Dr Ramsay

The Old North State

VOL. IV.] SALISBURY, N. C., FEBRUARY 26, 1869. [NO. 8

The Old North State

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY

D. A. JENKINS.

Editor and Proprietor.

SATURDAY MORNINGS.

One Year.
Six Months.
5 Copies to one address.

Rates of Advertising.

One Square, first insertion.....$1.00
Each additional insertion..... 50

Twelve lines of brevier—1½ inches lengthwise the column—or less constitute a square.

Special notices will be charged 50 per cent higher than the above rates.

Court orders, six weeks, $7, if the cash accompanies the order, $10 if it does not.

Obituary notices, over six lines, charged as advertisements.

To persons wishing to advertise for a longer time than one month the most liberal terms will be given.

For the Old North State.

THE VELOCIPEDE.

Carl Benson, of New York, was challenged to find a rhyme for "velocipede," and produced the following:

There was a man on a velocipede'
Who said I need not give my hoss a feed,
Without oats or hay
He will go all day,
It's cheap to keep a velocipede.

The Boston *Advertiser* man sought to improve it thus:

There was a man with a velocipede,
Who said, "I will not do so gross a deed
As make any fuss
About horse-car or 'buss,
When I can ride my velocipede."

A wretch on the Chicago *Post* being thus tempted, falls to wit:

There's a vehicle called the velocipede
Which is said to excel any hoss for speed,
So cease all your jars
About crowded cars,
And mount, every man, his velocipede.

The Cincinnatti *Times* then takes a hay at it with this deplorable result:

A gentleman who cannot boss a steed.
Can safely ride a velocipede
You drive with your two legs,
And feed it on shoe pegs.
And thus fat up your velocipede.

Whereupon some egotist of the Philadelphia *Bulletin* soberly announces that he intends to eclipse every thing by the following:

If Benson, who signs the velocipede,
In prose would express all his gossip, he'd
Teach his steed how to go
To wheel or to whoa!
As become a well-mounted velocipede.

On reading the above, an old lady in Chambersburg, who is decidedly averse to innovations, and who laments bitterly the slightest encroachment upon the old and established method of locomotion, exclaimed:

The velocipede! the velocipede!
A pretty looking hoss, indeed,
While there's bridle and saddle,
I never will straddle,
This machine that these fools call velocipede

The "*devil*" of the Hagerstown *Mail*, adds, as an improvement on the other:

Velocipede! velocipede!
A man must be a fool indeed,
To get astride, and try to ride,
A hoss with neither hair nor hide,
Nor neck, nor leg, nor head, nor tail!
A great deal better ride a rail!

To which your correspondent begs leave to add:

Carl Benson surely never could read,
One half the rhymes to velocipede;
This singular "hoss" of foreign breed,
That thrives *sans* ostler, stable, or feed;
And surely's becoming a daily need,
To a people noted for gain and greed—
For now, we will ride velocipede,
From day to day, at greatest speed,
And stopping never to *bait* or *bleed*.
Thus saving our money, as all are agreed,
For time now is money, so says the creed,
Either in thought, or in word, or in deed.
Veloc! veloci! velocipede!
Why! "nary" mule will a "nigger" lead
When he's able to buy velocipede.
Send 'em down South with greatest speed
Sambo and Dinah bot' can read,—
And they want to vist Sumner and Weed,
On the very "biggest" velocipede—
And see "the Ball, and the sights to be see'd
In "Washington City," yes, indeed!
Come, quick! by thousands, velocipede!
Congress can furnish you, hasten! inded!
Bring down some immigrants, such as we need.
And take up "de brudders to Sumner and Weed,
Oh! VELOC! *veloci! velocipede!*

He that is truly polite knows how to contradict with respect, and to please without adulation, and is equally remote from insipid complaisance and a low familiarity.

From the New York World.

IMPORTANT DECISION OF THE SUPREME COURT.

