National Intelligencer.

& WASHINGTON ADVERTISER.

VOL. IX. WASHINGTON CITY, PRINTED BY SAMUEL HARRISON SMITH, PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE. NO. 1382.

FIVE DOLLARS PER ANNUM, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1809. PAID IN ADVANCE.

THE *National Intelligencer* is conducted by SAMUEL H. SMITH, and JOSEPH GALES, Jun. and printed at the office of the *former*, to whom subscribers and correspondents are requested to address themselves.

The annual price, payable in advance, is *Five Dollars.*

ADVERTISEMENTS, not exceeding one square in breadth, are inserted the first time at *fifty cents*, and for every subsequent insertion *twenty-five cents.* If inserted less than three times a *Dollar* is charged. If inserted but once a week, an addition of one fourth part is made. Other advertisements charged i[illegible]

[BY AUTHORITY.]

An act to suppress Gaming.

SEC. 1. BE *it enacted by the First and Second Chambers of the City Council of Washington,* That after the passage of this act, no E O, A B C, L S D, Faro, Rolly-Bolly, Shuffle-board, Equality table, or other device, to be used with Cards, Balls, Dice, Coin or money, except Billiard Tables, for the purpose of playing or gaming for money or any thing in lieu thereof, shall be set up or kept in any part of this city, under the penalty of twenty dollars for every day or less time that such E O, A B C, L S D, Faro, Rolly-bolly, Shuffle-board, Equality-table, or other device shall be so kept and maintained, to be recovered of the person so setting up or keeping the same, before any single magistrate, one half whereof shall go to the informer, and the other for the use of the City Council.

SEC. 2. *And be it further enacted,* That if any person or persons whatever shall after the passage of this act, permit any E O, A B C, L S D, Faro, Rolly-bolly, Shuffle-board, Equality-table, or other device, except as aforesaid, to be set up, kept or played, in his, her or their house, out-house, tavern, or place appertaining thereto, he, she, or they, shall incur the penalty of twenty dollars, for every day or less time, that the same is so kept up and maintained, to be recovered before a single magistrate, one half whereof shall go to the informer, and the other for the use of the City Council.

SEC. 3. *And be it further enacted,* That after the passage of this act, no game shall be permitted to be played on any Billiard-table, properly licenced, except with three or four balls and with a mace or cue not more than two inches wide at the extremity.

SEC 4. *And be it further enacted,* That every tavern and ordinary keeper, and every retailer of wine and spiritous liquors, having a licence from this Corporation, for keeping and retailing the same, shall, on being proved as aforesaid, before a single magistrate, to have permitted any E O, A B C, L S D, Faro, Rolly-bolly, Shuffle-board, Equality-table or other device, for the purpose of playing or gaming for money, or any thing in lieu thereof, to be set up, kept and played, in his or her house, or appurtenances thereto, and on being sentenced as aforesaid to pay the penalty aforesaid, forfeit his or her said licence, from the day that judgment shall have been obtained

SAML. N. SMALLWOOD,
President of the First Chamber.
DANL. RAPINE,
President of the Second Chamber.

APPROVED,
August 16th, 1809.
ROBERT BRENT, MAYOR.

CLERMONT SHEEP-SHEARING.

CLERMONT, JUNE 29, 1809.

To Samuel Bard, M. D. President of the Agricultural Society of Duchess County.

