

# VERMONT PHOENIX.

VOL. VI.

BRATTLEBORO, Vt. JUNE 26, 1840.

NO. 43

## VERMONT PHOENIX.

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY MORNING, BY  
WM. E. RYTHER.

Advertisements conspicuously inserted at  
\$1.00 per square for 3 insertions, and 20 cents  
for each subsequent insertion. Less than a  
square 75 cents for 3 insertions, and 12 1-2  
cents for each subsequent insertion.

From the Ontario Repository.

### TRUTH STRANGER THAN FICTION!

Several interesting trials took place at the Circuit Court, held in this village last week. One of them disclosed the most ingeniously contrived conspiracy, and its unravelment the most extraordinary combination of events, and (if the verdict of the jury be, as all seem to admit, correct) the most extensive and polluting corruption which the annals of our courts of justice have ever brought to light.

It was an action of ejectment, brought by the young widow of Oscar F. Crittenden, deceased, against two of his brothers, to recover a large and valuable farm, situated near the old Indian Castle, in this county. The widow claimed the farm, in fee, as the heir at law of a child, to which it was alleged she gave birth after the death of her husband, but who died before the commencement of the suit, leaving her entitled, as heir, to the whole inheritance.—The brothers claimed as heirs at law of the deceased. They admitted that the widow was entitled to dower in the farm, which they had caused to be admeasured to her, but insisted that the pretence of her being the mother of a child was fabulous. The issue, therefore, was upon the issue.

The cause was conducted by Asgil Gibbs and Jared Wilson, Esquires, as counsel for the plaintiff, and by Judge Whiting and the Hon. Mark H. Sibley, for the defendants, before his Honor, Daniel Meseley, Circuit Judge.

It appeared, by the testimony, that the plaintiff was married to Oscar F. Crittenden in July, 1835, he then being a ward of the Court of Chancery, as an habitual drunkard; that he died on the 6th day of October, 1837, of *delirium tremens*; and that at the time of his death, he was the owner of the farm in question, leaving no issue born during his life.

In respect to the birth of a posthumous child, one Doct. Kimber, a practising physician, residing in the village of Geneva—Mrs. Kimball, the mother of the plaintiff, at whose house she was, and a sister of the plaintiff, all testified, that in the afternoon of the 17th July, 1838, she gave birth to a female infant; that they were present and assisted at the birth; that the child lived about three weeks, when it died, and was buried in the burying ground of the Crittenden family, on which occasion there was a large funeral, a funeral sermon preached, and the Kimball family put on mourning. Mrs. L., a respectable female and near neighbor of that family, also testified that she was present, not at the very moment of the birth, but immediately thereafter; that she saw all the appearances usually observable on such occasions—received the newborn infant from the arms of the physician, as he performed the last act of separation from the mother, washed and dressed it, (in the apparel which the sister swore had been prepared for this purpose in the month of April or May preceding) and placed in the plaintiff's arms, she being by that time restored to her bed. Many witnesses testified that she nursed this child as long as its health continued, and when that began to fail, the Doctor procured a puppy to supply its place at the breast. Much proof was also given of the pregnant appearance of the widow for months before her confinement.

Thus the plaintiff's cause seemed to be established by the most positive and conclusive evidence. Yet it was insisted by the defendants' counsel, that all the testimony given by Dr. Kimber, and by the relatives of the plaintiff, in relation to the birth of the child, was false and corrupt, and that a child, born of the body of another female, in the same house on the 17th July, 1838, was presented to and imposed upon Mrs. L. in the manner described by her; and that the child died and was buried with the solemnities and mock mourning before mentioned. In support of this view of the case, the defendants' counsel called a middle aged man, who testified that in 1838, and for several years previous, he was the captain of a canal boat, and that a young unmarried woman, who was the maid on board his boat, was discovered, in the spring of 1838, to be *enchant*; and, as he had reason to believe, by himself, that having a family, and being desirous to conceal his and her disgrace, and to provide as far as he could, for her comfort, he applied to a friend in Geneva to assist him in procuring a suitable place for the girl to remain until her confinement, and where she could be properly taken care of. This friend recommended him to Dr. Kimber; that he had applied to the Dr., who asked him when the child would probably be born; and upon being informed that the birth might be expected in the early part of July, he, the witness, was directed to call again on the following day. He did so.