The Supreme Court of the United States has handed down the first of the important group of cases involving the legal-tender question, which have been under advisement for some weeks. We give below the opinion of the court, as delivered by the Chief Justice:

This case comes before us on a writ of error from the Court of Appeals of New York. The facts shown by the record may be briefly stated. In December, 1861, one Christian Metz, having borrowed of Frederick Bronson, executor of Arthur Bronson, $1,400, executed his bond for the repayment to Bronson of the principal sum, borrowed on the 1st day of January, 1867, in gold and silver coin, lawful money of the United States, interest also in coin until such repayment at at the yearly rate of 7 per cent. To secure these payments according to the bond at such place as Bronson might appoint, or, in default of such appointment, at the Merchants' Bank in New York, Metz executed a mortgage upon certain real property which was afterwards conveyed to Rodes, who assumed to pay the mortgage due, and did, in fact, pay the interest until and including the 1st day of January, 1864. Subsequently, in January, 1865, there having been no demand of payment nor any appointment of a place of payment by Bronson, Rhodes tendered to him United States notes for the amount of fifteen hundred and seven dollars, a sum nominally equal to the principal and interest due upon the bond and mortgage. At that time one dollar in coin was equivalent in market value to two dollars and a quarter of United States notes. This tender was refused, whereupon Rhodes deposited the United States notes in the Merchant's Bank to the credit of Bronson, and filed his bill in equity praying that the mortgaged premises might be relieved from the lien of the mortgage, and that Bronson might be compelled to execute and deliver to him an acknowledgment of the full satisfaction and discharge of the mortgage debt. The bill was dismissed by the Supreme Court in Erie County, but on appeal to the Supreme Court in general term, the decree of dismissal was reversed, and a decree was entered adjudging that the mortgage had been satisfied by the tender, and directing Bronson to satisfy the same of record, and this decree was affirmed by the Court of Appeals. The question we have to consider, therefore, is this: Was Bronson bound by law to accept from Rhodes United States notes equal in nominal amount to the sum due him, as full performance and satisfaction of a contract which still stipulated for the payment of that sum in gold and silver coin, lawful money of the United States. It is not pretended that any real payment and satisfaction of an obligation to pay $1,507, coined money dollars, can be made by the tender of paper money worth in the market only six hundred and seventy coined dollars. The question is, does the law compel the acceptance of such a tender for such a debt. It is the appropriate function of courts of justice to enforce contracts according to the intent and understanding of the parties. We must therefore inquire what was the intent and understanding of Frederick Bronson and Christian Metz when they entered into the contract under consideration, in December, 1851, and this inquiry will be assisted by reference to the circumstances under which the contract was made.—Bronson was an executor charged as a trustee with the administration of an estate, Metz was a borrower from the estate. It was the clear duty of the former to take security for the full repayment of the money loaned to the latter. The currency of the country at that time consisted mainly in the circulating notes of State banks, convertible under the laws of the States into coin on demand. This convertibility, though far from perfect, together with the acts of Congress which required the use of coin for all receipts and disbursements of the national government insured the presence of some coin in the general circulation, but the business of the people was transacted almost entirely through the medium of bank notes. The State banks had recently emerged from a condision of great depreciation and discredit, the effects of which were still widely felt, and the recurrence of a like condition was not unreasonably apprehended by many. This apprehension was, in fact, realized by the general suspension of coin payment which took place in 1857, shortly after the bond of Metz became due. It is not to be doubted, then, that it was to guard against the possibility of loss to the estate from an attempt to force the acceptance of a fluctuating and perhaps irredeemable currency in paper, that the express stipulation for payment in gold and silver coin was put into the bond.