

# The Anderson Intelligencer.

An Independent Family Journal---Devoted to Politics, Literature and General Intelligence.

HOYT & CO., Proprietors.

ANDERSON, S. C., THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 11, 1869.

VOLUME 5---NO. 20.

From the Southern Cultivator.

Mr. Dickson on Immigration Again.  
SPARTA, GA., Oct. 7, 1869.

Editors Southern Cultivator:—I could not finish what I had to say on immigration in my first article—will close, however, in this. I will not reply to any criticism on my views hereafter, as I have no interest to serve that is not common to every planter, to-wit: the prosperity of the South. I have never held any office, and do not wish to do so. I speak and write simply what I believe is the true interest of the cotton planter, without regard to pleasing or displeasing. I will use round numbers—these will be near enough for all purposes. It has been about ninety years since the close of the Revolutionary War. The population then was estimated at about three millions—in this original number a few have been added since, by purchase of territory and annexation, but not enough to alter the results materially. During about ninety years we have been engaged in wars (including the Indian wars) as much as one-sixth of the time, and what is the result? The population of the United States has increased thirteen fold, reaching now, probably, thirty-nine millions. Taking the ninety years together, there has been increase of population equal to the original number, once in about every seven years, including the limited immigration. Who can want a greater increase of population than that? And as long as there is sufficient room to produce all the necessaries of life, the increase will keep up to these figures. Is there any one that wishes to encourage a system that would stunt the food of their own children so as to stop the natural increase of a well provided population? Taking thirty-nine million as the number of persons in the United States at present, let us see what they will be in ninety years more, or in 1859, (and some who are children now will be alive then), 13 times \$9,000,000 makes five hundred and seven millions of persons.

Messrs. Editors, we will try the figures in the case of Georgia, and what is true of Georgia is true of the Cotton States. The population of Georgia is now about 1,200,000—thirteen times that amount is fifteen million six hundred thousand.—Now, is there anything that will prevent the ratio of increase for the next ninety years being equal to the past ninety years, but a scarcity of food and clothing and room? It is often said that the South is the garden spot of the world. Heretofore we had permanent and limited labor, and the cotton plant, together with an extensive forest before us. All is changed now—the best of the forest is gone, and it requires a greater number of acres in the South to support its people than in regions farther north. It is much more difficult to retain the soil and improve it. Here the land is not frozen and covered with snow six months in the year; the summers are much hotter and longer; heat hastens exhaustion when under the plow; and the heavy rains damage the land the year round; therefore, we need more land, that we may rotate the crops and give the soil rest. Labor is chiefly valuable, not on account of the aggregate of what it produces, but the money value, after paying for labor and all expenses. The amount of labor that will produce the greatest net profit, is what I want. I contend we now have it in the cotton States. The laborer and his family has to be first fed and clothed, no matter what the price agreed on for labor, before capital gets anything.

It is said we want more labor. Can we get more laborers without at the same time getting more consumers; or is it meant we want more persons without capital? If so, I am opposed to that plan. I had rather have less labor, and have a majority of the people interested in property, morals, true religion, and everything that is desirable. A large population has a tendency to develop a central government and a standing army. I will leave it to some divine to say what effect the introduction of Chinamen would have on religion and morals, &c.

Had it not been for the clause prohibiting slavery, which Virginia put in the articles ceding the North-West territory, and the immigration of Europeans, we would not have had the late war and its results; and even if the war had come, there would have been no "lost cause." Immigration is the chief cause of the changed character of the Government of the United States, and a continuance of the former will hasten the overthrow of the latter, with all its attendant consequences.

Cotton planters! the whole capital of Europe, including money and machinery, together with that of the North, is striving to increase the quantity of cotton, and to reduce the price. You have no concert of action—a panic increases your anxiety—this feeds the panic still more. Your only remedy is to make only what is wanted, at paying prices—keep out of debt—be the creditors—make the most of your supplies at home; then, and only then, will you have power.

Messrs. Editors, there is a great deal said about the capital the immigrants bring to this country. I do not think they bring any, except enough to exchange during the first year's residence, for articles that would be exported during that year, if not consumed by the immigrants, such as bacon, cheese, corn, flour, lard, &c. The gold returns to Europe in place of the above articles, to pay for their clothing, &c.