Dear Sir,

When I last had the pleasure of seeing you at Hyde Park, you appeared to think that the account which you published of my sheep-shearing two years ago, had much effect in forwarding my favorite plan of finding a new staple for the U States, and opening the eyes of our fellow-citizens to the advantages that would result to them and the community, if the Merino was substituted to the common sheep. I required no other inducement to repeat the experiment upon a more enlarged scale ; and the rather, as I could now do it with more ease to myself, and without apprehending the errors which interruptions from company or business might have occasioned Mr. Briggs, in whose accuracy I could confide, undertook the task, in which I occasionally aided him. The inclosed letter and report embraces every object I had in view from the investigation, and presents such results as leave no excuse to prejudice or indolence for neglecting to cultivate this invaluable stock. I have seen with some pride and much pleasure that my efforts to introduce these sheep have not been ineffectual, and as I number you with the earliest of my disciples, and place you at the head of those whose principles and examples have had most weight with intelligent farmers, I have availed myself of your name to introduce this communication to their notice, and the rather as your suggestions gave birth to it. I am fully sensible that plain facts, and obvious deductions from those facts, make more forcible impressions on the mind than labored and eloquent reasoning. If therefore I extend the limits of this letter, it will be merely to place the facts mentioned in the enclosed in a still stronger point of light, and to subjoin others which do not appear in Mr. Briggs' report. You see that with a view to ascertain the proportion which the fleece bears to the carcase, I directed a number of the sheep to be weighed. I regret that this had not occurred to me before the higher grades had been shorn and turned out ; but from the average weight of their fleeces and their general size, I think the result would have been similar to that drawn from the half and three-fourths blood, which I own differed greatly from any opinion I had previously formed, and I should have suspected some error had I not been myself present at the weighing. For the still greater certainty I had a ewe weighed which happened to be under the shears, when Mr. Schuyler and Mr. B. Tillotson accompanied me to the barn. The neat weight after shearing was 61lbs. that of her fleece 7lbs. 2 ounces, about one eighth of her weight of carcase, though she had a lamb of 3 months old. The average proportion however of the ewes, fleeces to their weight appears by the report to have been one to ten and a half, while that of the common ewes was one to twenty. As the consumption of food in animals of the same species must (generally speaking) be in proportion to the carcase, it will follow that one pound of common wool worth three shillings, costs as much hay and grass, as two pounds of wool from a 3-4 Merino worth two dollars and fifty cents. It should be understood that those sheep were not washed, which however makes no difference in the comparative result, since the common sheep were also shorn without washing, or in the price, as the wool was sold at the price stated in the report as it came from the sheeps back.

I might add that though the Merino wool loses more than common wool when scoured, yet that when washed on the sheep's back it loses much less. Doctor Pary says the loss is only one-ninth, while the common wool loses a fifth. My sheep were however kept as clean as possible, having been littered all winter and fed from the racks. The tags and dirt were taken off before the wool was weighed. It is observable that the proportion of wool to the carcase is not the same in the males as in the females, probably because of their great weight of bone and horn; thus the Tup Clermont weighed without his coat 126 lbs. his fleece nine pounds six ounces—his wool therefore was to his carcase when shorn as one to 12 and 1-2. Ramboulet weighed 140 lbs. including his coat, and his fleece 9 pounds ; the general average may I think, be stated as one to fourteen, while in common wethers it is as one to twenty-seven. I found the weight of our wethers to be about 128 lbs. the average of their wools to be about 5 lbs. if well kept. In this difference between the males and females we may probably find a reason for the Spanish shepherds destroying the ram lambs. It is certainly from this view of the subject much less profitable to keep wethers than ewes. The tables state the quantity of wool and the price at which it sold. From these then it appears that the gross weight from 230 sheep was 1068 dollars 68 cts. leaving 765 clear profit after paying 15o cents per head for keeping. It is observable, that upon the common sheep composing part of this flock, if the fleece only is taken into consideration, there was a loss of 3 cents per head; that the profit upon two hundred & one Clermont Merino's of different grades, amounted to seven hundred and sixty-seven dollars, instead of a loss of six dollars and three cents ; which would have been incurred had the flock been composed entirely of common sheep. To the benefit of the wool must be added that arising from the increase. I raised 14o lambs, the estimate of their value must be arbitrary if we consider them as stock in the market, because the demand may be uncertain. Let us then take up a rule applicable to every man's situation. I will suppose every lamb to be worth twice the value of his fleece, or in other words to pay 5o per ct. upon his cost yearly. This I believe will be deemed a rich return even though the capital should sink in ten years (the life of a sheep) the lamb will more than pay the expence of keeping. The estimate may then be made from the value of the fleeces as contained in the report, without deduction.