—There was no necessity in law for such a stipulation at that time, for then no money except gold or silver had been made a legal tender. The bond without any stipulation to that effect would have been legally payable only in coin. The terms of the contract must have been selected, therefore, to definitely fix the contract between the parties, and to guard against any possible claim of the mortgages that any ordinary currency would be sufficient to discharge the obligation. The intent of the parties is therefore clear; whatever might be the form or the fluctuations of the note currency, this contract was not to be affected by them, it was to be paid in all events in coined lawful money. We have just adverted to the fact that the legal obligation of payment, a coin was payable without express stipulation. Also it will be useful to consider somewhat further the precise import in law, of the phrase, "Dollars payable in gold and silver coin, lawful money of the United States." To form a correct judgment on this point, it will be necessary to look into the statutes regulating coinage. It would be instructive, doubtless to review the history of coinage in the United States, and the succession of statutes by which the weight, purity, form, and impression of gold and silver coins have been regulated, but it will be sufficient for our purpose that we examine three only. The acts of April 2, 1792, of January 18, 1837, and of March 3, 1849. The act of 1792 established a merit for the purpose of the national coinage. It was the result of very careful and thorough investigation of the whole subject, in which Jefferson and Hamilton took the greatest part, and its general principles have controlled all subsequent legislation. It provided that the gold of coinage, or standard gold, should consist of eleven parts fine and one part alloy, which alloy was to be silver and copper in convenient proportions, but not exceeding one-half silver, and that the silver of coinage should consist of fourteen eighty five one hundredth parts fine, and one hundred and seventy-nine parts of alloy, wholly of copper. The same act established the dollar as the money mint, and required that it should contain four hundred and sixteen grains of standard silver. It provided further for the coinage of half dollars, quarter dollars, dimes, and half dimes, also of standard silver, and weighing respectively one-half, one-quarter, one-tenth, and one-twentieth of the weight of the dollar. Provision was also made for a gold coinage, consisting of eagles, half eagles, and quarter eagles, and containing respectively two hundred and seventy, one hundred and thirty-five, and sixty-seven half grains of standard gold and being of the value respectively of ten dollars, five dollors, and two half dollars. These coins were made a legal tender in all payments, according to their respective weights of gold and silver, if of full weight at their declared value, and if of less at a proportionate value. And this regulation as to tender remained in full force until 1837. The rule prescribing the composition of alloy has never been changed, but the proportion of alloy to pure gold and silver, and the absolute weight of coins have undergone some alteration, partly with a view to the better adjustment of the gold and silver circulation to each other and partly for the convenience of commerce. The only change of sufficient importance to require notice is that made by the act of 1837. That act directed that standard gold, and standard silver also, should thenceforth consist of nine parts pure and one part alloy; that the weight of standard gold in the eagle should be two hundred and fifty-eight grains, and in the half eagle and quarter eagle, respectively, one-half and one-fourth of that weight precisely, and that the weight of standard silver should be in the dollar four hundred twelve and a half grains, and the half dollar, quarter dollar, dime, and half dime, exactly one half, one fourth, one tenth and one twentieth of that weight. The act of 1849 authorized the coinage of gold double eagles and gold dollars conformably in all respects to the established standards, and therefore of the weights respectively of five hundred and sixteen grains and thirty five eight tenth grains. The methods and machinery of coinage had been so improved before the act of 1837 was passed that unavoidable deviations from the prescribed weight became almost inappreciable, and the most stringent regulations were enforced to secure the utmost attainable exactness both in weight and purity of metal. In single coins the greatest deviation tolerated in the gold coinage was half a grain in the double eagle and half eagle, and a quarter of a grain in the quarter eagle and gold dollar! and in the silver coinage, a grain and a half in the dollar, a grain in the quarter dollar, and a half grain in the dime and half dime. In 1849 the limit of deviation in weighing in weighing large numbers of coins on delivery by the chief coiner to the Treasurer, and by the Treasurer to the depositors, was still further narrowed. With this and other precautions against the emission of any piece inferior to weight or purity to the prescribed standard, it was thought safe to make the gold and silver dollars of the United States legal tenders in all payments according to their nominal or declared value. This was done by the act of 1837. Some regulations as to the tender for small sums of coins of less weight and purity have been made, but no other provision than that made in making coined money a legal tender in all payments now exists upon the statute book. The design of all this minuteness and strictness in the regulation of coinage is easily seen. It was doubtless the intention of the Legislature to give a sure guarantee to the people that the coins made current in payments contained the precise weight of gold or silver of the precise degree of purity declared by the statute. It recognized the fact, accepted by all men throughout the world, that value is inherent in the precious metals, that gold and silver are in themselves values, and being such and being in other respects best adapted to the purpose, are the only proper measures of value, and that these values are determined by weight and purity, and that the form and impress are only certificates of weight and purity, worthy of absolute reliance only because of the known integrity and good faith of the government which gives them. The propositions thus stated are believed to be incontestible.