the importation of one, for other than by buying negroes which have descended from them."

"Our modes—I dare we have none—we to different from yours, generally speaking, and our business being carried on by means without subsidiaries, so little by hiring, and full less by calculation, that I frankly confess to you, I am unable to give your query respecting sheep-walks, or how many sheep an acre of woodland pasture would support. I shall have pleasure, at all times, as far as I possess the means, or can command them, to give you every information that can contribute to your satisfaction, or that of your friend; but I am so thoroughly persuaded of my inability to bestow any lights upon any branch of husbandry, in a country where it is so well understood as in England, and that any thing I could propose on the subject, would only serve to expose the defective practice of my country men, and be considered as the boasts of our ignorance, that I am rather inclined to be very cautious of offering a word, where so much of that information is conveyed to the public, as is to be found in your Board of Agriculture.

"With every great esteem,
I am, Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
"G. WASHINGTON."

[Subjoined to this letter, are several communications received by General Washington from respectable farmers in different parts of the United States, replete with information, but which appears to have been, for the most part, intended to give information abroad. We shall confine our notice to the following remarks of *Mr. Jefferson*:]

"Mr. YOUNG calculates the employment on 30400 worth of land, and 12000 farmer's capital, making an aggregate capital of 42400, in 18 grand, which he makes give per cent. extra, or ten per cent. upon the whole. I will calculate, in the Virginian way, the employment of the same capital, on a supposition of good management, in the manner of the country.

"1. Supposing negro labourers to be hired:

"2. Supposing them to be bought.

"1. Suppose labourers to be hired; one half men, at 18l.; the other half women, at 14l. for labour, subsistence, clothing (I always mean sterling money.)

"Interest of 12000l. for 3310 acres of land, at 25s. per £. s. d. acre,	208 0 0	
of 8800 for farmer's capital of stock, tools, &c.	104 0 0	
Taxes, at 7d. the acre (I do not know what they are),	96 10 0	
Hire of 33 labourers, at 16l.	528 0 0	
	£.936 10 0	

"*Produce to be sold annually.*

"Wheat, 6600 bushels, at 3s. £.990		
Meat, and other articles, at 5l. for each labourer, 165—	£.1155 0 0	
Net profit over and above the five per cent. above charged,	219 10 0	
Add annual rise in the value of lands,	165 10 0	
Real profit, over and above the five per cent. above charged,	£.385	

which is 6 1-2 per cent. extra, or 11 1-3 per cent. on the whole capital.

"2. Suppose labourers to be bought, one half men, and one half women, at 60l. sterling, on an average.

"Interest of 12,25l. for 2500 acres of land, at 25s.	£. s. d. 156 5 0	
of 1890 for farmer's capital of stock, utensils, &c.	78 2 6	
of 1890 $\frac{1}{217\frac{1}{2}}$ for purchase of 25 labourers, £.175 Subsistence, clothes, &c. 150—	325 0 0	
"[I allow nothing for losses by death, but, on the contrary, shall presently take credit for one per cent. per annum, for their increase over and above keeping up their own numbers.]		
Taxes, at 7d. the acre,	72 18 4	
	£.532 5 10	

"*Produce to be sold annually.*

"Wheat, 2000 bushels, at 3s. £.750		
Meat, and other articles, at 5l. for each labourer, —	125—875 0 0	
Net profit, over and above the five per cent. above charged (£13. 15s. a head on negroes),	342 15 10*	

* 5 1-2 per cent. on capital.
Add five per cent. annual rise in the value of lands, 156 5 0

* The average weight of the fleeces being 3lbs.

four per cent. increase of negroes, more than keeping up original number, 60 0 0

Real profit, over and above the five per cent. above charged,	£.539 10 0	

which is nine per cent. extra, or 14 per cent. on the whole capital.

"In the preceding estimate, I have supposed that 200 bushels of wheat may be sold for every labourer employed, which may be thought too high. I know it is too high for common land, and common management; but I know also, that on good land, and with good management, it has been done, through a considerable neighborhood, and for many years. On the other hand, I have overrated the cost of labouring negroes, and I presume the strikes all are over-rated. I have observed, that our families of negroes double in about twenty-five years, which is an increase of the capital invested in them, of four per cent. over and above keeping up the original stock."

[Accompanying the letters are notes and remarks by Mr. Young, from which we select the following encouraging comparison between the production and net profit of American and English land:]

"We may thus compare England and America, supposing 300 acres bought and formed by the purchaser.

"ENGLAND.	£. s. d.	
"Produce of 300 acres, 5 rents, at 12s. or 3l. -	900 0 0	
Deduct:		
Land-tax 25d. in the £. s. d. pound, at a 4s. rate on 180l.	37 0 0	
Rates 4s. 6d.	40 10 0	
Tythe 4s. 6d.*	40 10 0	
	118 10 0	
Allodial taxes, -	3 0 0	
	114 10 0	
	£.785 10 0	
Deduct further:		
Labour, -	130 0 0	
Interest of 3040l. at 5 per cent.	252 0 0	
Int. 1298l. farmer's capital	60 0 0	
	442 0 0	
Nett, -	£.323 10 0	
9s. 3s. per cent. on 6240l.		