A country being rich is a very different thing from a population being rich. Suppose Georgia had 500,000,000 of taxable property, and one million of inhabitants, and you add 200,000,000 taxable property and 1,000,000 population, the people would be poorer than at first. Population does

not lessen taxes. Thirty years ago, with one-half of the present population, we did not pay more than one-tenth of the present tax. Under the Adams' extravagant administration, a tax of about two dollars and fifty cents per head, with a population of 5,000,000, was paid. Under Mr. Johnson's administration, with an average population of 35,000,000, nearly 500,000,000 was paid to the government, or sixteen dollars per head. Let each reader figure for himself, and make up his mind accordingly.

Messrs. Editors, I would not reply to my friend's review of my letter on immigration, but through courtesy to him, as he has asked it. I am willing to go before the cotton planter and take a vote, without rejoinder. I will reply without quoting him, referring the reader to his letter. One of the benefits of scarcity of labor is, it gives high priced cotton, and thereby gives us a monopoly of all commercial manures; and only one-half the land being required to produce the same amount of cotton, deeper plowing can be done—this will hold moisture, to keep the manure soluble and make the insoluble soluble. More care in cultivation follows; the best and most level lands will be selected—the worn and gullied lands will go into forest again, to equalize the seasons as to the cold and hot, wet and dry. The very scarcity of labor will enable planters to acquire a cash capital, and with that, if they are true, they can dictate terms. I feel no apprehension that the negro will or can force the planter to sell his lands.

Mr. Moore, I do not believe that the increase of price of grain in the great North-west, is due to the hundreds of thousands of immigrants annually settling there. If it was true, I would not want such immigrants; they could not make bread for their own consumption. It must be found in other causes, as depreciation of the currency, conversion of grain into meat for cities, for export, and the gradual impoverishment of land.

I take issue again, Mr. Moore, on the amount of labor that can be spared from a dense population, compared with a sparse one. European experience shows that only about one man out of each hundred of the population can be spared, without creating a scarcity of the necessaries of life. The United States taking both sections, furnish from six to eight to the hundred. If the South, previous to the war, had taken the native white man and negro to build her Railroads, instead of employing immigrants, cotton would have advanced to such an extent as would have twice paid for the whole work, thus getting the roads for nothing, and still have enough to pay for all iron, &c. Georgia for the last four years, has repaired and made more miles of new roads, built more factories, shops, houses, &c. (all with Georgians,) than any 1,200,000 people ever did, since the creation of the world, and in this lies the secret of our success.

I will only touch upon one more item, viz: low rate of interest. Dense population has a tendency to centre property in a few hands—property in the hands of a few, has a tendency to lower the interest, because the few do not consume the whole interest; if more generally diffused, all would be consumed. Low interest at home causes capital to seek investments, where interest is high. For instance, Europe purchases bonds here that pay 5 to 7 per cent. interest, to be re-invested year after year, still making money centre to the lowest point of interest, and rendering it more difficult for those to live who have no money. This country in less than ten years will pay a tribute in interest to Europe of more than one hundred millions of dollars, for goods consumed.

I am no apologist for the negro. I would be glad for him to feel the stimulating effects of immigration, if it could be done without injuring the white race.

I shall now take final leave of this question, recommending it to the calm and thoughtful consideration of the thousands of planters at the South who have as deep an interest in it as I have. My object has not been to provoke controversy, but to caution my fellow countrymen against a policy which, in my humble judgment, is fraught with ruin to the South. Yours truly,

DAVID DICKSON.

"PUT MORE MONEY INTO IT."—It is said that many years ago the Proprietor of the American Agriculturist asked a friend of his, an old experienced Publisher, how he should promote the welfare of his journal. After sundry remarks, to the effect that people would in the long run patronize that journal which really contains the most valuable reading matter, and that the only way to secure this was to spare no labor or expense in obtaining the best men and the best information that money would buy, his friend closed by saying he would sum up his advice as follows: "Put more money into it."—2d. Put more money into it.—3d. Put some more money into it. That advice seems to have been followed. No other monthly journal or Magazine is got up at greater expense of labor and money than the Agriculturist. Every page shows this. Its beautiful, pleasing, and instructive Engravings cost about \$1,000 in each number! Its ample pages are filled with carefully prepared reading matter, abounding in information useful to all classes, whether in City, Village, or Country. A large force of the best practical men and women are constantly employed in gathering, and sifting, and condensing information. Yet while prepared at a cost exceeding that of the \$4 and \$5 magazines, the American Agriculturist, owing to the large patron-

age it enjoys, is supplied at \$1.50 per annum, or four copies for \$5, and at still less to large Clubs. And those subscribing now get the paper from date of subscription to end of 1870 at the price of a year. We advise all our readers to avail themselves of the opportunity, and subscribe now. They will find it a good investment. The Publishers are ORANGE JUDD & Co., 245 Broadway, N. Y. City.

