Express, a French girl, who was engaged to teach for one year in a southern institution on a salary of $900 per year. On her way to New York she saw a German merchant of this city, who was smitten with her, for she was a young lady of dazzling beauty. He followed her to New York and made a formal proposal for her hand. The gentleman was well known to the head of the house of Adams & Co. as a man of wealth and standing. But the young teacher declined the proposal, at least till her contract for teaching should expire, and the consent of her parents obtained. But the gentleman was not to be baffled. The lady had great confidence in the integrity of the company, and appealed to the head of the house of Adams & Co., who said that he thought he could vouch for all of the honor and position of the suppliant. She relented and yielded, and cards are out for the wedding at one of our most fashionable hotels, and this young adventurer, with nothing but her talents and beauty, will soon be at the head of an establishment, with a husband worth $300,000."

MRS. LINCOLN.—A correspondent of the N. Y. *World*, who evidently sees the future mistress of the White House in the most favorable point of view, writes of her as follows:

"She is yet apparently this side the advantageous point of forty, with a face upon which dignity and sweetness are blended, and an air of cultivation and refinement to which familiarity with the courtly drawing-rooms of London, or the aristocratic salons of Paris, would hardly lend an added grace. She is admirably calculated to preside over our republican court. If one were permitted so far to indulge the curiosity which is generally felt upon the subject, the description would be that she is slightly above the medium stature, with brown eyes, clearly cut features, delicate, mobile, expressive; rather distinguished in appearance than beautiful, conveying to the mind generally an impression of self-possession, stateliness and elegance. I distrust my own powers of description in this case; but I concur in the belief prevalent hereabouts that she will make an admirable a leader of the stately dames and lovely demoiselles of the national capital as the most fastidious social martinet could desire."

HOW IT WORKS.—The tenor of our advices indicates the existence in South Carolina and two or three other States of intensity of feeling which threatens great disadvantage to the business interests of those States. The action of the South Carolina legislature, and the excitement of which that is the lever, is already alarming the holders of the bills of South Carolina banks. They are thrown upon the banks in such quantities that the most urgent measure pressed on the legislature, even after the act calling a State convention, is one for the suspension of specie payments. Thus probably that spirited State get a foretaste of the embarrassments which will overtake her business if she persists in her ill-advised course on which she has entered. Her finances deranged, her credit crippled, her people staggering under taxation, and perhaps her negroes uneasy and on the point of insurrection, and all this follows so naturally in the train of attempted secession, that a severe discipline may lead our infatuated brethren to retrace their steps before they have provoked a collision with the federal authorities.

The brightest boy at the late examination at the Naval Academy at Annapolis is said to have been a little fellow of fifteen, from Texas, who had worked his way, poorly clad, all the way from his native State to Annapolis, picking up jobs of type-setting along the route. He had studied arithmetic and mathematics by the light of a dip candle, in a garret, and passed his examination with high honor. One of our exchanges says that "this is the right stuff for commodores."