Humorous Department.

Mistaken Indentity.

A well known and popular Los Angeles physician upon the occasion of a recent visit to a professional friend at Fresno (the physician in charge of the state institution for the deaf and dumb) was invited to attend one of the periodical "hops" given the inmates. All the unfortunates and a goodly sprinkling of guests were present.

Before the function had progressed very far the Fresno physician approached his Los Angeles medical friend with, "Get busy, doctor!" The doctor got busy. Although tipping the scales at 210, he is an easy and graceful dancer and much enjoys the exercise. Approaching a young lady of singular sweetness and beauty, he indicated his desire to dance with her. She proved to be as bewitching with her feet as with her eyes, and our Los Angeles friend, in contempt of all convention, danced two or three numbers with her.

At the close of the last one a gentleman approached his charming partner and asked for the next dance. "I should be delighted to favor you, my friend," said she in a voice no less sweet than her face, "but I've promised to dance the next number with this dummy here!"

Each had taken the other for an inmate!—Los Angeles Times.

A Financial Puzzle.—Here is an incident that a Chanute man tells as having occurred in a certain Kansas town. He was in the ticket office and watched the proceedings, says the Kansas City Times.

A man came up to the window and asked for a ticket to Kansas City, inquiring the price.

"Two-twenty-five," said the agent.

The man dug down into a well worn pocketbook and fished out a bill. It was a bank note for $2. It was also all the money he had.

"How soon does this train go?" he inquired.

"In fifteen minutes," replied the agent.

The man hurried away. Soon he was back with three silver dollars, with which he bought a ticket.

"Pardon my curiosity," said the ticket seller, "but how did you get that money? It isn't a loan for I see you have disposed of the $2 bill."

"That's all right," said the man. "No I didn't borrow, I went to a pawnshop and soaked the bill for $1.50. Then as I started back here I met an old acquaintance to whom I sold the pawn ticket for $1.50. I then had $3, and he has the pawn ticket for which the $2 bill stands as security."

Didn't Stay Her Time Out.—Old colored Joe had for many years been man of all work for the Gordons. When the family moved to another town, Joe remained in Reading. Several years later when Mr. Gordon returned to Reading on business, old Joe heard he was in town and went at once to the home of Mr. Gordon's sister. They were at dinner and at one of the open windows Joe took his stand, a pleased grin on his face. After Joe had asked about each member of Mr. Gordon's family, Mr. Gordon said, "Where's Harve now, Joe?" Harve was Joe's brother.

"He's daid, suh," returned Joe. "A woman in Foht Smith shot him."

"What did they do to her?" asked Mr. Gordon.

"They put her in the penitentiary foh life—she didn't stay her time out, tho," said Joe.

"She didn't? Why not?" asked Mr. Gordon.

"She's daid," said Joe.

Where They Got Done.—"Among the gambling stories that the late Pat Sheedy used to tell in his art shop," said a New York reporter, "was one about a jackpot.

"A beautiful young bride, the story ran, entered a corner grocery one morning and said:

"'Have you got any jackpots, Mr. Sands.' 'No, ma'am.' Sands answered, and he hid a smile behind his hand. 'I've got teapots and coffee pots, but jackpots I don't stock.'

"'Oh, dear!' said the bride. A frown wrinkled her smooth and beautiful brow. 'I'm so sorry! You see, Mr. Sands, my husband's mother used to cook for him, and nearly every night he talks in his sleep about a jackpot. So I thought I'd get one, for, since he mentions it so often, he must be used to it. Could you tell me, Mr. Sands, what they cook in jackpots?'

"'Greens, ma'am,' was the quick answer."—Detroit Free Press.

Justice Fines Himself.—Wm. Stotler, police judge in Wellington, Kan., arraigned himself in his own court this week on a charge of disturbing the peace after he had fought with J. L. Ferguson, a tailor, in the street. Immediately after the fight, Stotler summoned himself to court.

"Have you been fighting?" he asked himself.

"Yes," he answered himself. "But, judge, I"—

"Tut, tut," interrupted the judge, "I'll fine you $5 and costs."

Ferguson was then arraigned by Judge Stotler, and fined the same amount. The fight started over a story Stotler, who is an editor, wrote about Ferguson.

"How Sharper Than a Serpent's Tooth."—An irritable old farmer and his ungainly, slouching son were busy grubbing sprouts one hot, sultry day, when the old man suddenly stumbled over a small stump.

"Gosh durn that everlastin' stump!" he exclaimed. "I wish it was in hell!"

The son slowly straightened up from his work and gazed reproachfully at his father.