Important Decision by the Supreme Court of the United States.

WASHINGTON, November 1. A case of peculiar interest to the people of the late Confederate States was decided in the Supreme Court to-day.

The facts in this case may be briefly stated as follows:

In the month of November, 1864, Smith & Hartley, of Montgomery, Ala., purchased of one Thorington, of the same city, a tract of land, for which they agreed to pay \$45,000. They did pay him \$35,000, and their note for the balance \$10,000. To recover these \$10,000, Thorington brought suit in the United States Circuit Court for Alabama. The defence insisted that at the time of transaction the authority of the United States was excluded from that portion of the State of Alabama, where all the parties resided, and the only currency in use consisted of Confederate Treasury notes. It was also insisted that the land purchased was worth no more than \$3,000 in lawful money; that the contract price was \$45,000 and this was to be paid in Confederate notes; that \$35,000 were actually paid in these notes, and that the note given for the remaining \$10,000 was to be discharged in the same manner; and it was claimed on this state of facts that the vendor is entitled to no relief in a court of the United States. This claim was sustained in the lower court, and the bill was dismissed. Thorington then carried his case to the Supreme Court.

The questions before the Supreme Court upon the bill were these:

(1) Can a contract for the payment of Confederate notes, made during the late rebellion between parties residing within the Confederate States, be enforced at all in the courts of the United States?

(2) Can evidence be received to prove that a promise expressed to be for the payment of dollars was in fact made for the payment of any other than lawful dollars of the United States?

(3) Does the evidence in the record establish the fact that the note for \$10,000 was to be paid, by agreement of the parties, in Confederate notes?

It cannot be questioned that the Confederate notes were issued in the furtherance of an unlawful attempt to overthrow the Government of the United States. Nor is it a doubtful principle of law that no contracts made in aid of such an attempt can be enforced through the courts of the country whose Government is thus assailed. But was the contract of the parties to this a suit a contract in aid of the rebellion?

[The Chief Justice here sketched in a few graphic sentences the origin and character of the Confederate Government, and the difference between a *de facto* Government and a Government *de jure*, illustrating it by interesting examples from English history.]

It is very certain that the Confederate Government was not acknowledged by the United States as a *de facto* Government. Nor was it so acknowledged by other Powers. No treaties were made by it. No obligations of a national character were created by it binding after its dissolution by the States which it represented, or on the National Government. The central government established for the Confederate States was a government of force sustained by military power, and the rights and obligations of a belligerent power were conceded to its military character very soon after the war began, by the United States, from motives of humanity and expediency. The whole territory held by it was thereupon held to be enemy's territory. Within its limits the authority of the Confederate Government was supreme. That supremacy would not justify acts of hostility to the United States, but it made obedience to its authority not only a necessity but a duty. Without such obedience civil order was impossible. It was by this Government exercising its power through an immense territory that the Confederate notes were issued early in the war, and those notes in a short time became almost exclusively the currency of the seceded States. As contracts, except in the contingency of successful revolution, these notes were nullities; for, except in that event, there could be no payment. They bore, indeed, this character upon their face; for they were made payable only "after the ratification of a treaty of peace between the Confederate States and the United States of America." While the war lasted, however, they had a certain contingent value, and were used in nearly all the business transactions of many millions of people. It seems to follow as a necessary consequence from the actual supremacy of the Confederate Government that this currency must be regarded in courts of law in the same light as if it had been issued by a foreign Government temporarily occupying part of the territory of the United States.

We cannot doubt that such contracts should be enforced in the courts of the United States. The first question, therefore, must receive an affirmative answer. The second question is to be considered. It is quite clear that a contract to pay dollars made between citizens of any State of the Union which maintains its constitutional relations with the National Government is a contract to pay lawful money of the United States, and cannot be modified or explained by parole evidence. It is equally clear that if, in any other

country, coins or notes denominated dollars should be authorized of a different value from the coins or notes which have been current under that name, evidence would be admitted to prove their equivalent value in lawful money of the United States. The same rule must apply in the case of the Confederate Government. Our answer to the second question must also be in the affirmative.

