

THE WESTERN CAROLINIAN.

THE POWERS NOT DELEGATED TO THE UNITED STATES BY THE CONSTITUTION, NOR PROHIBITED BY IT TO THE STATES, ARE RESERVED TO THE STATES RESPECTIVELY, OR TO THE PEOPLE.— Amendments to the Constitution, Article X.

B. AUSTIN & C. F. FISHER,
Editors and Proprietors.

SALISBURY, N. C., APRIL 17, 1840.

NO. XLIV, OF VOL. XX.
(Whole No. 1084.)

TERMS

OF THE WESTERN CAROLINIAN.
The Western Carolinian is published every Friday, at Two Dollars per annum if paid in advance, or Two Dollars and Fifty Cents if not paid before the expiration of three months.
No paper will be discontinued until all arrearages are paid, unless at the discretion of the Editors; and a failure to notify the Editors of a wish to discontinue one month before the end of a year, will be considered as a new engagement.
Advertisements will be cheerfully and correctly inserted, at one dollar per square (of 360 ems, or 15 lines of this sized type)—for the first insertion, and 25 cents for each continuation. Court and Judicial advertisements will be charged 25 per cent more than the above price. A deduction of 25 per cent from the regular price will be made to yearly advertisers.
Advertisements sent in for publication, must have the number of times marked on them, or they will be inserted till forbid, and charged for accordingly.
Letters addressed to the Editors on business must be post paid, or they will not be attended to.



THE AGRICULTURIST.

ON HAY MAKING.
FROM THE ALBANY (NEW-YORK) CULTIVATOR.
CLINTON COLLEGE, Sep. 17, 1839.

HON. J. BEEB—SIR: In the August number of the most valuable cultivator, for the present year, I see a revolving horse rake recommended by Mr. Dexter. Of the advantages of this rake I am not informed, such improvements in the implements of husbandry not having yet reached this western country; but if my view be correct, of the best and most economical mode of making hay, we have, perhaps, no need of a rake of any kind. I therefore write for information, and am willing at the same time to benefit others as far as I can.—I shall detail briefly my plan with the hope that if any of your numerous readers have a better, they will favor me and the public with theirs, through the Cultivator. I have travelled some, and read a little for agricultural information, and have practiced, as circumstances would allow, upon those plans which my opportunities have taught me are the best. Hay making has been, with me, a subject of attention; and my plan, as taught me in Kentucky and elsewhere, and confirmed by experience, is this:—As fast as the grass is cut, (when there is no dew or moisture on it), as many hands follow the scythes as can keep close to them in stacking, or *cocking the hay in its perfectly green state.* If the sun does not shine on or wilt the hay at all, so much the better, and for that reason it must be shocked as fast as cut. The shocks are made about six feet high and six feet wide at the base, and tapering like a cone at the top, and the shocks dragged down with the fork to make them turn firm. All this can be speedily done with the hay fork, one hand being able to gather and shock three acres, or six tons per day. The rake spoken of may do better than this, but I doubt it, and should like for Mr. Dexter, or some one else, to state the amount a hand can rake and shock per day with that instrument.

As you remark, I never spread the hay, but proceed to shock after the scythe as fast as it is cut by following along the swath, and with a fork rolling the hay till it is as much as I can raise on the fork, when I pitch it on the shock. Thus I continue to carry as many swaths to a row of shocks as will complete them. I always roll towards the shocks to save walking with the hay, which is laborious. This plan of collecting the hay will be more approved, when you understand an improvement I have made in the mode of cutting hay. I do not mow with the scythe, as is common, but *cradle the hay*, (as will be explained,) which throws all the grass into swaths double as large as those made in the usual way, and hence the hay is already collected into a sort of winnow by the cradle, so that the rake is not needed.
For cutting hay, make a cradle with two fingers only. Let the one nearest the scythe be 7 inches shorter than the blade, and so arranged as to let its point nearly touch the blade; let the second finger be 7 inches shorter than the former, and arranged so that its point may come in one inch of reaching the first finger, and you are now ready for business. In cradling do not mow, but give the usual stroke of cradling grass, only take care to set your cradle in no further than you can carry but with ease. In cradling grain close to the ground, you have to squat a little in making the stroke, proceed the same way in grass, and you have it to the ground.
I know that the farmers of the old States, who have made hay all their lives, will laugh at this plan, and particularly at the idea of a Tennesseean proposing to show them something new in cutting hay. They will argue, that a cradle will be too heavy, and that it will tangle, and cannot work in dense hay. Let them try it. The denser the grass the less you must cut at a stroke, and your cradle will go easily through thick and thin. But the greatest advantage of the improvement remains to be told. They are no less than three. Let us take the first, and you will see the rest. Let us suppose you cut twice as much in a swath as in the common way of mowing, and then the grass is all collected into a winnow as you proceed, and not left scattered as the scythe would do it. Thus the labor of raking is saved, and less of the hay is left on the ground at the end of the process. Besides, the cradle cuts it perfectly clean under the swath, which few hands will do with the mowing scythe.