—If they are so in fact, the inquiry concerning the legal import of the words 'dollars payable in gold and silver coin, lawful money of the United States,' may be answered without much difficulty. Every such dollar is a piece of gold or silver certified to be of a certain weight and purity, by the form and impress given to it at the mint of the United States, and, therefore, declared to be a legal tender in payment, and any number of such dollars is the number of grains of standard gold silver in one dollar multiplied by the given number. Payment of money is the delivery by one to another of the amount due. A contract to pay a certain number of dollars in gold and silver coins, is, therefore, in legal import nothing else than an agreement to deliver a certain weight of standard gold to be ascertained by a count of coins, each of which is certified to contain a definite proportion of that weight. It is not distinguishable, as we think, in principle from a contract to deliver an equal weight of bullion of equal fineness. It is distinguishable in circumstance, only by the fact that the sufficiency of the amount to be tendered in payment must be ascertained in the case of bullion by assay and the scales, while in the case of coin it may be ascertained by the count. We cannot suppose that it was intended by the provisions of the currency acts to enforce satisfaction of any contract by the tender of depreciated currency of any description, equivalent only in nominal amount to the real value of the bullion on the coin dollars. Our conclusion, therefore, upon this part of the case is, that the bond under consideration was in legal import precisely what it was in the understanding of the parties, a valid obligation to be satisfied by a tender of actual payment according to its terms, and not by an offer of mere nominal payment. Arguments and illustrations of much force and value in support of this conclusion might be drawn from the possible case of the repeal of the legal-tender laws relation to coin and the consequent reduction of coined money to the legal consideration of bullion, and also from the actal condition of partial demonetization to which gold and silver money was reduced by the introduction into circulation of the United States notes and national bank currency. But we think it unnecessary to pursue this branch of the subject farther, nor do we think it necessary to examine the question whether the clauses of the currency act making United States notes a legal-tender are warranted by the Constitution, in this case; but we will proceed to inquire whether upon the assumption that those clauses are so warranted, and upon the further assumption that engagements to pay coined dollars may be regarded as ordinary contracts to pay money rather than as contracts to deliver certain amounts of standard gold, it can be maintained that a contract to pay coined money may be satisfied by a tender of United States notes. Is this a performance of the contract within the true intent of the acts? It must be observed that the laws for the coinage of gold and silver have never been repealed or modified. They remain on the statute book in full force, and the emission of gold and silver coin from the Mint continues; the actal coinage during the last fiscal year having exceeded, according to the report of the Director of the Mint, 19,000,000; nor have the provisions of the law, which make these coins a legal tender in all payments, been repealed or modified. It follows that there were two descriptions of money in use at the time the tender under consideration was made, both authorized by law, and both made legal tender in payments. The general denomination of both descriptions was "dollars," but they were essentially unlike in nature. The coined dollar was, as we have seen, a piece of gold or silver of a prescribed degree of purity, weighing a prescribed number of grains; the note dollar was a promise to pay a coin dollar, but it was not a promise to pay on demand, nor at any fixed time, nor was it in fact, convertible into a coin dollar. It was impossible in the nature of things that these two dollars should be the actual equivalents of each other, nor was there anything in the currency acts purporting to make them such. How far they were at that time from being actually equivalents has been already stated. If then, no express provision to the contrary be found in the acts of Congress, it is a just, if not a necessary inference, from the fact that both descriptions of money were issued by the same government, that contracts to pay in either were equally sanctioned by law. It is indeed difficult to see how any question can be made on this point. Doubt concerning it can only spring from that confusion of ideas which alway attends the introduction of varying and uncertain measures of value into circulation as money. The several statements relating to money or legal tender must construed together. Let it be supposed, then, that the statutes providing for the coinage of gold and silver dollars are found among the statutes of the same Congress which enacted the laws for the fabrication and issue of note dollars, and