With regard to the third question it is enough to say that it has left no doubt on our minds that the note for \$10,000, to enforce the payment of which suit was brought in the Circuit Court, was to be paid by agreement in Confederate notes. It follows that the judgment of the Circuit Court must be reversed, and the cause remanded for new trial in conformity with this opinion.

From the Savannah Republican.

Disgraceful Condition of Affairs in Florida.

Down in Florida they have a Governor for whom even decent Radicals appear to have a most superlative contempt. Some of the carpet-baggers who helped to foist this miserable impostor and landshark upon the people are the loudest in their execrations of the "man and brother" who spends his time chiefly in New York concocting schemes of plunder, and comes back to Florida to pocket the stealings. We publish to-day an exposé of this man. It will shock the senses of all respectable Radicals, while it inflicts a stigma upon Radical administration from which we have no wender some of the better sort of carpet-baggers desire to cut loose. Governor, though his title be, it is a little consoling to feel that it is so only by the grace of Radical reconstruction, and not by the sanction of honest and fair voting, even among the Radicals themselves. The honest people of Florida have no share or lot in the scoundrel, and are in nowise responsible for his crime. Some of the Florida carpet-baggers seem to have a sense of honor and decency, and would be rid of the pestiferous incubus upon their own party if they could succeed against the terrible power of patronage which they, themselves, have put in to the hands of their own Executive.—We deeply sympathize with our Florida neighbors and trust that they will find some way of driving the fellow from their State, or, what is better, getting him in the State's prison, where he properly belongs.

This charge upon "His Excellency" of Florida, is not of Democratic origin. We cannot be abused for "rebel calumny" against him. We have often denounced the immorality and corruption of the carpet-bag governments generally, from our Conservative standpoint; but now the Radicals have given us ammunition out of their own cartridge-boxes, and come to the rescue of their own reputation when they can no longer tolerate the infamy of their own chosen leaders.

The following affidavit is substantiated by others, that we have neither room nor patience to publish. Twelve thousand five hundred dollars in cash, for which receipts can be produced, is a very cheap price for the conscience of a Chief Magistrate of an American State:

IN THE CASE OF THE CHIEF COMMISSIONERS OF JEFFERSON COUNTY, VS. GEORGE W. SWEPSON, HARRISON REED, GOVERNOR, AND OTHERS. IN CHANCERY:

STATE OF FLORIDA, } s. s.  
Duval County, } s. s.

On this 8th day of October A. D. 1869, before me, Charles L. Mather, Clerk of the Circuit Court in and for said county, appeared Sherman Conant, a citizen of the State of Florida, who, being duly sworn, says: That on or about the 15th day of June, A. D. 1869, during the session of the Legislature, at its special term in June, deponent read a letter written by George W. Swebson, and addressed to Harrison Reed, Governor of Florida; that deponent knows the handwriting of said Swebson, and his signature was of the said Swebson; that said letter stated that it would be delivered to said Reed, Governor, by Milton S. Littlefield, or by Mr. Littlefield, and further stated that Swebson had paid the said Reed, Governor, five thousand dollars in New York city, some time before, for which he the said Swebson, had taken a mortgage on the said Reed's property in Tallahassee; that said Littlefield would return to him the mortgage and would pay said Reed seven thousand dollars on his approval of the Bill or Act which the said Littlefield would have introduced into and passed by the Legislature; that according to this deponent's best remembrance and belief, the contents of said letter were as follows: "You remember, Governor, on agreement in New York, I was to give you fourteen thousand dollars for calling the Legislature together and using your influence to secure the passage of the bill. Five thousand I paid you in New York, for which I hold mortgage on your property in Tallahassee.—Two thousand Mr. Littlefield will hand you when he reaches Tallahassee. When you have signed the bill he will give you seven thousand dollars and return to you your mortgage."

That there is a mortgage on record in Leon county of the property in Tallahassee, mortgaged by the said Reed to said Swebson and that shortly before the recent departure of said Reed to the North, according to the best knowledge and belief of deponent, the said Reed inquired of the Clerk of the Circuit Court of said county if the said Swebson had not sent a release of said mortgage for record, stating that it had been paid, and that he, the said Swebson, had promised to send the Clerk a release of the same for record; that a true and correct copy of said letter from said Swebson to said Reed was at the time herebefore mentioned made, and the same was sworn to before a duly appointed

and lawfully authorized Notary, and that the same is now in existence.

