



HUMANITY, TEMPERANCE, PROGRESS.

THE SECRET OF THE STREAM.

There is something very touching and beautiful about these verses, full of the best pathos—breathing the tone of genius.

On the silver stars looked down,  
From Heaven  
Smile to the world to rest,  
O man, from all refuge driven,  
By little babe caressed,  
And thus she saag—

Waken within thy mother's arms,  
Lead to thy mother's heart,  
And to the breast that warms  
From its inward smart,  
From the peat-up flame,  
Wailing fiercely at its core,  
Faded by my loss and shame:  
Will I live to suffer more?  
Will I live to bear the pang  
The world's neglect and scorn?  
Is the distant bell's clang  
Nearer to the coming morn.  
Will I live to see it rise?  
Is not better far to die?  
I gaze upon the skies—  
And upon them shamelessly I  
Behold Words.

see the prisoner, and hear the trial. He himself appeared firm and collected, nothing in his appearance and manner indicating guilt, and when the question was put to him by the clerk, "are you guilty or not guilty?" he answered with an unflinching tongue, "not guilty." The counsel for the prosecution now opened the case. There was apparently little expectation of finding the prisoner guilty. He stated to the jury that the case was involved in great mystery. The prisoner was a man of respectability and property. The deceased was supposed to have about him gold and jewels to a large amount; but the prisoner was not so much in want of funds as to be under a strong temptation to commit murder. And besides, if the prisoner had obtained the property, he had effectually concealed it. Not a trace of it could be found. Why then was the prisoner suspected? He would state the ground of suspicion. The deceased, Henry Thompson, was a jeweler, residing in London, and a man of wealth. He had left London for the purpose of meeting a trader at Hull, of whom he expected to make a large purchase. That trader he did meet; and after the departure of the latter, Mr. Thompson was known to have in his possession gold to a large amount.

the evidence was not sufficient to convict him. Had the jury mean to say that there was any evidence against him? Was he to go out of the court with suspicion resting against him after all? This he was unwilling to do. He was an innocent man, and, if the Judge would grant him an opportunity, he would prove it. He would call his house-keeper, who would confirm a statement he was now about to make.

The housekeeper had not appeared in court. She had been concealed by Smith. This was considered a dark sign against him, but he now offered to bring her forward, and stated as a reason, not that he was unwilling that she should testify, but knowing the excitement, he was fearful she might be bribed to give testimony contrary to the fact.

He was now ready to relate all the circumstances that he knew; she might then be called and examined. If her testimony did not confirm his statement, he was willing to be condemned.

The request of the prisoner seemed reasonable, and Lord Mansfield, contrary to usual practice, granted it.

The prisoner went on with his statement. He said he wished to go out of court relieved from the suspicions which were resting on him. As to the person by means of which the stranger was said to have died, he knew neither the name nor the effect of it, nor even the existence of it, until made known by the counsel. He could call God to witness what he said.

And then, as to Mr. Thompson, he was a perfect stranger to him. How should he know what articles of value he had with him? He did not know. If he had such articles at Hull, he might have lost them on the road; or which was more probable, have otherwise disposed of them. And if he died by means of the fatal drug, he must have administered it himself.

He begged the jury to remember that his premises had been minutely searched, and that not the most trifling article that belonged to the deceased had been discovered in his possession.—The stopper of a phial had been found—but of this he could only say, he had no knowledge, and had never seen it before it was produced in court.

One fact had been proved, and only one. That he would explain, and his housekeeper would confirm his statement.

A witness had testified that some one had gone to the bedroom of the housekeeper on the night in question. He was ready to admit that was himself. He had been subject many years of his life to sudden fits of illness; he had been seized with one on that occasion, and had gone to her to procure her assistance in fighting a fire. She had returned with him to his room for that purpose, he having waited a minute in the passage, while she put on her clothes. This would account for the momentary disappearance of the light. After remaining a few moments in his room, finding himself better, he had dismissed her and retired to bed, from which he had not risen when he was informed of his guest's death.

Such was the prisoner's address, which produced a powerful effect. It was delivered in a very firm and impressive tone, and from the simple and artless manner of the man, perhaps not one present doubted his entire innocence.

The housekeeper was now introduced and examined by the counsel for the prisoner. She had not heard any part of the statement of Smith, or a single word of the trial.

