From the National Intelligencer.

The conductor of the Political Register has undertaken to destroy the popularity of the administration by shewing their deadly hostility to the "agricultural, commercial and manufacturing interests."

For this purpose two powerful batteries are opened; the one against the alleged acts of the government; the other against the speculative opinions of the President.

The exportation of a small consignment of Peltries, not exceeding seven thousand dollars in value, by the agent for Indian affairs, is represented as evidence of a deliberate purpose to depress and destroy our own by preferring foreign manufactures. A few of the hatters of Philadelphia have been induced to come forward, and to express *their* sense of this measure, & as might be expected, they deeply deprecate its tendency. Facts have been grossly distorted: a mountain of misrepresentation been raised; but a short disclosure of the truth has reduced it to a mole hill. Mr. Davy, whose veracity is unimpeachable, has declared that previous to the exportation of the peltries he offered them for sale in the Philadelphia market, and that he only exported them because he could not get a reasonable price for them; and it further appears that the standing instructions of the War Department are not to export what can be advantageously sold at home.

From these facts it follows that the only difference between Mr. Davy and the hatters must have been as to the price of the peltry. He thought he could get more for them by exporting them; and they knew they would stand a better chance of getting them low provided a greater stock was retained in the U. States than the demand required, while by the exportation of a part, that part would by being carried to the great European market, sell for its full price, while the part retained in the United States would, likewise, from its diminished relation to the demand, sell for its value. Thus a good and reasonable price would be received for the whole and the government would correspondently be the gainer.

On the other hand, by systematically withholding the exportation of peltry, the natural effect would be its accumulation here beyond the demand, and its inevitable diminution in value. By this, the government and the whole people would be losers. If our manufacturers succeeded in monopolising the raw materials they could afford to sell their fabrics cheaper; but would they do it? That they would not is evident from the consideration, that they regulate their prices, not by the intrinsic worth of their articles, but by the price of similar imported articles. Now the monopoly in the home market, by diminishing the supply of the foreign market, and rendering the raw materials there scarcer, would necessarily make them dearer, and proportionally elevate the price of the manufactured articles of which they are made. Thus, while our manufactures could afford to sell their fabrics cheaper they would be enabled to sell them dearer. Is it then at all surprising that they should aim at a monopoly; or that they should do what has always been attempted by manufacturers in like circumstances? It would, however, be truly surprising if the agents of a government apprised of these effects should for the purpose of unduly fostering the interests of a few manufactures, injure the interests of the whole people and diminish the national revenue.

We are very much inclined to believe from the irrational clamour, attempted to be excited, that the general interests have heretofore been extensively sacrificed to those of a small class of individuals; and that the reform, now commencing, has spread alarm lest the sources of monopoly should be dried up. It would be an interesting view, to contrast the prices paid in the United States for ten years past, for the peltries sold by the government, with the prices current in Europe. This would enable us to see whether the interest of the whole community have not been sacrificed to the gain of a few; and whether the future prevention of similar injustice does not require other expedients than those heretofore used, and whether among these, an occasional resort to exportation is not necessary.

These animadversions may be considered harsh by the class of individuals to which they refer. But they are surely too enlightened, not to know, that it is the duty of the government to consult the general interests; that, consequently, it is the duty of their agents to get the best price they can for the articles they sell; and that it is not with any executive officer, without the express sanction of the law, to allow either virtual or direct bounties on manufactures.

So much for this branch of the new attack on the administration. In our next we will say a little on the strictures on the speculative opinions of the President.

In the same spirit with that manifested in the Register, the editor of the Baltimore Federal Gazette has presented his readers with the following mistatement of facts, and perversion of motives.

"Considerable part of yesterday's Gazette was taken up in exposing the conduct which certain of Mr. Jefferson's editors have pursued, to defend his administration; and a portion of this day's paper is occupied with extracts from the Political Register, exhibiting striking traits in the character of the administration itself.

"If our information be correct,—and it is from a respectable republican,—executive enmity is carried as far against the agricultural as it is against the mechanics and internal commerce of our country—No American raised hemp, however good its quality, we are assured, is permitted to be used in any cordage for the American navy; and the rope makers in the employ of government are prohibited from purchasing it for that purpose!"

To this piece Mr. John Gordon of Baltimore immediately replied as follows:

Baltimore, 14th August, 1805.

Messrs. YUNDT & BROWN,

Gentlemen,

I beg leave to correct the statement of the executive enmity against agriculture and mechanics, in your Gazette of last evening—'That no American hemp, however good its quality, is permitted to be used in any cordage, for the American navy, and the rope-makers in the employ of government are prohibited from purchasing it for that purpose.'

I assure you there was no such stipulation by col. Striker, naval agent for the cordage, Gordon and Smith are making for government; only that it was to be of the first quality, which cannot be made of other than Russia hemp, and only of the first quality of that hemp, of which there are three.