33 half bred lambs at $7	6 cents	232 98
54 three-fourths do.	12 5o	675 5o
23 seven-eights do.	15 38	353 74
24 full bred and 15 1-6	2o 5o	512 5o
Amount of wool as per report,		1o68 68
		2842 9o
Deduct expence of keeping at 15o cents per head,		345
Clear profit,		$ 2497 90

Five lambs are omitted to make up casualties. Had the flock consisted of common sheep, the amount would have been thus :

140 lambs at 150 cts.	$ 210 oo	
Loss of 3 cents on each fleece	6 90	
Profit on 230 common sheep		23o 1o
Difference between them & mixed Merino sheep,		$ 2294 8o

These calculations are not made from the selling price nor even on the intrinsic value of the sheep, for surely twenty-five per ct. would have been thought an ample profit, in which case the value of the lambs would have been carried to twice the amount that I have stated, and the clear profit have been $ 3299 48 cents ; upwards of $ 14 and an half per head. It may may be alleged that when Merino sheep are common, the price of their wool will fall. Admit the fact for a moment ; will not the price of other wool fall in proportion, will not the Merino still maintain its relative superiority ? Again, suppose so great an absurdity as that fine & common wool should be equally valuable, as it appears by the above table that the Merino gives twice the wool in proportion to its carcase, and it is know to afford mutton of a superior quality, must it not be the interest of the farmers under every circumstance to prefer them ? But it is by no means clear that the price of fine wool will fall when the quantity at market shall increase. When an article is intrinsically useful the consumption grows as the means of obtaining it is facilitated. When cotton was introduced into the southern states, the same argument might have repressed the ardor of the planters, and they should have continued to raise tobacco and indigo lest the increase of cotton should reduce the value.

The contrary effect has however resulted from their exertions ; fifty pounds of cotton are now consumed where one was 30 years ago. Let it be remembered too, that cotton is in some sort a luxury, while wool is a necessary of life. Wool is employed in a variety of manufactures in which cotton cannot be used, while there are few manufactures to which cotton is applied which would not be much more highly estimated if fabricated of Merino wool, which is capable of being spun as fine or finer than cotton ; witness the India and even the French shawls. How many years will roll away before the sheep of Europe and America are converted into Merino's ? How long will it take to supply the void which is doubtless made in this valuable stock by the convulsions in Spain ? How many machines will be introduced which by reducing the price of labor extend the consumption of a manufacture while they add to the price of the raw materials ? This subject appears to me in a more interesting point of view, when I consider its influence upon the general mass of the people. It enriches the farmer, it affords employment to the manufacturer and to the family of labor, and it saves an immense capital to the community. But this is not all, it is consoling to humanity to think that it can bring ease and comfort within the reach of every midling farmer ; it requires no capital to enable him to commence his undertaking. He need not 10 talents to make other 10 ; let him not bury his single talent if he possesses but one, and he will soon be on a footing with his richest neighbor. Both may tend to the same goal without jostling each other ; there is sufficient room for the exertions of all.

The able farmer will set out indeed with some advantage in the purchase of a higher bred ram, the poorer will however will overtake him though he sets out with less advantage, since he is creating capital as he goes. If he sets out with a tup of inferior grade, provided the form, figure, and fleece is good, in the profits of his stock he will find the means of advancing to higher improvements. The price of a tup is not cash expended, but money put out on interest, since their fleece will pay net twenty per cent. upon the capital. A small sum saved out of any casual expenditure puts the farmer in the road, and with very little attention he will progress to wealth and ease. Should I profess to teach the husbandman how to make two bushels of wheat grow, where one of rye now grows, would he not say, teach me this and I shall soon be as rich as I would wish to be ? Have I not done this ? Have I not shown him how to make two pounds of fine wool grow upon the pasture that now yields only one of coarse ? Is not this substituting wheat for rye, and more than doubling the produce of his soil ? Let him thus be as rich as he wishes to be, and let me enjoy the satisfaction of thinking that I have contributed to his prosperity.

I am, with much esteem,
Dear sir, yours, &c.
ROBT. R. LIVINGSTON.

LETTER

From the hon. E. Gerry, to Mons. C. M. Talleyrand.