The Doctor then asked him if he and the girl would be willing to part with the child after its birth, provided it could be well brought up, and inherit a large property; that he knew of a widow whose husband had recently died; and if she could have a child within nine months after his death, it would get a large estate. The name and residence of the widow were withheld. The witness, partially consenting to the proposition, was requested to bring the girl to

the Doctor's office, which he did, and after some private conversation between her and the Doctor, he left her there, under his assurance that she would be well provided for. Not being entirely satisfied that all was right, he called on the Doctor some days afterwards, and insisted on being informed where the girl was, that he might see for himself that she was comfortably situated; but he could obtain no information on the subject, and thereupon addressed a letter to her, enclosing some money, which was placed in the Doctor's hands; that being still dissatisfied, he again called on the Doctor, a few days afterwards, and threatened to expose him unless he informed him where the girl was; the Dr. left his office, & after a short absence returned & directed him to a neighboring house, which he understood to be the residence of old Mrs. Kimball, where he had an interview with the girl; and that he did not see her again until the latter part of July, 1839. He left her with the Doctor about the middle of May. The witness also testified, that some time after the girl was delivered of a child, and in the latter part of July, or the first of August, in the same year, he had a conversation with the Doctor, who stated to him that the child lived about eight days; that after its death he buried it in the burying ground, about midnight.

This female, referred to by the last witness, was next called, and testified that she went with him, as he had stated, to Dr. Kimber's office, in the village of Geneva, about the middle of May; that in a private conversation between her and the Doctor, he first asked her when her child would probably be born. She told him about the 1st of July. He then told her that if she would part with it as soon as born, he would make it an heir to a large property, and have it brought up, and she need never have any trouble with it. She neither assented to or rejected this proposition. The Doctor took her to the house of Mrs. Kimball, where she remained until the 17th of July, when she gave birth to a child, which was immediately taken out of the room where she was, by a sister of the plaintiff, and she had not seen it since; that Doctor Kimber, old Mrs. Kimball, and the sister, were present at the birth. They had all told her that the child died immediately after it was born, and the Doctor said he had buried it. She remained at Mrs. K.'s nine days after the birth of the child, when she was removed to a place a few miles distant, provided for her by Dr. K. While at Mrs. Kimball's, she was kept in a room up stairs, without being permitted to go into the street, or look out of the window, or see any person except the family.—She knew that the child was born alive, for it cried twice before it was taken out of the room, and she heard a child cry every day, down stairs, after that, as long as she remained at old Mrs. Kimball's, but had not heard any thing of the kind, in that house, before her child was born, and she was positive it was born in the afternoon on Tuesday, the 17th of July, that soon after she went to old Mrs. Kimball's she noticed plaintiff appeared in a family way. Several female acquaintances of the plaintiff testified, that they had not observed that she was in that situation until some time in the month of May; but that during the latter part of that month it was quite apparent.

To rebut the force of this testimony, Doct. Kimber testified that he received and took care of the last witness, at the request of the boat captain, for a compensation, and because he appeared very anxious to conceal her situation; that he obtained board for her at Mrs. Kimball's because it was convenient to attend her at the same place he was attending the plaintiff; that she had a male child there, and he was present at its birth; but that it was born on the 19th day of July, two days after the plaintiff was put to bed; that the child died as soon as it was born, and he took it to his office and put it into a jar of spirits to preserve it, but the spirits not being strong enough, "it spoiled." The Doctor further testified that the plaintiff's mother and sister were the only persons present when the girl was confined, or who had any knowledge of the event. Both these females corroborated him in regard to the time of the delivery, the sickness and death of her child, and its being carried away by the Doctor; and they all reaffirm most positively and solemnly, that the plaintiff gave birth to a female child, and that this occurred two days before the other child was born.

Such is a brief statement of the substance of the direct testimony, given in this extraordinary cause. Considering its positive character and the number of witnesses on the part of the plaintiff, the balance seems to incline strongly to her side; but the principal witnesses to support her case were subjected to a most severe and searching cross-examination by the defendant's counsel; and we have never seen a case in which the great value of that right was so obvious, or its exercises conducted with greater ingenuity and effect. The fortress, that had been so cautiously reared, and which to the eye of the spectator, appeared at first impregnable, fell slowly, by piecemeal, under this well directed artillery.

The cause was commenced on Thursday afternoon, and the examination of the witnesses was not finished until Friday evening. On Saturday it was ably argued before the jury by Mr. Sibley, for the defence, and Mr. Gibbs for the plaintiff.