that the coinage and note acts respectively make coin dollars and note dollars a legal tender in all payments, as they actually do. What reason can be assigned for saying that a contract to pay coin dollars must be satisfied by a tender of an equal number of note dollars which is not equally valid for saying that a contract to pay note dollas must be satisfied by a tender of an equal number of coin dollars? It is not easy to see how difficulties of this sort can be avoided except by the admission that the tender must be according to the terms of the contract. But we are not left to gather the intent of the Currency acts from mere comparison with the Coinage acts. The Currency acts themselves provide for payment in coin. Duties on imports must be paid in coin, and interest on the public debt, in the absence of other express provisions, must be paid in coin; and it hardly requires argument to prove that this positive requirement cannot be fulfilled if contracts between individuals to pay coin dollars can be satisfied by offers to pay their nominal equivalent in note dollars. The merchant who is to pay duties in coin must contract for the coin which he requires. The bank which receives the coin on deposit contracts to repay the coin on demand. The messenger who is sent to the bank or the custom-house contracts to pay or deliver the coin according to his instructions. These are all contracts, either express or implied, to pay coin. Is it not plain that duties cannot be paid in coin if these contracts cannot be enforced? An instructive illustration may be derived from another provision of the same acts. It is expressly provided that all dues to the government except for duties on imports, may be paid in United States notes. If, then, the government needing more coin than can be collected from duties, contracts with some bank or individual for the needed amount to be paid at a certain day, can this contract for coin be performed by the tender of an equal amount in note dollars Undoubtedly it may if the note dollars are a legal tender to the government for all dues except duties on imports, and yet a construction which would support such a transaction would defeat a very important intent of the act. Another illustration not less instructive may be found in the contracts of the government with depositors of the bullions at the Mint to pay them the ascertained value of their deposits in coin. These are demands against the government, other than for interest on the public debt, and the letter of the act certainly makes United States notes payable for all demands against the government, except such interest. But can any such construction of the act be maintained—can judicial sanction be given to a proposition that the government may discharge its obligation to the depositors of bullion by tendering them a number of note dollars equal to the number of coined dollars, which it has contracted by law to pay? But we need not pursue the subject further. It seems clear beyond controversy that the act must receive the reasonable construction not only warranted, but required, by the comparison of its provisions with the provisions of other acts and with each other, and that upon such reasonable construction it must be held to sustain the proposition that express contracts to pay coin dollars can only be satisfied by the payment of coin dollars. These are not debts which may be satisfied by the tender of the United States notes. It follows that the tender of such notes in payment of the bond under consideration, was not warranted in law, and the decree directing satisfaction of the mortgage was erroneous. Some difficulty has been felt in regard to the judgment proper to be entered on contracts payable in coin. This difficulty arises from the supposition that damages can be assessed only in one description of money, but the act of 1792 provides that "the money of the coin of the United States shall be expressed in dollars, dimes, cents and mills, and that all accounts in the public offices, and all proceedings in the courts of the United States, shall be kept and had in conformity to this regulation. This regulation is part of the first coinage act, and doubtless has reference to the coins provided for by it, but it is a general regulation and relates to all accounts and all judicial proceedings. When, therefore, two descriptions of money are sanctioned by law, both expressed in dollars, and both made current in payment, it is necessary, in order to prevent ambiguity and to prevent a failure of justice, to regard this regulation as applicable alike to both; when, therefore, contracts made payable in coin are sued upon, judgment may be rendered for coined dollars and parts of a dollar, and when contracts have been been made payable in dollars generally, without specifying in what description of currency payment is to be made, judgment may be entered accordingly, without such description. We have already adopted this rule as to judgments for duties by affirming a judgment of the Circuit Court for the District of California in favor of the United States for one thousand three hundred and eighty-eight dollars and ten cents, payable in gold and silver coin, and judgments on contracts between individuals for the payment of coin may be entered in like manner. It results that the decree of the Court of Appeals of New York must be reversed, and the cause remanded to that court for further proceedings.