"Why, you oughtn't to say that pap," he drawled. "You might stumble over that stump ag'in some day."—Everybody's.

Profane History.—"Pop."

"Well, what is it now? If it's foolish question No. 9,697 I'll spank you and put you to bed."

"No, pop; I just want to know what is profane history."

"Profane history, oh? Well it's—it's just a term to distinguish it from sacred history."

"But why is it called profane, pop?"

"How the—that is, how do I know! I suppose it say, you know when little George Washington cut down his father's pet cherry tree?"

"Yes, pop."

"Well, what little Georgie's father said to little Georgie is profane history. I should think you could get your lessons without bothering me with your fool questions."—New York Times.

JONES, THE WIFE MURDERER

[Continued from First Page.]

with charging in respect to matters of fact."

A Technical Break.

It would appear from the opinion handed down that counsel for the defense made a technical "slip up" when they did not hand to counsel for the state or to the jurors in question the affidavits alleged to disqualify certain jurors in the Jones case.

On this point the court states that the exception is overruled because of the fact that the affidavits were not served upon the jurors and upon counsel. In the case of the State vs. Harding, 2 Bay, 267, which case the court refers to, one of the jurymen had been heard to say, it was charged in the affidavit: "By God, he was one of the jurors to try the prisoner and he would hang him at all events." Upon this and the other two reasons that new evidence had been discovered and that there was not sufficient evidence to convict, a new trial was asked for and was refused in the Harding case. The court at that time was unanimous that copies of affidavits of this stature must be served on the juryman or jurymen in order that preparation might be made to exculpate. So in the Jones case the court rules likewise.

The affidavits in the Jones case contain the following alleged statements of jurymen:

1. By H. H. Pruitt: "I would sit on his jury, if I ever got on it, until I rotted or break his neck."

2. By L. Lawson: "That if I ever sit on the jury that tries W. T. Jones I would sure break his neck or send him down the road."

3. Mr. Hartsell: "Hang, and I would like to be one of the twelve to break his neck."

There were several other affidavits of this nature tending to show that the jury was prejudiced against defendant.

The most interesting of the exceptions was that as to Judge Memminger's charge, but there were a number of other exceptions as to testimony admitted and other points of a legal nature. At one stage the court says: the testimony tended to show that there were continuous acts of brutality on the part of the defendant against the deceased from January, 1906, to within a very short time of her death. "It was held also that from brutal conduct malice might be inferred."

Judge Memminger has also stated in reference to the affidavits alleging prejudice against Jones by jurors that, inasmuch as the jurors had been duly summoned, at the trial the defendant had ample opportunity to object to them. "But," continued Judge Memminger, "even in my judgment considering these affidavits which have been read, and considering them ex gratia, I don't feel it is sufficient to warrant me to grant a new trial. I doubt if there is any case of magnitude which has ever been tried and a verdict of guilty rendered, in which affidavits could not be gotten up, made and filed as to what some juror had said about the case. I am satisfied no wrong has been done the defendant by the jurors."

A Death by Strychnine.

"When I found her she was lying on the bed and was nude from the waist down," testined Dr. J. T. Jeter, who was called in to attend Mrs. Marion Jones the night she died. "I drew the sheet up on her and asked Mr. Jones to get me a glass of water and a spoon. He got the water and I got my hypodermic fixed. After I gave her the morphine she began screaming and it was then that Jones asked me what was the matter with her; if I could tell? if I thought that she had taken strychnine, as there was a bottle of it on the bureau? I told him I did not know; as soon as the convulsion was over I asked her what was the matter with her? What hurt her? She said 'I am suffering; throw cold water on me.' Just before that she began to repeat the Lord's Prayer. What she said was broken and disconnected; there was scarcely any connection in what she said; it was just a word or a syllable at the time, after she got through what she said, 'I am—syllable; throw cold water on me; forgive me; wrong doing,' and she died then in about twelve seconds. Whether Mrs. Jones knew we were there or not I don't know. Strychnine poisons produce a dilation of the pupils of the eye and a ringing in the ears. I don't know whether she even heard what I asked her about what was the matter. I don't know, I would not say she even knew I was there. Strychnine poisoning caused her death."

Such was the frightful end that Mrs. Marion Jones, wife of W. T. Jones, met shortly before midnight, July 5, 1908. Dr. Jeter was called in and by a little after midnight, Mrs. Jones had died.

To connect the husband with the poisoning of Mrs. Jones was the work of the counsel for the state, and this case turned out to be what is generally called convicting one by circumstantial evidence. Instances of ill treatment of the wife by the husband were brought out in the testimony. One witness swore that Jones was seen to lead his wife out as far as the road from their home by the back of her hair and whip her after they got back to the steps. It was testified that on the night of the death of Mrs. Jones her husband was heard cursing at the home in Santuck, Union county.