The address of Mr. Sibley was one of the most powerful and effective specimens of forensic eloquence to which we have ever listened, every circumstance tending to develop a cunning devised conspiracy, was collected and combined, and presented together in the strongest light, and with irresistible force, impelling the minds of his

hearers to the conclusion that the new born infant of the girl was, with those appearances observed by Mrs. L., brought from the chamber to the room where she found the plaintiff, just at the moment when the Doctor and the plaintiff had placed themselves in an attitude to deceive her. Generally, the speech consisted of a strain of logical and well arranged arguments; but there were occasional bursts of lofty and impassioned eloquence that made the blood course rapidly thro' our veins. The "Doctor" was literally anatomised. No subject under his own knife was ever more thoroughly dissected. He was not allowed the poor excuse that Shakspeare's apothecary pleaded for furnishing poison to the ill-fated Romeo, "My poverty, but not my will, consents."

The Jury received a brief and impartial charge from the Court, and in a few minutes returned a verdict, that the defendants were entitled to the farm; and that the widow was only entitled to dower.

Many curious developments were made in the progress of the trial, which our limits will not allow us to notice. Among these were the facts that the young woman the Jury it seems believed to be the real mother of the pretended heir, has since that period married a respectable man, who was entirely ignorant of her misfortune until she was subpoenaed to give her evidence, but who with a commendable philosophy consented, and indeed insisted, that she should obey the process of the law, disclose the whole truth, and prevent the triumph of injustice.—He sat in Court while she gave her testimony, and returned with her to their residence.

We are informed that the fact that this woman was at the house of Mrs. Kimball, at any time, or that any other female gave birth to a child there, was wholly unknown to the defendants or to any other person except the Kimball family, the Doctor and the putative father of the child until shortly before the trial, when a slight circumstance seized upon and followed up by the sagacity of counsel, led to the subpoenaing of the girl & her seducer, and to the disclosure made by them on the trial for the first time. We understand the plaintiff and her witnesses came to Court in the confidence that the great secret was unknown to the defendants, and that the situation of all who had possession of it rendered a disclosure impossible.

How discouraging, then, is the moral which this case presents, to all who contemplate the commission of frauds, in the hope that the most wary caution is to secure them from ultimate detection! And how appalling is the mass of legal and moral crime that in this case may have been committed! 1st. A criminal conspiracy to effect an unlawful object. 2d. A legal crime in the false personation of an heir. 3d. Perjury of the deepest and blackest die; and possibly the murder of the child of the girl, by depriving it of its natural nourishment, and committing it to an unnatural mother.

Surely, the lessons taught in our courts of justice are powerful dissuaves to all who are inclined to enter upon a career of vice and crime.

We ask the attention of our readers to the article below, which we copy from the Franklin Messenger, originally taken from the correspondence of the Boston Atlas.—It seems that Mr. Ogle has given a bill of particulars of various items of expenditure at the White House which somewhat concerns the character of our president for economy in the use of the people's money. We think our readers will be able fully to appreciate the benefits of such expenditures.

Mr. Van Buren has been aptly styled the "Gold Spoon Candidate." He is the first President of the United States that ever introduced a service of gold plate into the Presidential mansion; and he is lauded as the most democratic of all our Chief Magistrates. He is the first President that ever provided a British coach for the royal use; filled the White House with French furniture, or loaded his dinner table with foreign trinkets and gew-gaws at the public expense.

I have given you some account of this English coach and the French furniture, and the gold spoons, and the magnificent European table ornaments, in my former letters; and I perceive, by a paragraph in the Boston Morning Post, that the truth of my statements is denied, on the authority of Gov. Lincoln, of Massachusetts, a member of the committee on Public Buildings, in the present Congress. Now I will pledge my personal reputation upon the literal accuracy of every word that I have ever written upon the subject; and I will engage to prove, by the positive assertions of credible witnesses, by facts and figures, and the items of expenditure as given in the official reports of the government, the entire truth of the gold spoon story. I wrote an account of this extravagant finery at the White House before the subject had been mentioned upon the floor of Congress. I obtained my facts from members who dined with the President, according to the custom, in the early part of the session.