"AMERICA.		
"Produce of 300 acres, supposed the same as in England, but the £. s. d. price as 7 1-2 to 1)	613 0 0	
Deduct:	£. s. d.	
Taxes 7d. per acre,	8 15 0	
Labour at cent. per cent. higher than England,	300 0 0	
Interest of 1061l. at 5 per cent. the purchase of 300 acres at 3l. 16s. 9d. -	52 11 0	
Interest of 900l. farmer's capital, at 3l. per acre, or 20s. less than England -	45 0 0	
	406 6 0	
Nett, -	£.206 14 0	

10l. 11s. per cent. on 1951l."

In Purtiance of Orders

From the Orphans Court of Washington County, in the District of Columbia, and of Prince George's County, in the State of Maryland, we shall proceed to sell by public Sale, at the farms of the late Notley Young, Esq. in Washington County, on Monday the 25th of October next, if fair, if not fair on the first fair day,

A valuable Stock of Cattle,

Draft Horses, Hogs, Sheep, Farming Utensils, and various other articles of the personal Estate of the said Notley Young, deceased—and on Tuesday the 26 day of November, we shall sell the personal property belonging to the Estate of the said deceased, at his plantation in Prince George's County, in the Forrest of Queen Ann, except his slaves, consisting of a very large and valuable flock of every kind, farming utensils, &c. &c.

None months credit will be given for all sums above twenty dollars, on bonds with approved security.

BENJ. YOUNG,
NICH. YOUNG, } *Executors.*
ROBT. BRENT.

N.B. The Sales will commence at the Farm adjoining the City, which belonged to Mr. Young.

Sept. 27th, 1802. eptp25O.

NOTICE.

THE Subscriber intends to petition the Washington County Court, at their next meeting, for LICENCE to keep the ferry from George Town to Virginia, known by the name of Beatty's Ferry.

JOHN KENNEDY.

Sept 13, 1802. 3tmtawtf.

National Intelligencer,

We have received a communication in reprobation of Duelling. It commences with some fewer strictures on a late duel which has much engaged the public attention. These we are obliged to omit, as they implicate private character. Though in themselves extremely exempt from intemperance, our correspondent's correspondent will perceive that the door being once open to personal animadversion might lead to mischievous consequences.—The general remarks are cheerfully admitted. Were we have stated will account for the abrupt commencement of the piece.

And now let us ask, what is this reputation for courage, which our high country men would deem life to be worthless. If a man wants promotion in the army, it may be advantageous. It will make men cautious of offending him. This is an advantage indeed! But will it make men love him? Not every wife mother detests in his heart the practice of duelling, and cautiously avoids all intercourse with professed duellists, or men of nice sensitive honor. It may indeed be imprudent for any man to disavow the principle of duelling, because fo undrels and bullies might thereby be encouraged, on occasion, to insult him. But there never is an advantage in all throw tenfe, benevolence, and patriotism, who did not regret that such a barbarous absurd custom should exist amongst civilized men (I will not by christians.)

Did Washington, Green, Williams, or Wayne, ever fight a duel? It may be asked in return *did any one of them ever refuse a challenge?* I do not know that he did. But his not having fought, is sufficient to convince me, that he could not have been a duellist on principle. The truth is, that a young man, who grows up with the idea, that before his reputation is established he *must* fight, and that a duel will give him eclat, is never easy, until he has called a man into the field. And may every such young man always have occasion to remember the day on which he fought.

It is to me disgusting in the extreme, to hear men who are the old hackneyed idea, that the practice of duelling has reformed our manners, &c. They do not consider, that the modern refinement of manners is owing to various other causes besides the fall of duelling. They do not consider, that a worthless scoundrel, who is known to possess courage, and nice skill in the trigger, gains a conspicuous place in society, which he would not otherwise possess.

"*But how shall a small weak man maintain his dignity, without the existence of this salutary custom.*" Let his case stand against the case of the boasted bully. But why may he not appeal to the laws. If that is not sufficient, why not go with a pistol in hand, &c. &c. This is a sufficient answer. But the fact is, that pistols do not put men on equality. How cutton it is to see young men constantly practising, until they shall acquire the skill of hitting a dollar or falling a bullet at 10 yards distance on the edge of a knife. Against such heroes, what chance would there be for an unpoundy, who had seldom or never fired a pistol? It duels *must* be fought, let the seconds enquire carefully concerning all the habits, and the skill of the contending parties. If no arrangement with respect to pistol and sword shall put them on a par, let them take muskets, rifles, or fowling pieces, stand at a suitable distance, and advance, if they please, until they shall be within 20 yards, fire at pleasure.