2. The process is less laborious than mowing; no man who ever cradled hay would mow, if you gave him his choice as to the mode of cutting.
3. A hand can cut double as much in the day as he can do with the mowing scythe. If a hand can mow one acre per day, he will cradle two acres of the same grass with less labor.
I have tried this plan but one season, having cradled about fifty acres of timothy alone, and of clover and timothy mixed. The cradle does so well as these kinds of grass, that I expect to have no use for mowing scythes hereafter in raking hay, unless the plan should fail in herds grass or ryegrass. I have not tried it in that grass, as I have grazed my herdgrass this year, instead of cutting it for hay. I wish my brother farmers to try this plan effectually with a strong cradle blade, and let me hear from them next summer, in the Cultivator.
But to return to the process of curing hay. Having shocked, as before described, (I mean timothy or herds grass,) I let it remain for six days, when I run my hand to the centre of each shock; if I find them still cool, I do not disturb them; but if any are warm, I put the left hand on the top of the shock, while the right is thrust to the centre, and turn the upper half down to the ground, so carefully as not to disturb its form, and leave it inverted. In an hour or two, the whole is cool, and I then take hold in the same manner and place it back on the shock as it was before. Not more than one shock in twenty will ever get warm at all, (most of them curing fine and green without heating,) and now will need turning down more than once. In this way, your hay has three signal advantages over that made by spreading and curing in the sun. 1st. It costs not more than half the

labor of spreading and shocking repeatedly till dry. 2d. You run no risk of getting any injured or lost by rain. 3rd. You get more hay both by weight and measure, and the quality of it is far better than can be made in the sunshine and open air, both of which dissipate much of the nutritious virtue of the hay. Yes, much more of the virtue of most of the products of the farm is lost by exposure to the air, than is generally believed. You have to be particular to cut and shock when there is no dew or rain on the grass, (for if wet it will heat),—examine it once in six days—and be sure to let it be well cured before you stack it, and you cannot fail to make the best of hay, in any season, without injury or loss.

When I make clover hay, I follow the foregoing plan in all respects, till it is shocked. Then I haul and stack it perfectly green, in large stacks, taking care to salt and tramp it well while stacking. I use about as much salt as the cattle would require while eating the hay, say 50 pounds to a stack 16 feet high and 14 feet at the base. In five or six days, the stack becomes hot and smokes profusely, but in two or three weeks it will have "gone through the sweat," and be found perfectly dry and sweet. The less wilted before stacked, the less it heats and the better the hay it makes. By this process, the hay is of a dark green color, and all kinds of stock will eat it greedily and thrive upon it. It shrinks but little in curing, and loses no leaves, and is, in all respects, better for cattle, horses, or sheep, than clover cured in the open air.
FRANCIS H. GORDON.

From the Portland Advertiser.
THE LIFE OF THE HUSBANDMAN.
"I am a true laborer; I earn that I eat, put that I wear, owe no man hate, envy no man's happiness; glad of other men's good, content with my farm, and the greatest of my pride is, to see my Ewes graze and my Lambs suck."—Shakespeare.
We have come to the conclusion, that nature's truest nobleman is the man who earns his bread by the sweat of his face, upon his own bought and paid for plantation. An independent farmer may stand upon his house top and say to himself, as did Selkirk:

"I am monarch of all I survey,
My right there is none to dispute;
From the centre all round to the sea,
I am Lord of the fowl and the brute."