American hemp was not even mentioned when we made the contract.

For your better information I will add, that first quality cordage cannot be made from American hemp, owing to its being too harsh and not well cleaned; that the difference of price is, American 8 and 9 cents per lb. Russia 13 and 14 cents per lb. consequently no rope maker would attempt to impose cordage made from the lowest price hemp, for first quality.

You will please give the above a place in your Gazette of to-morrow.

I am
Gentlemen,
Your obedient serv't.
JOHN GORDON.

Since receiving the Baltimore print, containing this letter, we have been requested to publish the following communications, which shew, in the clearest manner, the sentiments and measures of the Navy Department, and the competency of the American hemp to the most important purposes of the navy. The reader will perceive, that the statement of Messrs. Chalmers and Parrott being the most circumstantial, gives the clearest views of the quality of that article.

Washington, August 17, 1805.

Mr. SAML. H. SMITH,

SIR,

IN Wednesday's Federal Gazette, of Baltimore, I saw a publication reflecting on our executive for prohibiting the use of our own country hemp, which I was about to answer, but in Thursday's paper I perceive two pieces on the subject, the one as an answer. Taking all into view, though I have no talents or inclination for scribbling, yet I think it a duty I owe to the secretary of the navy and the public, to give through the medium of your paper, the following plain relation. When I came here to establish myself for the purpose of serving the department of the navy with cordage, the secretary gave me positive orders to give all possible encouragement to our country hemp. I stated some objection to its generally being badly cleaned, and of course its not making so neat cordage to look at, but at the same time did believe that it was a stronger fibre; since then I have had an opportunity to give it a trial by the secretary's directing me to prepare some cable yarn of it. I did so, and in September 1803, made cables for the frigate Essex, of the yarns of which we boasted of our ship riding independent of Russia, for the cables were so neat in their appearance as not to be easily distinguished from Russia, and gave great satisfaction to the captain at the yard, and also to the officers who were after appointed to her. From that time I have encouraged the hemp, and have paid from 10 to 12 dolls. per cwt. for clean country hemp, when I have refused 5 dolls. for other American hemp of inferior quality, and could have bought clean Russia for 12 dolls. of which a spinner could spin more in a day than of country; but I did in obedience to orders. Yet I never ventured to make one coil of running or a piece of standing rigging of it, only because I thought it would not look so neat as the Russia. But the result of my experience in the business is this, that for cables, hawsers, or any water ropes, it will answer as well; I hesitate to say outwear, as I have not had a trial, but it will not make so neat running or standing rigging.

Our farmers do not understand water rotting, they generally dew rot, of course do not make so clean; but when it is well cleaned it is stronger. There are considerable objections to the manufacturer purchasing this hemp. It generally needs so much cleaning in which it loses considerably, so much so, that it is not easy to ascertain its loss. And again, no spinner can spin as much yarn in the same time from our country as he can from the Russia hemp. The particular color of Russia is an advantage to its looks, while our hemp at best has a dark look, and when it imbibes the tar, is not so neat in its appearance to the eye, tho' the yarn be otherwise equal or preferable.

I aim nothing in this but plain truth, which must support itself,

And remain your humble serv't.
JOHN CHALMERS, Jun.

Mr. SMITH.

HAVING seen a piece in the Federal Gazette of Baltimore, calculated to impress the public mind with a belief that the present administration is not friendly to the produce and manufactures of our country, and that the Naval department has been wanting in their duty in not making experiments of, or giving proper encouragement to American hemp; and having been employed almost wholly by that department for five years, I think it my duty to state what has come to my knowledge on that subject.

Soon after Mr. Smith came into office, he made particular enquiries into the quality and price of country hemp to be procured at this market, and particularly requested that the highest price should be given for the best clean country hemp, and that it was his wish that a fair experiment should be made; and if it was found equal in quality, tho' the appearance might not be so good it ought to be brought into use. I well remember that in the spring of 1803, the Secretary appeared desirous that I should purchase hemp or yarn from Kentucky, as large supplies of excellent quality are to be had there. In fitting out the Essex a bout two years ago, the experiment was made: her cables were of country hemp and highly approved, and in fitting out the Mediterranean fleet last summer, Mr. Chalmers and myself made the cables and water ropes mostly of country hemp; and I have understood that those officers who have returned, have said "the cables were more approved of than the cordage," which was made of Russia hemp. Indeed those acquainted with that article cannot question the superiority of the lint of the country hemp to that of Russia; and the improvement made within a few years in rotting and cleansing it, has exceeded all expectation. I have received hemp of Col. Douglas of Loudon county for two years past, as properly rotted and cleansed as the imported; and last summer I purchased a quantity of a Mr. Beall, which was sent by a Mr. Willis, of Berkley county, and which had been water rotted, which in color and other respects so resembled the Russia, that my spinners did not know the difference. With encouragement so liberal and effective, and experiments so flattering to our agriculture, ought not our citizens to be well pleased?