There was testimony as to the character of Mrs. Jones, and of questions the husband had asked a negro woman about his wife. There was testimony much of it, as to Jones's drinking, and as to his alleged mistreatment of his wife.

One witness testified that Jones had said after the death of his wife in a conversation referring to his wife:

"Not so sad," meaning his wife's death was not. Witness said: "It seemed they tried to prove it on you that you poisoned her. Witness said that Jones said: "They were not sharp enough to catch me that time. I have been laying off to do that for a long time."

Mrs. Ida Whitlock's testimony played an important part in the case. She testified as to fights between Mr. and Mrs. Jones. Mrs. Whitlock was Mrs. Jones's sister. She testified that she had seen the body marks of where the husband struck the wife. In the opinion handed down this testimony was reviewed and the court rules that it was competent and that where it was not there was no motion to strike out.

There was testimony by many witnesses and when it was all over and the brilliant array of legal talent had argued the case, a verdict of guilty with recommendation to the mercy of the court was brought in, and Jones was sentenced to life imprisonment. The case then went to the supreme court with the result that the lower court is affirmed.

Miscellaneous Reading.

STATUS OF THE INCOME TAX.

Constitutional Amendment Now Before the States.

There still seems to be some misunderstanding of the status of the income tax proposal now before the country, upon which the South Carolina legislature has recently acted, writes Zach McGhee to the Columbia State. South Carolina has not voted to enact a Federal income tax, has not even voted for the enactment of such a law. When Senator Bailey, for instance, spoke before the legislature in favor of the income tax he was not speaking on the same proposal as that upon which he made his great speech in the senate last year. An income tax bill was introduced by Senator Bailey in the senate, but that was to enact an income tax law, and his speech was to show that it would be constitutional. He was defeated, the Republicans being in the great majority. But in order to defeat it these Republicans, led by President Taft and Mr. Aldrich, got up the scheme to submit to the states a constitutional amendment authorizing the congress to enact an income tax law. Ostensibly the president and the leaders of his party in congress claimed that congress did not have the authority to pass such a law the supreme court having once declared the law passed in 1894 unconstitutional. Mr. Taft afterwards admitted that he was not sincere in this and that what he really wanted to do was to defeat the income tax, because, he said, should an income tax law be enacted which would raise a large amount of revenue there would not be such a good excuse for a high protective tariff. It was never intended by those who proposed this idea that the states shou'd vote for the constitutional amendment. That is why the Republican newspapers, like for instance, the New York Tribune, which the Charleston News and Courier has been quoting in support of its opposition to the income tax, have been so maliciously and contentiously urging the legislatures of the various states to turn down the proposed constitutional amendment.

Twice in recent times congress has enacted an income tax law, without any constitutional amendment authorizing it. Once in 1862, a law which was enforced for ten years. Then it was repeated, not because it was considered wrong in principle, but because the rates were thought to be too high and burdensome by the few men of wealth who were then as they are now able to dominate the whole country.

Then again, in 1894, the Wilson tariff law contained an income tax. This was put on with a special provision that it should expire in 1900. But shortly after it was passed the supreme court declared by a vote of five to four that an income tax not apportioned among the people according to population was unconstitutional. It was upon the theory that the court was so closely divided, and then after one man had changed his mind between Friday and Monday, as Senator Bailey showed, that the effort was made by the Democrats with the aid of three or four Republican insurgents, to put through an income tax last year to take the place of high tariff duties.

All the South Carolina members and senators have always been or appeared to be in favor of the income tax. All were in favor of it last year, and wanted to put it through without any constitutional amendment. When, in 1894, the income tax amendment was put into the Wilson tariff bill on the floor of the house by an amendment offered by Representative McMillan of Tennessee, Democrat, of course, who had charge of certain features of the bill in the house, there was no roll call, but it was adopted by acclamation. It may be assumed that nearly all the Democrats voted for it and nearly all, if not all, the Republicans against it. Certainly no one about here ever heard of any South Carolina Democrat at that time being against it. In the senate the two South Carolina senators, Butler and Irby, were for it. It is interesting to note, however, that Grover Cleveland, then president, expressed himself in a letter to Mr. Wilson, chairman of the house ways and means committee, as against the income tax, or rather as not being altogether satisfied with it, for at the time of the famous letter to Mr. Wilson the income tax provision had been passed. David B. Hill of New York in the senate voted against the whole tariff bill.