He is truly a monarch—with a landed title more secure than that of feudal Lord or Baron—more easily protected and preserved, not by deeds of valor, through the shedding of blood, but by the lawful labor of his hands. His house is his castle, his acres are his dominions. His gardens are his parks, his grass plants his lawns, and his forests his groves. His cattle, sheep, and poultry are his subjects, and he becomes, at pleasure, either the executioner or the multiplier of such subjects. Tell us if the King upon the Throne has more power worth possessing? His happiness, we know, is less, as he increases his toils, cares and sorrows in proportion as the cultivation of the soil diminishes his.

In the spring time he sows, and in the Autumn he reaps. Providence has assured him that spring tilling and harvest shall not fail, and he has the assurance of the Giver of every good and perfect gift, that as he sows, so shall he reap. His grounds are watered in the season of drought, with the rains and dews of heaven, and in the damp season, the sun shines to cheer, invigorate, and give promise to his labors. The sweeter tasks of the summer are succeeded by the lighter labors of the winter. As we have said, in the words of Will. Shakespeare, he "cares that he cuts, and gets that he wears," and his philosophy is that of the shepherd, who said that "good pastures make fat sheep." He may say truly, and with an honest pride—
"I eat my own lamb,
My chickens and ham,
I shear my own fleece and wear it."

What could a man want more, and how can a farmer, capable of enjoying life, possessed of his farm-house, his farm, and his necessary implements of husbandry, ever sigh for a residence within the enclosures of a city—choosing bricks and mortar for the elbow room of a spacious farm-house, the smoke and dust of the town for the village, the three or four story brick-house, for the granary or the haycock—the purest air of heaven, for the atmosphere of a thousand smoky houses, and ten thousand unwholesome breaths? How could a farmer make such a choice as this? We would pause for a reply, did we not know that for every answer which could be devised, after a long study, would be the unsatisfactory one, that something better was anticipated only—for it would be a miracle almost, for a man to find himself happier, or in better circumstances after a change of residence, from the country to the city. No, no. The true Elysium—the real paradise on earth, is the country—the green, fruitful, beautiful country. The city for the task-master and his hard working servant; but the country for a man who wishes for health and pleasure—contentment and a long life.
The ancient Romans venerated the plow, and in the earliest, best times of the republic, the greatest praise that could be given to an industrious and judicious husbandman.

Sheep and Dandies.—The following is too good to be lost. It is from a humorous report made by the committee on Sheep at the Worcester, Mass., cattle show:

"A sheep should be judged of like a dandy, by the fitness of his coat. We beg pardon of the sheep for the comparison—but it is so apt! In both cases the coat is the most important part of the animal. What is a sheep good for without a coat?"

What dandy can read the above without feeling sheepish?

There is a town in the interior of Arkansas containing but seven inhabitants, viz: a crippled negro, a jackass, a quack doctor, a lezzard, a peccol, an alligator, and a Van Buren man.—Federal paper.

The above must be one of the strong federal holds in Arkansas—showing six federalists to one Democrat. Harrison is sure of a majority in that town.—Haverhill (N. H.) Republican.

"True love never did run smooth," as the lover said when he heeled it over the corn hills, with the dog and the father of his beloved in pursuit of him.

NORTH-EASTERN BOUNDARY.

WAR DEPARTMENT, March 27, 1840.
SIR: The resolution of the Senate of the 12th instant, "That the President of the United States be requested to communicate to the Senate, if, in his judgment, compatible with the public interest, any information which may be in the possession of the Government, or which can be conveniently obtained of the military and naval preparations of the British authorities on the Northern frontier of the United States, from Lake Superior to the Atlantic ocean; designating the permanent from the temporary and field works, and particularly by noting those which are within the claimed limits of the United States;" having been referred by you to this Department, it was immediately referred to Major General Scott, and other officers who have been stationed on the frontier referred to, for such information on the subject as they possessed, and could readily procure; and an examination is now in progress for such as may be contained in the files of this Department. Gen. Scott is the only officer yet heard from; and a copy of his report is herewith submitted, together with a copy of that to which he refers, made upon the resolution of the House of Representatives of the 9th instant.—As soon as the other officers who have been called upon, are heard from, and the examination of the files of the Department is completed, any further information which may be thus acquired, will be immediately laid before you.
Very respectfully, your most obedient servant,
J. R. POINSETT,
To the President of the United States.