RICHD. PARROTT.

George town, Aug. 17, 1805.

A machine has lately been put into the secretary of state's office, by a Mr. John M'Bride, of South Carolina, but late from Tennessee, and a patent taken out for securing the profits thereof to the ingenious inventor. This machine, which is called the *Columbian Spinster*, is so contrived as to gin, card and spin at the same time; it is operated on by one person, who is perfectly adequate to the whole direction of it. This model spins 12 threads, and machines may be so enlarged as to spin any greater number. The machine requires no other attendance than the person who feeds it with the seed cotton, who also turns the wheel by which the operations are carried on. It might be advantageously worked by water: the owner of the present model finished one of 15 threads (which he left at Tennessee) that by great exertions extended each thread 7 yards in a minute. Many ladies and gentlemen of Washington and George-town have seen this model, and expressed the highest satisfaction at it.

We wish our ingenious countryman success in his invention, and we sincerely hope he may be rewarded in the sale of his machines. No doubt a discerning public will see their utility, and avail themselves of the use of so valuable an article. [*Wash. Fed.*

Egyptain Wheat.—A pound of this grain having been lately sent by Mr. W. Moore of Dublin, as a present to Mr. Jefferson, the following account taken from a late English paper will show its produce and the estimation in which it is held in England. "Mr. Showler of Lincoln, three years ago, planted thirty five grains of this wheat. The second years produce was 10 bushels. This year he reaped upwards of 40 quarters, part of which, the last week, he sold at five guineas per quarter."

PRINTING

In its usual variety, executed in the neatest manner, on reasonable terms, and at the shortest notice at the STAR-OFFICE.

FOR THE REPUBLICAN STAR.

CIVIS — No. I.

To the PEOPLE of MARYLAND.

THE General Assembly of this state having at their last session, passed a law that virtually abolishes the general court, it will necessarily become the duty of the next legislature either to ratify or reject this proposed alteration in our constitution. This being an object of high importance to the people, it is certainly desirable, that prior to the next election, the utility, propriety and policy of the measure should be fully discussed, as it may then be thought necessary to declare to our delegates the result of our maturest reflections on this interesting point.

I would immediately proceed to consider the proposed alteration; but I think it first necessary to notice an objection to the plan, grounded on pretended constitutional prohibition.*

It has been publicly contended, that although a majority of two successive legislatures may alter or amend the constitution on any points of UNIVERSAL concern; yet that the general court could not be done away, unless TWO THIRDS of the legislature should assent thereto.

It will be immediately recollected by most of my readers, that the general court exists by virtue of the 56th section of the constitution, and therefore stands on the same extensive ground with other parts of that instrument, which guarantees *general* rights to the people of Maryland, without designating whether they belong to the Western or Eastern shore.

But it is objected that the general court is an "institution which relates to the Eastern shore *particularly*," and that the provision as contained in the 59th section of the constitution, declares, "that nothing in this form of government," which relates to the Eastern shore particularly, "shall at any time be altered, unless at least two thirds of all the members of each branch of the General Assembly shall concur." Let us proceed to consider this objection.

To those persons unacquainted with the geographical division of Maryland, the above provision in the constitution might appear paradoxical; but to the citizens of the state, the reason for introducing this restriction is not less universally understood than approbated.

The wise and patriotic framers of the constitution were fully sensible, that from natural causes, the Western shore then was, and always must be, more populous and more wealthy than the Eastern; and that on any plan of just representation, they would have the greater portion of delegates—They were also fully aware, that whenever the interests of the two shores came in competition, the Eastern must yield the boon.

This suggested the necessity of the constitutional provision, that in all those cases where *exclusive* privileges were enjoyed by the citizens of the Eastern shore, a majority of the legislature should neither alter nor change the enjoyment.

The question is now fairly before us, reduced to its present form. Is the enjoyment of the general court the exclusive province of the inhabitants of the Eastern shore? or do they enjoy this privilege in COMMON with the whole people of Maryland? For if this right is exclusively attached to the Eastern shore, less than two thirds of all the members of each branch of the legislature cannot affect it; but if it is enjoyed only as a UNIVERSALLY extended system, it then stands on the same *general* ground with other parts of the constitution, and may be affected by a similar procedure.

In the course of the constitution, I find the following cases of exclusive privilege attached to the Eastern shore—"They shall have a treasurer"—"They shall have six senators"—"They shall have a register of the land office." Now in these cases, the constitution is clear and imperative—The *separate* rights to be enjoyed by the citizens of the Eastern shore are clearly enumerated and defined, and a majority of the legislature could not curtail them; they could only be affected by the votes of two thirds of all the members.