The members from whom I obtained the account of the dinner table and the gold plate, were the Hon. T. C. Chittenden, of New York, and the Hon. L. W. Andrews, of Kentucky, who examined the spoons, knives and forks with particular care. They still believe these articles to be gold. The dishes, urns, and other parts of the dinner service are executed in a style to correspond with the spoons, and if not solid gold, are made to dazzle and deceive. Mr. Andrews took an inventory of the gold plate, and a sketch of the foreign ornaments on the table, which it was said he intended to have printed by a lithographer. The "pyramid of fantastic finery in the centre of the table is a

French ornament, and is called a *Plateau*. It was purchased in France, at an expense of \$4000 of the people's money. No other President ever had such an article in the White House. It consists of an immense gilded tray, or platter, containing a pyramid of golden fillagree work, on the summit of which there are several golden Cupids, sustaining golden candelsticks. The table is also ornamented with other finery of the same description, and with vases of artificial flowers, one bunch of which, as I shall show presently, cost the sum of one hundred dollars. The ceremonies of these democratic dinner parties are conducted on the most courtly system. Every thing is forced, formal, and far removed from that republican simplicity which should distinguish the residence of a republican President. Visitors are first shown into an ante-room, where they are prepared to appear in the august presence of the Chief Magistrate. They are then ushered into the reception room, announced, and introduced to his Majesty.—Nearly an hour is then spent in solemn and oppressive silence. A confidential friend or two, obtain a seat near the throne, and occupy the cur of the President until the dinner hour arrives. Similar formality is observed in passing from the reception room to the dining hall, and the guests finally find themselves seated at the president's table. The brilliancy of the chandeliers—the glittering of the foreign gewgaws, the multitude of strange dishes, and colored glasses, utterly confounds and bewilders all plain, honest republicans—and it is a long time before they begin to learn the use of these extraordinary arrangements. A number of Dutch and French dishes are then brought in, and the guest is supplied with a dozen different specimens of outlandish cookery, not one of which is agreeable to his taste, and the plates are often changed before he can tell whether it is agreeable or not. Thus he goes through with dinner, tasting of every thing and eating nothing—inconvenient, uncomfortable, and unsatisfied. In the midst of luxuries he can find nothing to suit his taste, and he sighs for the solid comforts of Log Cabin fare. He finds his plate surrounded with wine glasses of various sorts and sizes—wine bottles, and wine coolers—but nothing equal to the good old beverage, *hard cider*. He washes his fingers in Fanny Kemble glasses and wipes them on a damask napkin; and after exchanging a parting salutation with his Democratic Majesty, he bids farewell to the folly and extravagance of the White House, and thanks his fortune when he finds himself once more breathing the pure air of heaven.

Mr. Charles Ogle, of Pennsylvania, an original Jackson man, and at present a member of the Whig party in Congress, dined with the President not long since, and was forcibly struck with the air of extravagance which pervaded the Presidential mansion; and knowing the arguments which were urged against John Q. Adams, when he occupied that house, he was led to examine this subject, and gave the result of his inquiries in a speech which he delivered about two weeks since. The facts which he presented, showed that Mr. Van Buren had exceeded all former incumbents of the White House in his expenditures, and in his spicing of foreign courts and foreign manners. Mr. Lincoln, of Massachusetts, replied to Mr. Ogle, and denied some of the charges which had been made against the President.

A report of Mr. Lincoln's remarks appeared in the Globe, and they have been quoted in the *Locomotor* journals, as a contradiction of the gold spoon story, by a member of the whig party. Mr. Lincoln said, among other things, and if there was any thing wrong in relation to the furniture at the White House, the Committee on Public Buildings and not the President, were to blame for it. Mr. Ogle replied to Mr. Lincoln's remarks last evening, with great power. He repeated the gold spoon story with additional force, and gave some new items of extravagance, with the substantial facts, figures, and the receipts bills. Mr. Ogle, at the outset, denied the right of Gov. Lincoln so to do, if he persisted in maintaining that the items of expenditure of the furniture of the White House, as exhibited in the accounts, were all perfectly reasonable. The Whig party, he said, were in favor of a reform in these things, and opposed to extravagance. And when a man found his speech reported at full length in the Globe, and sent by thousands over the country, he might be sure he did not speak the sentiments of the Whig party. He should be the last person, he believed, to object to any reasonable furniture in the White House. He should not object to any respectable furniture of American manufacture; to American mirrors and carpets; to busts of Washington and Franklin, and Columbus, or any other ornaments of that description. He considered them proper and necessary. But he did object to the foreign trash collected in that house; and he believed that no man would dare to go before his constituents and justify such extravagance as was there manifested.

He found, among other items, \$4000 charged for French comfortable chairs, and ottomans, purchased during Mr. Van Buren's administration. Then there were some "tabacets," or *tabby cats*, he couldn't tell which—something of foreign manufacture. Then there were Fanny Kemble finger-glasses, in which to wash the delicate fingers of the Democratic President, after dinner; and \$100 for a bunch of artificial flowers, to place on the table before him. He objected to buying these articles, and many more of a similar description, with the people's money; and he believed that every good Whig would object to such expenditures.