Supreme Court Opinions.—The following opinions have been delivered:

By Pearson, C. J., in Gibson *vs.* Smith, from Cabarrus, no error, judgment affirmed. In Scott *vs.* Elliott, from Chatham, *venire de novo*.

By Reade, J., in McKesson *vs.* Bynum, no error. In Lattimore *vs.* Dixon, from Cleaveland, demurrer overruled.

By Rodman, J., in Blankinship *vs.* McMahon, from Yancey, no error. In Wadsworth *vs.* Davis, remanded.

By Dick, J., in Perry *vs.* Campbell, from Alexander, judgment affirmed. In Morrison *vs.* Cornelius, from Iredell, judgment affirmed so far as appealed from by plaintiff, judgment reversed and *venire de novo*, so far as appealed from by defendant.

By Settle, J., in Shipp *vs.* Hettrick, from Rutherford, report of Commissioners be reformed so as to charge the plaintiff with the value of Confederate money received on the sale notes in 1862, and also with the value of Confederate money received in 1863, on the bond of C. L. and J. W. Harris, and enforced to the Clerk. In Mary Dunn, *ex parte*, from Wake, no error, judgment affirmed.—*Sentinel.*

DOMESTIC ECONEMY.

Subscribers would do well to paste the "Domestic Receipts" in a book, for future reference.

Milk Biscuits.—A quarter of a pound of butter, one quart of milk, one gill of yeast, as much flour as will form the dough, a little salt. Stir flour into the milk add the yeast, this is called a sponge This should be done in the evening; in the morning cut up the butter, and set it near the fire were it will dissolve not get hot; pour the melted butter into the sponge, then stir in enough flour to form a dough, knead it well and stand it away to rise. As soon as it is perfectly light, butter your tins, make out the dough in small cakes, and let them rise. When they are light bake them in a very quick oven, take them out, wash the tops over with water and send them to the table hot.

Omelette Souffle.—Beat the white of three eggs to a stiff froth, the yelks with three-quarters of a pound of white sugar, juice and rind of one lemon; mix all together lightly. Butter a dish that will just hold it, and bake for fifteen minutes.

Indian Light Cake.—One pint of Indian meal, one pint of milk, two eggs one teaspoonful of butter, salt to the taste, one teaspoonful of dissolved saleratus.

Mix the butter and salt with the meal; boil half the milk, add the dissolved saleratus and the eggs, after they have been well beaten, to the remaining half of cold milk. Pour the boiling milk over the meal and let it cool, then add the cold milk and saleratus. Bake in a shallow pan.

Indian Muffins, No. 1.—One pint of Indian meal, one pint of white meal, two eggs, one gill of yeast, salt to the taste, as much milk as will make a batter. Pour as much boiling milk over the Indian meal as will wet it Beat the eggs very light and add them alternately with the cold milk and flour. Lastly stir in the yeast and salt.

They may be baked in pans or rings, as soon as they rise.

Indian Muffins, No. 2.—One quart of corn meal, half a gill of yeast, two eggs salt to the taste, half an ounce of butter. Cut up the butter into meal, and pour on it enough boiling milk to form a thick batter: set it away to cool. Whisk the eggs very light and add to the batter, then the yeast and salt.

Butter square tins, fill them three parts full, and bake in a quick oven. Or they may be baked in rings as wheat muffins.

Indian Meal Breakfast Cake.—One quart of Indian meal, two eggs, a teaspoonful of dissolved saleratus, half an ounce, of butter, Salt to taste, milk sufficient to make a thick batter. Beat the eggs, very thick and light. Cut up the butter in the meal, then pour over it enough boiling water to wet it. When it is cool add the eggs and salt; pour the dissolved saleratus into the milk and add much milk as will make it into a thick batter.

Butter square tin pans, fill them but about two thirds and bake in a quick oven. When done cut them into squares hot.