To this succeeded her cross-examination by the counsel for the prosecution. One circumstance made a deep impression on her mind—that was that while the prisoner was in the room of the former, something like a door had obstructed the light of the candle, so that the witness testified to the fact, but could not see it. What was the obstruction? There was no door—nothing in the room which could account for this. Yet the witness is positive that something like a door did, for a moment, come between the window and the candle. This needed an explanation. The housekeeper was the only person that could give it. Desiring to prove this matter in the end to the bottom, but not wishing to excite her alarm, he began by asking her a few important questions, and among others where the candle stood when she was in Smith's room?

"In the centre of the room," she replied.

"Was it, and was the closet, or cupboard, or whatever you call it, opened once or twice while it stood there?"

She made no reply.

"I will help your recollection," said the counsel. "After Mr. Smith had taken the medicine out of the closet, did he shut the door, or did it stand open?"

"He shut it."

THE SECRET CLOSET.

GOD WILL DETECT CRIME.

Little more than fifty years ago a man by the name of Henry Thompson called at the residence of John Smith, residing in a part of England, and requested a night's lodging. This request was readily granted, and the stranger having taken some refreshments, retired early to bed, desiring that he might be wakened betimes in the morning. When the servant who was ordered to call him entered the room for that purpose, he found the stranger perfectly dead. On examining his body no marks of violence appeared, but his countenance looked extremely natural. The story of his death soon spread among the neighbors, and enquiries were made as to who he was, and what was the cause of his death.

Nothing certain, however, was known. He had arrived on the previous evening, and was seen passing through a neighboring village an hour before he reached the house where he came to his death. And then, as to the manner of his death, so little could be ascertained, that the jury who were summoned to investigate the case returned a verdict—"Died by a visitation of God." When several weeks passed on, and but little further was known, a suspicion existed that foul means had hastened the stranger's death. Whispers to that effect were expressed, and in the minds of the neighbors, Smith was considered the guilty man. His former life had not been good. He had always lived a loose and dissipated life, involved himself in debt by his extravagance, and was, being suspected of having obtained money wrongfully, had fled from town. More than ten years, however, had passed since his return, during which he had lived at his present residence, apparently in good circumstances, improved character, and a more useful life was remembered, and suspicion at once fastened on him.

On the expiration of two months, a gentleman one day stopped at the residence of John Smith, and inquired respecting the stranger who had been found dead in his bed. He supposed himself to be a friend of the man. The horse and clothes of the unfortunate stranger remained, and were at once recognized as having belonged to his brother. The body was taken up, and though countenances changed, bore a strong resemblance to him. He now desired to ascertain, if possible, the manner of his death. He requested, therefore, to investigate the circumstances as well as possible. At length he made known to the magistrate of the district the information he had collected, and upon the receipt of this, Smith was taken to jail to be tried for the murder of Henry Thompson.

The celebrated Lord Mansfield was then on the bench. He directed the grand jury to be cautious as to finding a bill against Smith. The evidence of his guilt, if any, might be small, and should the jury now find a bill against him, and he was acquitted, he could not be again molested, whatever testimony was set up against him. They did, however, find a bill against him, but it was by a majority of only one. The trial was then commenced, and Smith was brought into court and seated at the bar. A great crowd thronged the room, eager to

With this in his possession, he left Hull on his return to London. It was not known that he stopped until he reached Smith's, and the next morning was found dead in bed. He died then in Smith's house, and if it could be shown that he came to his death in an unnatural way, it would increase the suspicion that the prisoner was connected with the murder.

Now, then, continued the counsel, it will be proved beyond the possibility of a doubt that the deceased died of poison. But what was the poison? It was a recent discovery of a German chemist, said to be produced by distilling the seed of the wild cherry tree. It was a poison more powerful than any other known, and deprives of life so immediately as to leave no marks of suffering and no contortions of the features.

But then the question was, by whom was it administered?—One circumstance, a small one indeed, and yet upon it may hang a horrid tale, was that the stopper of a small bottle of a very singular description had been found in the prisoner's house. The stopper had been examined, and said by medical men to have belonged to a German phial, containing the kind of poison which he had described. But then was that poison administered by Smith, or at his instigation? Who were the prisoner's family? It consisted only of himself, a housekeeper, and a manservant.—The manservant slept in an out-house adjoining the stable, and did so on the night of Thompson's death. The prisoner slept at one end of the house, and the housekeeper at the other, and the deceased had been put in a room adjoining the housekeeper's.

It would be proved that about three hours after midnight, on the night of Thompson's death, a light had been seen moving about the house, and that a figure holding the light was seen to go out of the room in which the prisoner slept, to the housekeeper's room, the light now disappeared for a minute, when two persons were seen, but whether they went into Thompson's room, the witness could not swear, but shortly after they were seen passing quite through the entry into Smith's room, into which they entered, and in about five minutes the light was extinguished.