SHERMAN CONANT.  
Sworn to and subscribed to before me this 8th day of October, A. D. 1869.  
CHAS. L. MATHER, Clerk.  
Filed October 8th, 1869.  
CHAS. L. MATHER, Clerk.

STATE OF FLORIDA, } s. s.  
County of Duval, } s. s.

I, Charles L. Mather, Clerk of the Circuit Court in and for said county, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the original now on file in my office. In witness whereof I have hereunto set [L. S.] my hand and seal of said Court this 28th day of Oct. A. D. 1869.  
CHAS. L. MATHER, Clerk.

By F. B. Knapp, D. C.  
The foregoing exemplification from the records of the District Court of Duval county can be seen at our office by such as may be disposed to question its authenticity.

The Woman of the Future.

Women are not so universally beautiful, so wise and so good as they might be, and it is to the interest of humanity that they should be beautiful, wise and good. Consider, in the first place, the question of beauty. The more hopeful look forward to the time when something of the old Greek feeling for physical perfection shall have revived, and a simple and more healthful life shall have fitted women to become mothers of a noble race. In this respect we are wiser than of old, but, though hygiene and common sense have done much for ourselves, they have done much more for our children. We of the present generation are the offspring of tight-lacing mothers; but small waists, tight shoes and other abominations are no longer universal. Dress is much better adapted to out of door life than formerly. Etiquette has been relaxed, and our young women enjoy a freedom from physical restraint undreamed of by their grandmothers. Health has ceased to be the monopoly of the other sex. Still the majority of women lead far from wholesome lives; and as beauty is more or less a matter of health, too much can never be said against such abuses of it as are yet in fashion. The worst of these abuses is that they lead to a perversion of taste. Quite naturally the fragile type of beauty has become the standard of the present day, and men admire in real life the lily-cheek, small-waisted, diaphanous-looking creature idealized by living artists.—When we become accustomed to a nobler kind of beauty we shall attain to a loftier ideal. Men will seek nobility rather than prettiness, strength rather than weakness, physical perfection rather than physical degeneracy, in the women they select as mothers of their children. Artists will rejoice and sculptors will cease to despair when this happy consummation is reached. Let none regard it as chimerical or Utopian. A very little rationalism brought to bear upon daily life would place physical well-being within reach of women of all ranks; and where health leads the way, beauty is seldom slow to follow.

Few will deny that wisdom, whose essence is common sense, has a large share in determining the happiness of social and domestic life. Is it not reasonable to suppose that the various reforms in female education will have proportionate effect upon the female character, and that the woman of the future will differ from the woman of the present, intellectually, as well as physically? Steady culture, increased habits of self-reliance, wider views of life, and a keener appreciation of the truth for truth's sake, can but enlarge and elevate the whole sex. The obvious inference is that just as a more healthful mode of existence will invigorate and beautify the bodies of women, so a rational mode of existence will strengthen and improve their minds. Frivolity, pettiness, inactivity, and other faults of which men most complain, will make room for opposite qualities; and who shall aver this to be against the interests of humanity? Perhaps nothing causes more domestic unhappiness than downright silliness. A foolish wife will often bring about as much mischief in her husband's home as a persistently evil-tempered one could do, and with the best intentions in the world, is sure to hinder and hamper him upon every occasion. Now silliness is the first stronghold of evil that a good system of education will storm. Just so long as girls are trained to frivolity and irresponsible habits from childhood upwards will they become frivolous and irresponsible wives and mothers. In granting, then, that the women of the future must of necessity inherit a large share of physical and intellectual excellence, we are led to extend the same happy prophecy of the moral faculties. Women often commit grave as well as small errors, not because they are perverse by nature, but because their reason is at fault, and they fail to recognize the proportionate relation of things. Again, habits of subservience induce a cowardly attitude of mind. Very few women have the courage to be individual. Very few women estimate their own lives of any value in the fullest sense of the word. They know well enough that they have some use as wives, mothers, daughters; but that they can have any share in the well-being of the world does not occur to them. Self-development conveys to their minds something quite apart from the duty of wife, mother or daughter, while the truth is that self-development embraces every other duty. Ill, therefore, does it become those who astrize women, to hinder any effort made in their behalf, whether educational or social; always remembering this, however, that such efforts are likely to do very little good which tend to make of women weak imitations of men.—*Pall Mall Gazette.*

Meeting of the Newberry Bar.