The first income tax law was passed July 1, 1862, and took effect January 1, 1863. It provided that all incomes over $600 and not over $10,000 should be assessed at 3 per cent, and that all incomes over $10,000 should be assessed at 5 per cent.

March 3, 1865, the law was amended, increasing the rates on incomes between $600 and $10,000 from 3 per cent to 5 per cent, and on those over $10,000 from 5 per cent to 10 per cent. Even this did not raise enough revenue, and on March 2, 1867, the law was again amended, increasing the exemption from $100 to $1,000 and levying a flat rate of 5 per cent on all incomes over $1,000. In the same act there was a provision that the law should expire in 1870. It did not expire, however, until 1872, because on July 14, 1870, it was again enacted, but with a rate of 2½ per cent on all incomes over $2,000. The whole thing was repealed January 26, 1871, by a majority of one vote in the senate, the vote being 26 to 25.

The amounts collected by the Federal tax collectors under this law, with the various amendments, while in force were as follows:

1863	$ 2,741,857
1864	20,294,733
1865	32,050,017
1866	72,980,160
1867	66,014,429
1868	41,455,599
1869	34,791,857
1870	37,775,872
1871	19,162,652
1872	14,336,861

The total amount collected in the ten years of the income tax was $346,908,740. It is impossible to tell what the law proposed by Senator Bailey would bring in. It excepts all incomes under $5,000.

But his bill is no longer before either congress or the country. The question the states are asked to decide, the one upon which South Carolina has voted, is whether or not the Federal congress shall be specifically authorized by an amendment to the constitution to enact an income tax law, which shall be apportioned according to wealth and not among the states according to the population. In case that amendment is made to the constitution by the vote of three-fourths of the state legislatures, then will arise the question of what kind of an income tax, if any, is to be enacted. With the present powers reigning in congress, it is pretty safe to say that none whatever would be enacted.

In 1868, when $41,455,599 was collected, 250,000 out of the 40,000,000 people then in the country paid the tax. Counting the usual average of five to a family, this makes just 1,250,000 people or just a little over one-thirtieth of the people who were interested in the payment of the income tax. And most of these, we may easily infer, were opposed to the levying of it. But they were the ones who had the money and then as now money not only talks but votes, and the tax was repealed.

THE POACHER'S DOG.

Gives Warning of Gamekeeper's Approach and "Hunts Silent."

During the recent trial of a poacher at Llangollen, North Wales, it came out in evidence that his canine companion on forays acted as an advance scout and gave him notice of the presence and whereabouts of the gamekeepers. Actions of that kind are all a matter of training, and when training "runs in families" the habit becomes quite instinctive, so that with the pups of old poaching dogs very little teaching is necessary. The best type of dog for that purpose is the "lurcher," product of the greyhound and smooth coated Scotch collie, especially if the dog is to be used for hare poaching after dark.

A highly trained dog of that stamp "hunts silent"—that is, it never gives a whimper in the chase. A dog of inferior instinct often whimpers, and if it finds its prey outmanoeuvring or outdistancing it gives utterance to loud yelps—a perilous thing to do on a dark, still night, as it may be heard for a mile or more around.

An old Ayrshire poacher of a past generation had a wonderfully trained dog. Starting from home, he and the dog went in opposite directions, the dog often making a circuit of many miles but never failing to meet its master at some appointed place. That dog also acted as a spy on gamekeepers, especially those of the old tippling, ruffianly "school," now almost extinct.

Dogs of that kind, so highly trained and instinctively hunters, often co-operate among themselves in forays and by skillfully imitating lessons taught them by man often do an immense amount of injury. The writer adds: "I knew two collie dogs that showed great skill in co-operative rabbit hunting, and when they 'snapped' more than they could carry to their respective homes (wide apart), they hid the carcasses and removed them bit by bit." Night sheep worrying by dogs is a curious "instinctive" survival of a trained habit neolithic or palaeolithic man taught wild canidae long before Cadmus or any other pundit brought him letters.—From the Scotsman.

Cement makers' itch, one of the latest diseases due to occupation, is an intense itching, resembling true itch, but instead of being caused by a parasite it results from some chemical or mechanical action on the skin not yet understood.

THE HINDU WIDOW.

Indian Author Explains the Sacrifice of Suttee.

Contrary to the usual western belief, said Sarath Kumar Ghosh, the Indian author, Indian women are more highly esteemed by their husbands even than their western sisters. The Indian is taught veneration for women from his earliest boyhood. And unkindness to a wife is supposed to be swiftly followed by misfortune and a man's prayers are of no effect unless his wife joins in them with all sincerity. At a coronation the presence of the sovereign's wife is of the utmost importance. Should she be unable to appear a statue of her must be placed at her husband's side. Otherwise the ceremony is not legal.