The witness would further state, that after the person returned with the light into Smith's room, and before it was extinguished, he had perceived some dark object intervene between the light and the window almost as large as the surface of a window itself, and which he described by saying, "appeared as if a door had been placed before the light."

Now in Smith's room there was nothing which could account for this appearance. His bed was in a different part, and there was a window looking out from the room, which, out for the bed, was entirely empty, the room in which he dressed being at a distance from it. The counsel for the prosecution here concluded what he had to say. During his address Smith appeared in no wise to be agitated or disturbed, and equally unmoved was he while the witnesses testified in substance what the opening speech of the counsel led the court and jury to expect.

Lord Mansfield now addressed the jury. He told them that in his opinion the evidence was not sufficient to condemn the prisoner, and if the jury agreed with him in the opinion, the court would discharge him. Without leaving their seats, the jury agreed that the evidence was not sufficient.

As was mentioned, what they were about to render a verdict on, the prisoner arose and addressed the court. He said he had been accused of a foul crime, and the jury had said that

the evidence was not sufficient to convict him. Had the jury mean to say that there was any evidence against him? Was he to go out of the court with suspicion resting against him after all? This he was unwilling to do. He was an innocent man, and, if the Judge would grant him an opportunity, he would prove it. He would call his house-keeper, who would confirm a statement he was now about to make.

The housekeeper had not appeared in court. She had been concealed by Smith. This was considered a dark sign against him, but he now offered to bring her forward, and stated as a reason, not that he was unwilling that she should testify, but knowing the excitement, he was fearful she might be bribed to give testimony contrary to the fact.

He was now ready to relate all the circumstances that he knew; she might then be called and examined. If her testimony did not confirm his statement, he was willing to be condemned.

The request of the prisoner seemed reasonable, and Lord Mansfield, contrary to usual practice, granted it.

The prisoner went on with his statement. He said he wished to go out of court relieved from the suspicions which were resting on him. As to the person by means of which the stranger was said to have died, he knew neither the name nor the effect of it, nor even the existence of it, until made known by the counsel. He could call God to witness what he said.

And then, as to Mr. Thompson, he was a perfect stranger to him. How should he know what articles of value he had with him? He did not know. If he had such articles at Hull, he might have lost them on the road; or which was more probable, have otherwise disposed of them. And if he died by means of the fatal drug, he must have administered it himself.

He begged the jury to remember that his premises had been minutely searched, and that not the most trifling article that belonged to the deceased had been discovered in his possession.—The stopper of a phial had been found—but of this he could only say, he had no knowledge, and had never seen it before it was produced in court.

One fact had been proved, and only one. That he would explain, and his housekeeper would confirm his statement.

A witness had testified that some one had gone to the bedroom of the housekeeper on the night in question. He was ready to admit that was himself. He had been subject many years of his life to sudden fits of illness; he had been seized with one on that occasion, and had gone to her to procure her assistance in fighting a fire. She had returned with him to his room for that purpose, he having waited a minute in the passage, while she put on her clothes. This would account for the momentary disappearance of the light. After remaining a few moments in his room, finding himself better, he had dismissed her and retired to bed, from which he had not risen when he was informed of his guest's death.

Such was the prisoner's address, which produced a powerful effect. It was delivered in a very firm and impressive tone, and from the simple and artless manner of the man, perhaps not one present doubted his entire innocence.

The housekeeper was now introduced and examined by the counsel for the prisoner. She had not heard any part of the statement of Smith, or a single word of the trial.

To this succeeded her cross-examination by the counsel for the prosecution. One circumstance made a deep impression on her mind—that was that while the prisoner was in the room of the former, something like a door had obstructed the light of the candle, so that the witness testified to the fact, but could not see it. What was the obstruction? There was no door—nothing in the room which could account for this. Yet the witness is positive that something like a door did, for a moment, come between the window and the candle. This needed an explanation. The housekeeper was the only person that could give it. Desiring to prove this matter in the end to the bottom, but not wishing to excite her alarm, he began by asking her a few important questions, and among others where the candle stood when she was in Smith's room?

"In the centre of the room," she replied.

"Was it, and was the closet, or cupboard, or whatever you call it, opened once or twice while it stood there?"

She made no reply.

"I will help your recollection," said the counsel. "After Mr. Smith had taken the medicine out of the closet, did he shut the door, or did it stand open?"

"He shut it."