HEAD QUARTERS, EASTERN DIVISION.

Elizabethtown, N. J., March 23, 1840. **SIR:** I have received from your office copies of two resolutions, passed respectively, the 12th and 9th instant, one by the Senate, and the other by the House of Representatives; and I am asked for "any information on the subject of both, or either of the resolutions, that may be in (my) possession."
In respect to the naval force recently maintained upon the American lakes by Great Britain, I have just had the honor to report to the Secretary of War by whom the resolution of the House of Representatives of the 9th instant, was directly referred to me.
I now confine myself to the Senate's resolution, respecting "military (I omit naval) preparations of the British authorities on the Northern frontiers of the United States, from Lake Superior to the Atlantic ocean, designating the permanent from the temporary and field works, and particularly noting those which are within the claimed limits of the United States."

I will here remark, that however well my duties have made me acquainted with the greater part of the line in question, I have paid but slight attention to the forts and barracks erected by the British authorities near the borders of Maine, above Fredericton, in New Brunswick, or in Upper Canada, above Cornwall, being of the fixed opinion (which need not here be developed) that all such structures would be of little or no military value to either party in the event of a new war between the United States and Great Britain.

I was, last summer, at the foot of Lake Superior, and neither saw nor heard of any British fort or barracks on the St. Mary's river, the outlet of that Lake.
Between Lakes Huron and Erie, the British have three sets of barracks: one at Windsor, opposite to Detroit; one at Sandwich, a little lower down; and the third at Malden, eighteen miles from the first; all built of sawed logs, strengthened by blockhouses, loopholes, &c. Malden has long been a military post, with slight defenses. These have been recently strengthened. The works at Sandwich and Windsor have, also, I think, been erected within the last six or eight months.

Near the mouth of the Niagara, the British have two small forts—George and Memisanga. Both existed during the last war. The latter may be termed a permanent work. Slight barracks have been erected within the last two years, on the same side, near the Falls and at Chippewa, with breast-works at the latter place; but nothing, I believe, above the works first named, on the Niagara, which can be termed a fort.
Since the commencement of recent troubles in the Canadas, and (consequent thereupon) within our limits, Fort William Henry, at Kingston, and Fort Wellington, opposite to Ogdensburg, (old works) have both been strengthened, within this year, besides the addition of dependencies. These forts may be called permanent.

On the St. Lawrence, below Prescott, and confronting our territory, I know of no other military post. Twelve miles above, at Brockville, there may be temporary barracks and breastworks. I know that of late, Brockville has been a military station.
In the system of defenses on the approaches to Montreal, the Isle Aux Noix, a few miles below our line, and in the outlet of Lake Champlain, stands a system of permanent works of great strength. On them the British Government has, from time to time, since the peace of 1815, expended much skill and labor.

Oldtown, near our line, on the western side of Lake Champlain, has been a station for a body of Canadian militia, for two years, to guard the neighborhood from refugee incendiaries from our side.—I think that barracks have been erected there for the accommodation of those troops, and also at a station, with the like object, near Alburgh, in Vermont.

It is believed that there are no important British forts, or extensive British barracks, on our borders, from Vermont to Maine.
In respect to such structures on the disputed territory, Governor Fairbairn's published letters contain fuller information than has reached me through any other channel. I have heard of no new military preparations by the British authorities on the St. Croix or Passamaquoddy bay.

Among such preparations, perhaps I ought not to omit the fact that Great Britain, besides numerous corps of well organized and well instructed militia, has, at this time, within her North American Provinces, more than 20,000 of her best regular troops. The whole of these troops might be brought to the verge of our territory in a few days. Two-thirds of that regular force has arrived there since the spring of 1838.

With great respect, sir, your obt. servt.,
WINFIELD SCOTT,
Brig. Gen. R. Jones, Adjt. Gen. U. S. A.

ABOLITION PETITIONS.

Letter from the Vice President of the U. States to Lewis Tappan, of New York, declining to present to the Senate an Abolition Petition, signed by 140 women.