The standard of morality, the lecturer asserted, is higher in India than in England. The Indian, it is true, is legally allowed to take a second wife should his first marriage prove childless, but it is most rare to hear of an Indian availing himself of his privilege.

When the Princess of Wales visited India she was regarded with the greatest veneration, not merely for her charm of manner or the fact that one day she would be empress of India, but for the fact that she had five sons.

Death was not forced on any widow, the lecturer asserted. They were free to choose for themselves. If they did not feel called upon to make the sacrifice of suttee they were always at liberty to refuse. However, should they desire to sacrifice themselves the act brought them a crown of martyrdom, earning for themselves the title of "Devi." It was an error to think they were burnt alive. A cup of poison was drunk and cremation followed.

Finally Mr. Ghosh related that a prediction calling down disaster on a man, passed harmlessly over a woman, her moral standing being the higher of the two. The great diamond of India, the Kohinur, carried with it a curse to the effect that its wearer would rule over India but die a sudden death. A woman might wear the jewel safely. The late Queen Victoria had it placed in the royal crown, but now, said the lecturer, it adorns the one made for Queen Alexandra by the order of the king, to whom the prophecy was sent from India—London Chronicle.

The Slave and the Oysters.

One of the principal banking houses of St. Petersburg is said to have been founded by a man who for a great part of his life was a serf. Even in his condition of serfdom he was a wealthy banker, as may readily be imagined, made many attempts to procure his freedom. The story goes that he offered 1,000,000 rubles for his liberty, but that his master, Count Sheremetieff, proud of possessing such a serf, refused to liberate him.

The liberation was, however, finally procured, and at a much lower price than that mentioned. The story is a pretty one:

This serf, by name Shalounine, returned one day from Odessa to St. Petersburg, and as in duty bound repaired to the Sheremetieff palace, there to report himself. With him he had brought, as a gift to the count, a small barrel of choice Crimean oysters. This he left outside till he should receive an intimation that the offering would be acceptable to Sheremetieff.

Now, it so chanced that he found his master surrounded by a large number of guests who had been bidden to breakfast. The count was engaged in berating his butler for negligence to provide oysters for the breakfast. The butler contended that there were no oysters in the market.

It was at this juncture that the count caught sight of his banker serf.

"So," he angrily exclaimed, "you, too, are to annoy me! And with your pestering appeals for liberation! Let me tell you that your errand will prove a fruitless one! But stay! I'll release you on one condition—and one only—that you get me some oysters for breakfast!"

Shalounine bowed low and left the room. When he returned he laid the barrel of oysters at his master's feet.

Whereupon the count, true to his word, called for pen and paper and instantly wrote out a declaration of emancipation making the serf a free man. Then the former master, with a most gracious air added:

"And now, my dear Shalounine, will you be so good as to favor us with your company at breakfast?"—Harper's Weekly.

We are a scientific age. That is to say, claptrap has to make a noise something like science in order to take us in successfully.—Puck.

What impressed you most, the pyramids of Egypt or the pagodas of China?" "Oh, I don't know. They both made good backgrounds for photographs of our party."—Louisville Courier-Journal.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

County of York.

IN THE PROBATE COURT.

By L. R. Williams, Esquire, Probate Judge of York County.

WHEREAS Mrs. MAGGIE J. STEWART, has applied to me for Letters of Administration, on all and singular, the goods and chattels, rights and credits of GEORGE M. STEWART, late of the county aforesaid, deceased:

These are, therefore, to cite and admonish all and singular the kindred and creditors of the said deceased, to be and appear before me at our next Probate Court for the said county, to be holden at York Court House on the 19TH DAY OF MARCH, 1910, to shew cause, if any, why the said Administration should not be granted.

Given under my Hand and Seal, this 3rd day of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and ten, and in the 134th year of American Independence.

L. R. WILLIAMS,
Probate Judge of York.
18 f 2t

Professional Cards.

TO DEBTORS AND CREDITORS.

ALL persons having claims against the estate of J. D. HAMILTON, deceased, will present them, duly attested, within the time prescribed by law, and all persons indebted to said estate will make immediate payment to me or my attorney, J. S. Brice, Esq.

W. B. GOOD, Administrator.
18 t 3t

TIME TO PAY.

THE time by which we must settle with the publishers is at hand, and subscribers to The Enquirer, who have given their names to us, will please come forward with the money, handing it to either of us, or sending it in to the office.

JEFF D. WHITESIDES,
JOHN K. ALLISON.
14 f.t tf.