Let us now examine that section of the constitution which gives being to the general court, and endeavor to find out whether, in words or in spirit, it contemplates this court "as relating to the Eastern shore particularly;" or whether it is part of a GENERAL judicial system, calculated for the happiness and advantage of the WHOLE people of Maryland.

The 56th section of the constitution has the following provision for the establishment of the high judicial courts—"That there be a court of appeals, composed of persons of integrity and sound judgment in the law, whose judgment shall be final and conclusive in all cases of appeal from the general court, court of chancery, and court of admiralty—That one person of integrity and sound judgment in the law, be appointed chancellor—that three persons of integrity and sound judgment in the law, be appointed judges of the court, now called the provincial court; and that the same court be hereafter called and known by the name of the [illegible] court: *which court shall sit on the Western and Eastern shores, for transacting and determining the business of the respective shores*, at such times and places as the future legislature of this state shall direct and appoint."

Having quoted the express words in the constitution that provide the general court and court of appeals, the fair and honest interpretation of this provision now becomes the object of our enquiry.

In my judgment it is as follows:—That a general court, admiralty court, chancery court, and court of appeals, should be established for the use, happiness and convenience of the WHOLE PEOPLE of Maryland, and that these courts exist on the same principles with other GENERAL provisions in the constitution. That independently on the imperative words, "which court shall sit on the Western and Eastern shores," no obligation arose with the legislature to have any session of this court on the Eastern shore; but that under those words (the general court having been first established) it became an *exclusive* privilege of the Eastern shore to have a session of that court for transacting their business: Nor while the general court shall have being, can less than two thirds of all the members of each branch of the legislature alter or change the right of the Eastern shore to a session of this court.

The arguments of the opposition would apply with full force, if the last legislature had made an attempt to exclude the Eastern shore from a session of the general court, AND YET CONTINUE THE SYSTEM. In that case a right "relating to the Eastern shore particularly," would have been abridged; for while the general court shall continue, it is an exclusive right of the Eastern shore to have a session of this court on that shore.

In order further to illustrate my ideas of *general* and *particular* rights, and the mode by which *each* may be affected by the legislature, let me put a case from the constitution. By the 1st section, the senate is made a constitutional branch of the legislature, and by the 14th, 15th and 16th sections, the mode of electing the senators, their qualifications, their numbers, and periods of service, are prescribed. Now let us suppose that the next General Assembly, adopting the visionary scheme of ONE REPRESENTATIVE BRANCH, should by a majority pass a law to abolish the senate—such law, its object being UNIVERSAL, would unquestionably be constitutional. But should the same legislature, by only a similar majority, pass an act, that the Western shore should have *ten* senators, and the Eastern but *five*, such act would as clearly be unconstitutional; for while the senate shall exist as a component part of the government, the right of the Eastern shore to have six members in fifteen, is a special and particular privilege, from which they never can be excluded, unless by the votes of two thirds of all the members of each branch of the legislature.

Again—The senate are constitutionally elected for five years, and are empowered to fill up their own vacancies. Suppose a future General Assembly should by law reduce their TERM of service to three years, and adopt a more REPUBLICAN mode of filling up vacancies—I presume this could be done by a *majority* of two succeeding legislatures, unless it can be established, that it is a particular and exclusive right belonging to the Eastern shore, that *her* senators shall continue in office five years, although those from the Western, by this arrangement, must be limited to a much less period.

Finally—By attentively considering the section of the constitution that gives being to the general court and court of appeals, it will be found to embrace objects of GENERAL and UNIVERSAL concern, and to rest on the same foundation (as to the right of repeal by a majority) with other general provisions of the constitution. CIVIS.

In my two next numbers, I shall consider the propriety and utility of abolishing the general court.

Queen-Ann's county, Aug. 24, 1805.

* *See an essay in the* Star *of 16th of April last, under signature of* "A Friend to the Constitution."

"*Waynesborough, July* 30, 1805.

"I sit down to give you an account of the negro business, from the date of my last.

"One other negro was found guilty and hanged with the two I wrote you were to be hung the Wednesday following the date of my last. One other found guilty, was pilloried, whipped, nailed and his ears cut off on the same day.—Some others, who were guilty in a less degree, were whipped and discharged; others were acquitted for the want of sufficient evidence to convict them. The court then adjourned until after the superior court at Newbern, owing to the business of some of the parties concerned in that court. This court met again on Thursday last, tried and acquitted one for the want of the witnesses being bro't up. Nothing more was done until yesterday, when the court tried another, who is sentenced to transportation, agreeably to act of assembly. Our election commencing to-morrow, the court adjourned until next day, when it is expected the four will be tried, and one more, if taken; if not he will be outlawed."