Indian Pone.—Put on one quart of water in a pot, as soon as it boils stir as much Indian meal as will make a *very* thin batter. Beat frequently while it is boiling, which will require ten minutes. Then take it off, pour it in a pan, and add one ounce of butter, and salt to the taste. When the latter is lukewarm stir in as much Indian meal as will make it quick.

Set it away to rise in the evening, in the morning make it out in small cakes, butter your tins and bake in a moderate oven. Or the more common way is to butter pans, fill them three parts full, and bake them.

This cake requires no yeast.

Johny, or Journey Cake.—One quart of Indian meal, add to this salt to taste, and pour over it as much boiling water as will form a dough.

Take the dough, roll it into balls, press it on a board to form the cake—it should be about the eighth of an inch in thickness. Place the board in front of the fire so as the heat may brown the cakes, turn them, and when brown on both side, send to the table.

MISCELLANEOUS.

From the Asheville News.

A SINGULAR PHENOMENA.

Friend Stokes: There is at the foot of the Green Mountain, in Yancey County, N. C., near the residence of Mr. William Gardner and only a few paces from the main road leading from Burnsville to Asheville, a Rock, some nine feet in length by four in width, elevated three feet at one end and one foot at the other, above the surrounding earth, dipping to the South West 8 or 10 degrees, having the tracks of various animals—cows, dogs, bears, deer &c.,—so unmistakably imprinted in its surface that there can be no mistake as to their genuineness. The Southern end of the rock is literally covered with tracks. Mr. Gardner would take pleasure in showing this record of the great past to any persons passing that way. Will the State Geologist, in passing, or any other scientific person, give us the interpretation thereof. M. P. PENLAND.

Encourage Home Papers.—Persons who want to subscribe for Religious papers cannot find better ones, than the Raleigh Episcopal Methodist, the N. C. Presbyterian, and the Biblical Recorder. These papers represents three different denominations, and are well managed and filled with a variety of interesting matter. Having read them for a number of years past, we know they are worthy of the patronage of our people, and therefore direct attention to them for the purpose of keeping money in our midst and encouraging home enterprises.—*Charlotte Democrat*

Christianity is the special academy of patience, wherein we are informed, inured, and trained to bear all things.

The joy of the spirit is a delicate, sacred deposit, and must be kept in a pure casket, as an unholy breath will dim its lustre and fade its freshness.

Make no more vain resolutions, but proceed at once to duty. Know your weakness, trust and pray. God will help you through, and give you patience.

He that reproveth another without praying for him, or having compassion on him, is a merciless foe; no good physician, but a troublesome prater.—*Kempis.*

A Lock of Hair.—Hair is at once the most delicate and lasting of our materials, and survives us like love. It is so light, so gentle, so escaping from the idea of death, that with a lock of hair belonging a child or friend, we may almost look up to heaven and compare notes with the angelic nature; may almost say: "I have a piece of thee here, not unworthy of thy being now."—*Leigh Hunt.*

The law in a certain city is, "no boy is permitted to seize a dog unless he has reached the age of eighteen." The difficulty of determining the age of the dog, is similar to that experienced by the Provost Marshal of Norfolk, some time ago, when ordered to kill "every fourth dog." It was impossible to tell which was a "fourth dog."

"Mother!" exclaimed an affected young lady, just home from boarding school, "mother here is a grammatical error in the Bible!" "Law sakes," replied the old lady, adjusting her spectacles, "kill it! kill it, right off, for I do believe it's the the pesky thing that's been eatin' up all the book-marks."

A waggish Chicago editor was waited upon by a delinquent country subscriber who complained of being dunned. Pointing to a bit of flour paste beside him, with which he was making a column of paragraphs, he exclaimed tragically, "That's my dinner for to-day! Do you wonder at being dunned?" The subscriber did'nt wonder—paid up and mizzled.

Unsophistocated boy—"Mamma, papa is getting very rich, isn't he?"

Mamma—"I don't know: why, child?"

Boy—"'Cause he gives me so much money. Almost every morning, after breakfast, when Sally is sweeping the parlor, he gives me a sixpence to go out and play."

Sally received a short notice to quit.