The 27th October last being the day upon which his Honor, Judge Orr, proposed to adjourn the extra term of Court which he had been holding for several weeks past, a meeting of the Bar was held in the Court Room, Col. S. Fair called to the Chair, and B. M. Jones requested to act as Secretary.

C. H. Suber, Esq., stated the object of the meeting and offered some resolutions for consideration. L. J. Jones, Esq., moved that the resolutions be adopted as read, with an amendment to the second resolution by the insertion of the word impartial; the motion was seconded and the resolutions as read and amended were unanimously adopted:

1st. Resolved, That the Bar of Newberry tender to His Honor, Judge Orr, their sincere thanks for holding, at their request, the special Term of the Court of Common Pleas for this County, which is now drawing to a close.

2d. Resolved, That the manner in which he has discharged the laborious duties which thus devolved upon him, in disposing of the business of the vast accumulation of business on our dockets, and in the trial of cases of great magnitude and importance, entitles him to our highest praise as an able, impartial and enlightened jurist, and has won for him the admiration and esteem of our people.

3d. Resolved, That the patience and courtesy which have characterized his conduct on the bench has made his administration of justice, and his intercourse with the Bar and community of the most agreeable and pleasant character.

4th. Resolved, That our brother, Col. S. Fair, be requested to present the above resolutions to his Honor in open Court, and that they be published in the newspapers.

J. M. Baxter, Esq., then moved that the chair be requested, after reading the resolutions in open court, to ask that a copy be spread upon the minutes of the Court. Motion seconded and adopted.

The business of the meeting being finished it was adjourned.

SIMEON FAIR, Chairman.

B. M. JONES, Secretary.

Fencing Stock Out or In.

Editors Southern Cultivator: The Livingston Agricultural Club has rendered the public a valuable service by its clear and able report on the question of "Abandoning the use of fences, and the enactment of a stock law" which appeared in the September number of your journal. I regard the fences, that may be saved by proper legislation, without detriment to any interest, as equal to one half of a fair rent of some farms, taking them as a whole. In other words, relieve Southern farmers of the present expense of fencing out intruding stock that have no moral right to consume or damage in any way, the crops grown by any person on his own land, and you will double the value of all productive soil. It is obvious, that the higher the tax imposed to keep stock out of a wheat, corn, or cotton field to make a crop, the less inducement there is to cultivate the same; consequently, there is less demand for labor than there would be if this tax were removed. The poor who now keep a few hogs and cattle at large, lose far more by the depreciation of their wages, whether they work by the month, or crop on shares, than they gain by this untimely free stock range. Stock raised in this way in settled counties, costs the community at large ten times more than it is worth to the owners. This remark is based on my own experience, this Summer. I have kept a number of young hogs for a neighbor all Summer in a good clover field well fenced, for nothing, because it is far cheaper for me to fence them in one small field, than out of several large corn fields. Indeed, to fence many fields against small shad-bellied swine, jumping sheep, and unruly cattle, taxes common land more than the use of it is worth. Hence, many million acres lie out as a common waste that would be cultivated, to the incalculable advantages of all classes and interests, if this fence burden were taken off. Then a poor farmer, who is able barely to pay for fifty acres and a mule, could plow, plant, sow and gather in his crops, without the expense of working one panel of fence beyond what encloses any little stock he may choose to keep. Give this encouragement to buy land in the South, and defend honest agricultural industry from all invasion, by man or his beast, and you will soon change squatters and bad renters into independent land-holders and conservative freemen.

It is a mistake to suppose a poor laboring man in the South can never lay up money enough to buy a few acres—far more than the great Cicinnatus had when he was called from his plow to save his country from the greatest peril. Fence taxes and all others, on land, are now so heavy in the aggregate, that poor men can hardly afford to own any. In New York State this onerous fence tax does not exist; laboring men receive a dollar a day as farm wages. Here I hire good men at fifty cents a day. There a farmer makes fifty tons of hay with less labor than I can fence a meadow for such a crop. So long as the poor, unwittingly, compel farmers to throw away so much labor in mauling fence rails, their wages must be low.

D. L. K.

As storm following storm, and wave succeeding wave, give additional hardness to the shell that encloses the pearl, so do the storms and waves of life add force to character.

Be neither lavish nor niggardly; of the two avoid the latter. A mean man is universally despised, but public fame is a stepping stone to preferment; therefore generous feelings should be cultivated.