It had been said that it would let down the President's dignity to mention these things. Dignity! forsooth! Instead of the

dignity of virtue, of wisdom, of valor, you throw around the President the frippery of courtiers, and then call him *dignified*. And what is dignity—true dignity?—There is the dignity of rank, and the dignity of the mind. Now however high the rank, if the dignity of the mind be wanting, there is no real dignity. If the mind of Mr. Van Buren be mean, you may place him in the White House and surround him with French furniture and foreign gewgaws, but you cannot give him true dignity. The circular room, Mr. Ogle said was well furnished when Mr. Van Buren took up his residence at the White House; but he had not been there more than eight months when, as appeared by the account, he laid out one thousand three hundred and seven dollars to fix three windows curtains! The window curtains were good enough before, for any republican in the land. These things had been denied in the official organ of the Administration—the *Globe*—but he held the facts in his hands, and he should send them abroad to the people.

In August, 1837, six months after Mr. Van Buren took possession of the White House, said Mr. Ogle, we find the United States charged with the sum of two thousand dollars for gold leaf and gilding materials for the circular room!

On the 7th of July, 1837, we find that Mr. Van Buren charged the United States with upwards of four thousand dollars for foreign carpeting, imported expressly for his use.—Domestic American carpeting was not good enough for his royal mansion—and the people's money must be paid out in sums like this for foreign goods.

Next comes a charge of several hundred dollars for *towels*! Mr. Van Buren has a salary of \$88 per day, and charges his towels to the people! Then we have a small bill of two thousand dollars, and upwards, for repairs, such as taking down curtains and carpets, and large items for silver paper. Also a charge of one hundred dollars for one divan and eight cushions; a small bill for a French bedstead and other French furniture, of one thousand five hundred and ninety nine dollars! And an other bill in which the people are charged for grinding Mr. Van Buren's table knives, and for two knife blades, the sum of \$420! The people are also charged eight hundred and fifty-nine dollars, for the services of a horse, cart, and gardener, to aid in raising Mr. Van Buren's vegetables!

The White House, (with the exception of the East room) was handsomely furnished while Mr. Adams was President of the United States. Gen. Jackson spent \$45,000 for furniture during the eight years that he occupied the White House, and Mr. Van Buren, the first year of his administration, expended for the same purpose upward of \$19,000!

Mr. Ogle said he was aware that Mr. Van Buren was a great advocate of gold, and he supposed that eating with *gold knives* and *forks* gave him a "hankering" that way.

Mr. Lincoln repeatedly interrupted Mr. Ogle, in the course of his remarks, and informed him that the report of his speech which was published in the *Globe*, was taken by a reporter and published without his knowledge or consent; he never saw it, until it appeared in print, and had no opportunity to revise it; and he wished it understood that it contained many inaccuracies, some of which he had pointed out to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. The report, he repeated, was a perversion of his language, and contained expressions which he did not use. He disavowed the spirit of it, entirely.

Mr. Ogle said he was glad to hear the gentleman make this explanation. He did not believe that any man could stand up before his constituents and justify the foolish extravagance of the President. He did not believe that any man could justify him in his spicing of foreign courts—in the purchasing of French furniture, of gold plate, of artificial flowers, British coaches, and other things of that sort. He did not believe any man could justify him in charging his common household expenses to the people, while he was receiving the largest salary paid to any public officer in the nation. President Washington, he said, lived in a plain manner—and he paid for his own rent, and his food, and his family expenses. And there was no law to justify Mr. Van Buren in making such charges against the people, as he had read from the reports. No other President ever did such a thing. If we permitted these charges in one instance, there would be no end to them—no limit, whatever, but the limit of avarice. Instead of a salary of \$25,000, the salary of the President might be increased, by his own wish \$100,000. He considered this a monstrous use of power; & one that ought to be immediately checked.

Well, then, here you have a specimen of the facts, figures, and arguments presented by Mr. Ogle, to sustain the famous *Gold Spoon story*. The spirit of this story is the charge of extravagance, and a mean abuse of power for pecuniary advantages. Mr. Ogle has talked three days on the subject, and will soon present to the public the entire mass of facts which he has collected, with the receipts bills, and the certified documents to sustain his charges. I have only gathered a few items from the speech which he delivered last evening—and this was scarcely a third of the whole.