WASHINGTON, March 23, 1840.
SIR: Your letter of the 7th instant was duly received, enclosing a petition to Congress, signed by 140 women of the city and county of New York, praying for the abolition of slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia, and in those Territories of the United States where it exists, and to admit no new slave State into the Union, requesting me to lay the same before the Senate. I have also received your letter of the 17th instant, requesting me to inform you when I would present the petition. Having declined to present the petition, it is, perhaps, due to the fair petitioners, and to you, their organ, as well as to myself, to state some of the reasons which dictate my course.—The constitutional right of petition is contained in the first article of amendments, as follows:
"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Congress has never made a law abridging this right; but the people assemble at pleasure, and petition at pleasure, for a redress of their grievances. Of course, this part of the Constitution has not been violated; and if it did not exist, Congress could not, constitutionally, have passed such a law, because no such power is delegated to Congress. This right, reserved to the people, does not devolve upon the presiding officer of the Senate the obligation of presenting petitions of every conceivable description.

There are considerations of a moral and political, as well as of a constitutional nature, which would not permit me to present petitions of a character evidently hostile to the Union, and destructive of the principles on which it is founded. The patriots of the Revolution made great sacrifices of blood and treasure to establish and confirm the doctrines set forth in the Declaration of Independence. Each State was then an independent sovereignty; and to form a perpetual Confederacy for the safety and benefit of the whole, embodying the great doctrines of the Declaration, a compromise of interest and feeling was necessary. That compromise was made; and the principles which your fair petitioners are now agitating, was settled.—The right of regulating and abolishing slavery was reserved to the States; and Congress has no more right to destroy slavery in Virginia and Maryland, than they have to establish slavery in New York or New England. The right of petition for these objects is reciprocal; and the obligation of the presiding officer to present a petition to the Senate, if it exists in either case, is equally strong in both. But I cannot recognize the obligation in either case, though I acknowledge the right of the people in both.

In a difference made between the District of Columbia and the States of Maryland and Virginia, from which it was taken? The question was settled in relation to this District, by these States, by the formation and adoption of the Federal Constitution, when it was a part of these States; and a subsequent cession of jurisdiction could not deprive the citizens of the rights already secured to them by both the Federal Constitution and the Constitutions of their respective States.—The right of Congress to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatever, does not mean omnipotent legislation.—Congress have no right, in the District of Columbia, to take away the right of trial by jury; to pass ex post facto laws; to abridge the freedom of speech or of the press; to establish religion by law; nor to destroy the rights of property, or the personal liberty of the citizen.—These reserved rights are secured in the District of Columbia as in the State of New York. They have the same right to consider the abolition of slavery in New York a grievance, and petition to Congress to establish it there, as the citizens of New York have to consider it a grievance in the District, and petition Congress to abolish it. Their right in either case to assemble peaceably and make their petition, I do not call in question; but the obligation on my part to present it to the Senate, I do not admit.

If a number of citizens should consider a Republican Government a grievance, and petition Congress to establish a monarchy; if others should consider religious toleration a grievance, and petition Congress to destroy heresy, by abolishing all religious sects but their own, I should not consider it my duty to present a petition, the certain tendency of which is to destroy the harmony, and eventually to break asunder the bonds of our Union.
In regard to new States, the case is, if possible, still stronger. They must be united upon terms of equality. Each State having reserved the right of regulating this subject for itself, no one can be constitutionally deprived of the right. The State of New York has abolished slavery; but this abolition is not the condition on which she holds her place in the Confederacy. It is her own policy; and if it shall be her pleasure to change it, Congress cannot interfere. So, if new States are admitted into the Union, when admitted, they will stand upon an equality with New York. They may establish or abolish slavery at their pleasure, and neither Congress, nor any other State, will have any more laws of primogeniture in the British empire.—The object of the petition does not affect the abstract question of slavery; that is a subject which the Abolitionists of the free States can no more affect, than they can that of the privileges of the British nobility. The plain question is this: shall we continue a united confederate Republic, or shall we dissolve the Union? If the prayer of this and similar petitions should be granted by a majority of Congress, the inevitable effect would be an immediate destruction of the Confederacy; and, with it, those bonds of affection which have united us as one great, one harmonious family. It has been my grief to observe a recklessness on the part of some, whom I otherwise highly esteem, showing an utter disregard of all the consequences which must result from the perpetual agitation of this subject. We have an interest at stake too dear to be compromised for a phantom which we can never gain, however enthusiastically we may pursue it. As a free, a powerful, and a happy nation, we stand unrivalled in the annals of the world.