[*The following leter is in answer to an official note from Mons. T. published in the Patriot of May 20th. It casts new light on the mysterious X. Y. Z. negociation, and will be read with interest by every one who wishes to see the complete justification of Mr. Gerry against the aspersions of the French Machiavalian.*]—Editor Patriot.

To his Excellency
CHARLES MAURICE TALLEYRAND,
Late Minister of foreign relations, and now a Prince of imperial France.

SIR,

Your official letter, dated Paris, the 11th Fructidor, 6th year, (the 28th of August, 1798,) to Mr. Pichon, then Secretary of Legation at the Hague, has been lately published by his Excellency Mr. Adams, late President of the United States, and contains remarks on my conduct whilst on the embassy you refer to, which leave no alternative but that of a public answer. To me it appears immaterial, whether your object in writing that letter, was merely to obtain the negociation which resulted from it, or was intended to extend to personalities : for admitting the former, what apology can be offered for unmerited and unnecessary censures on a preceding minister, in order to obtain a sucessor ? The letter states, "that you used your endeavor to enter on a negociation with Mr. Gerry, in the spirit of substituting calmness for passion, and confidence for suspicions, from a conviction that distrust alone was the cause of the misunderstanding between the two republics." Admitting the fact, you will readily grant, sir, that the *distrust* on the part of the United States, existed long before the date of my commission to negociate with France, and resulted from a series of measures on her part highly injurious, and, as the United States conceived, unjust towards them. And have not the dispatches of the three envoys to their government proved to a demonstration, that the dark & crooked policy of negociating with them by secret agents, whom you recognised to me as having acted under your authority, increased that distrust & finally defeated the negociation ? On the first approach of those agents, so clearly was I convinced of what would be the result of conferences with them, as to have proposed to my colleagues to terminate their agency without delay, by the following declaration to them ——viz : "To the question whether the propositions, informally and confidentially communicated to us, *as private citizens*, at the request, as is stated, of Mr. Talleyrand, in *his private capacity*, will be adopted as the basis of a treaty ?—This answer is given : that it is highly probable some of the propositions communicated on the evenings of the 19th and 20th of October, (being the 28th and 29th Vendemaire) will be considered as the basis of a project of a treaty and others as *inadmissible* : *but that it is impossible to discuss them, or to come to a decision on them, until they are presented to us in our official characters.*" After the rupture of the negociation, by the dismission of my colleagues, & the publication throughout Europe of our dispatches, then indeed, you "used," and it might be stated, you repeated, "your endeavors to enter on a negociation with myself ;" not because it was practicable, or promising success, but because it was necessary to allay the indignation of the French nation and directory against yourself, as the sole cause of the rupture of the negociation with the three envoys. Can these facts be controverted ? Are they not fully proved by the dispatches of the envoys, and by your correspondence with myself ?