Men often go from love to ambition, but seldom return from ambition to love.

It is a miserable thing to be injured by one of whom you dare not complain.

The beginning of love is in the power of every one; to put an end to it in the power of none.

The following excellent article is from the *Memphis Enquirer*. A more just tribute never was accorded to any man. The subject of it (Gen. H.) is worthy the highest meed of praise. We hope the time is not far distant, and we believe it is not, when the base and cowardly attacks which have been heaped upon him will cease; but should this not prove the case, we have no fears as to the result. Harrison will pass through this ordeal unharmed. Let his opponents vent their malice and hatred upon him; let them say what they will against him, they cannot make American freemen believe he is such a "Coward," such a "Granny" as they represent him to be.

**THE GOLD OF CHARACTER.** The character of General HARRISON, like gold, grows brighter the harder it is rubbed. The more he becomes known, the better he is liked by the People. The harder he is rubbed by the assaults of his enemies, the brighter he shines. His proves to be a character that will stand the most rigid scrutiny. He comes out of the crucible of examination, when heated seven fold hotter than ever, unscathed by the fiery ordeal. Every assault upon him so far has been triumphantly repelled. Even many of his political enemies have given, and still continue to give, their public admiration of the man, & acknowledge his important services and great worth.—And we venture to say that no man ever received such honorable testimony of worth and excellence from his political enemies as have been displayed towards General HARRISON. Honorable men, who, although they differ with him in politics, nevertheless break through party shackles; come forward, and testify to his great services and worth. When a man possesses a character to draw forth such praise and testimonials of excellence from his political enemies, in times like these, partisan feelings consume almost every thing of an antagonistical character, we say he must be a man truly.

Memphis Enquirer.

"Reduce our nominal prices to the real standard of prices throughout the world, and you cover the country with blessings and benefits." [Mr. Buchanan's speech on the Sub-Treasury.]

This short extract embraces the whole question—the argument is this: As all that man eats, drinks and wears, enter into the price of labor, it is necessary to reduce the products of the soil, that the price of labor may also be reduced: For if a mechanic receives only 25, 50, or 75 cents a day for his labor, he would starve unless he could buy the necessaries of life with his wages. It may be said, therefore, that the value of bread, meat, vegetables, coffee, tea and sugar, which the manufacturer consumes, enters into the price of every piece of cloth, or other products of the manufactory and work shop, which we wear or use. Now, it is of some little consequence to the American people whether we encourage our own cultivators of the soil, or those of another country. If the American mechanic does not labor for the same price that the European mechanic labors for, then our manufactory and work shops are to be broken up according to the doctrine and policy of the administration; and we shall be paying for the produce of the soil of other countries, by being forced to buy and use the products of their looms and work shops. To avoid this, say our rulers, the price of labor must come down, so that we can enter into competition with England, Germany, and France, and thus create a market at home for the produce of the soil, or we shall be forced to transport it to a foreign market, and sell it at foreign prices. This, then, fixes the value of both labor and provisions of all kinds. We must bring them down to the "standard of price" throughout the world; or we have no demand for our surplus produce of labor.—This is the way our rulers propose to "cover the country with blessings!" Instead of this, let them give protection to the productive industry of the country, and prices will regulate themselves.

Farmers! Mechanics! Laborers! Have we not stated the argument fairly? Examine it carefully, and if you can pick any flaw in it, do so candidly and in the spirit of free inquiry, and we will sit down and reason together about it.—If you are convinced that we have stated the case as it is, then join us in putting things straight, for they are now wrong. "By their fruits ye shall know them." [Newark Advertiser.]

The following paragraph from a late London paper, may interest some of our fair readers. The general adoption of the system might save many a bashful lover a bungling or awkward *eclaircissement*:—

"If a gentleman wants a wife, he wears a ring on the first finger of the left hand; if he is engaged, he wears it on the second finger; if married, on the third; and on the fourth, if he never intends to get married.—When a lady is not engaged, she wears a hoop or diamond on her first finger; if engaged, on the second; if married, on the third; and on the fourth, if she intends to be a maid. When a gentleman presents a fan, a flower, or trinkets to a lady with the left hand, this on her part, in an overtone of regard; should she receive it with the left hand, it is considered as an acceptance of his esteem; but if with the right hand, it is a refusal of the offer. Thus by a few simple tokens explained by rule, the passion is expressed."

Nothing is more easy than to do a mischief, nothing more difficult than to suffer without complaining.