Your letter next states, "that your correspondence with Mr. Gerry, until the day of his departure, is a curious monument of advances on your part, and of evasions on his." That it is a curious monument of advances, or a monument of curious advances on your part, made with a conviction of the impossibility of their being accepted by him, is readily admitted : and permit him to enquire, whether you urged him to enter on a negociation which was warranted by, or on one which was directly repugnant to, the powers given him by his government ? You advocated his right to treat separately from his colleagues, because the government of the United States had commissioned, "jointly and severally, three envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary, of whom he was one, to treat with the French republic." Had his colleagues, by any other means than the agency of that republic, been disqualified from acting, then indeed he would have had a separate authority, and would have exercised it ; but, sir, your political abilities require no arguments to prove, that a separate power was not by his commission given to one envoy to treat, when the others were by the French government officially charged with misconduct, and dismissed from the embassy. If solid reasons did actually exist for the dismission, was it not incumbent on the French Directory to have stated them to the government of the United States, that the latter might have corrected the evil ? Was it your object, by urging that envoy to negociate separately, to induce him to a measure which would have terminated beneficially to the two republics, and honorably to the negociators, or to one, which, by his admitting the right of the French government to select one of the three envoys to proceed in the negociation, would have sacrificed, on his part, the rights, honor and independence of his government, and disgraced himself ?—Let him enquire further, sir, whether you was authorised by the government of the United States, (for your own government could not authorise you,) to construe for their minister, the powers which they had delegated to him ? Was it not, to say the least, indelicate to make the attempt, and unjust to refuse him the right of being governed in this construction by his own judgment ? Could he have met the advances, of which you boast, with a due regard to the rights and independence of his country, or to his own honor ? Most assuredly he could not, and for not meeting them has he incurred your censure. As to the evasions with which you charge him, they were refusals, and you so considered them, to close with your propositions. Your letter next states, "that it is wrong to suppose you confined yourself to vague protestations, that among that series of official letters, which will doubtless be published at Philadelphia, you select one wherein he (Mr. Pichon) will see that you make very positive propositions, without any mixture of preliminary conditions. That this letter was followed by three notes upon the articles to be discussed, and that you intended to complete the others in this manner, if Mr. Gerry had not refused to answer thereto." But let any candid man read our correspondence, and declare, if he can, that your protestations were not altogether vague from the beginning to the end—did you not know before the publication of the dispatches of the envoys, that, superior to pretexts, the envoy you had selected to negociate, declared himself, for the reasons herein stated, unauthorised to treat ? Did you not, in consequence of those reasons, and from a conviction of their truth, pledge yourself to prepare *informally* with him, a treaty, and to send a minister to the American government for a ratification of it ? And did you not, after the promulgation of the dispatches, depart from the arrangements, and renew propositions long before made to and rejected by him for treating separately ? If then, sir, your protestations were not vague, why did you not, in the informal mode agreed on, discuss fairly and substantially the important subjects of the negociation ? Why, in lieu thereof, did you propose a formal epistolary negociation, and even in this confine yourself to the correction of a consular convention, which was soon to expire ? Why did you not enter on the most important object, the project of a commercial treaty ? Of what use, without such a treaty, was a consular convention ? Your beginning with the smallest object of the negociation, and indeed your whole conduct in that discussion amounted, in my mind, to proof positive, that you was governed by no motive or expectation of attaining the important objects of the negociation, but that your sole view, as before stated, was to amuse the French government and nation, and to divert from yourself their indignation, resulting from the rupture of the negociation. Your letter then proceeds, "when it became necessary to abandon the idea of treating with that envoy, *who thought it important only to know how a negociation might thereafter be resumed,* I gave him the most solemn assurances concerning the reception that a new plenipotentiary would receive."—But did that envoy think it important only to know how a negociation might thereafter be resumed ? You know, sir, he did not. In his letters to yourself of the 4th and 20th of April, 1798, the first being before, and the last subsequent to the departure from Paris of one of his colleagues, he early proposed to "confer with you informally and unaccredited, on any subject respecting his mission, and to communicate to the government of the United States the result of such conferences." He gave you, agreeably to your request, the outlines of such a treaty as he thought would have been acceptable to his government ; and repeatedly urged you to come forward, on your part, with propositions "for terminating all differences, for the restoration of harmony and friendship ; and for the re-establishment of commerce between the United States and France ;" and to effect those objects he assured you of his immediate and cheerful co-operation. Look at your correspondence with him, which you appear to have forgotten, and you will there find a record of these and numerous other facts, proving his unremitted exertions while in France, to establish a commercial treaty & restore harmony between the two republics. Is it not then much to be regretted, sir, that you have hazarded such unfounded assertions, and produced the painful necessity of detecting them ?

Your letter then proceeds to state, "that you wished to encourage Mr. Gerry by the testimonies of regard that his good intentions merited." "Although you could not dissemble, that he wanted decision, at a moment when he might have easily adjusted every thing. That it does not thence follow, you designated him ; that you will even avow, that you think him too irresolute to be fit to hasten the conclusion of an affair of this kind." "Testimonies of regard," Sir, in negotiations, inspire neither courage or confidence : they are seldom successfully practised and always illusive ; and had you manifested such to him, he must have candidly declared to you, "*timeo danaos et dona ferentes.*" His primary object was to promote, on principles of reciprocity,