Let us now enquire respecting the motives for, and the intent of calling a man into the field. Is the motive revenge, and the intent murder! I suspect, that this question must be the case; that rarely indeed does the challenger and challenged each go, with a determination of killing his adversary. If they do, how abominable it is, that their innocent friends (and friends they must have) should be involved in the danger. But I believe that in 9 cases out of 10, a duel is fought, merely to convince the world, that in support of their honour, they can defy all laws, and all consequences. A man is insulted, takes out his pistols, in danger only wounded, recovers, and his honour is preserved. On the principle of revenge, he has received no satisfaction, notwithstanding he ought to fight again. He ought to spend the big enemy even into death. This is what common sense would allege; provided it could tolerate the principle of revenge. O! that on this interesting subject, I could utter such thinking unanswerable arguments, as should not be called common place, or that the common place might not fail of effect, merely because it has been a million of times repeated, and never yet refuted.

I have often heard the question fightly debated, Whether or not it was possible for laws to prevent duelling; but the determination has always been in the negative. *I ask, say they, "the killing of a man in a premeditated duel murder, by the law of the land? Is not hanging the punishment of murder? Does not every duellist know this? And if the fear of death will not deter, what further can punishment do to restrain him?*" It can do a great deal more; and, considered I am, that it may do it, with considerable, if not entire effect.

It is well known, that although the law declares the killing in a duel to be murder, there is hardly an instance, in which the penalty is inflicted. Either the evidence is defective; or the humane honor-loving jury decides against evidence, or a pardon is granted to the man, who has killed another *fairly*. If death be not the consequence of a well fought duel, pompously narrated in public prints, the combatants, instead of incurring punishment, are as much admired, and envied, as if they were crowned with laurels.

Every man, I presume, who fights a duel, hopes to escape with life; and even those, probably most men, who fight, have the fanciful hope or even a certainty, with respect to their adversaries. The fact is, that, under all circumstances, to young men of ardent mind, there is an encouragement to fight a duel at death.

But suppose laws to the following effect,—

1. Every man, who in a deliberate duel, that kill his adversary, shall be punished by death.

2. Every man, who wounds another in a duel, without killing, shall be punished by one month's close imprisonment, and be for ever disabled from holding any office of trust, or profit.

3. Every man, who fights a duel, without wounding his adversary, shall be, for ever disabled from holding any office of trust or profit.

4. Every man, who sends, or carries, or accepts a challenge, on the place of a second, although no duel shall enfue, shall be disabled for the term of three years from holding any office of trust or profit.

5. There shall be no power of pardoning any man, who, by law incur any penalty under these laws.

I am persuaded, that if such laws should be passed, some thoroughbred duellists would endeavour to evade them, by conceiving, that their reputation would appear like sudden rencontres. But the law should be careful to prevent such evasions. Upon a trial, for duellists, the jury should be of opinion, that the fighting, or the rencontre was the consequence of a preceding quarrel, the penalty should be, the same, as if a duel had been fought, in consequence of a regular challenge.

It is not uncommon for men, residing in Maryland to go over to Virginia, or to Pensylvania, or Delaware, to fight. I would make the penalty precisely the same, to all parties, as if the combat were in Maryland. I cannot comprehend, why a citizen should not answer to the state for killing one of its citizens in a neighbouring state.

It not the subject sufficient to attract the attention of congress? Ought not a law to be recommended to every state by congress? Or, if that would be improper, ought not the states to recommend laws to each other? Punishes should attend a duellist in whatever state he fights; and never should the man, who disregards the law of man and God, be permitted to have a share in passing or administering any laws whatever.

If no attempt should be made by government to abolish a most horrid, burtenous, unchristian practice, I am decidedly of opinion, that the next best thing to be done, would be for the law to sanctions, and even to regulate duelling.

I am much mistaken in human nature, indeed, if this would not have a powerful tendency towards the abolishing of the practice. But if it should not have that tendency, a great advantage, nevertheless, would result from the law.

After all that has been said, it cannot be denied, that men of noble minds are most likely to fight duels. May we not consider the matter in this light? If government, fully aware, as it is, of the existence of the practice, and of the almost unbounded influence of custom, or general opinion, will use no effort to suppress duelling, is not government culpable for every duel which is fought, and for every life which is lost thereby? Whilst the state of things shall remain as it is at present, I ask why should the death of one combatant deprive the state of at least one or more of its brave valuable citizens? The killer, and his friend, notwithstanding the known enmity of juries and executives, thinks it necessary to fly. He perhaps abandons an helpless family, and spends his life in a wretched exile.

For the sake of reason, justice, and humanity, let us strive no longer to have a populorous opposition between custom, or common, and the laws of the land. If possible, the former should be made to bend to the latter. If that cannot be done, if, in the opinion of men, who prize reputation and honour, beyond life and every other good, a challenge must be accepted, and an infuriated resentment shall challenge indisperfible; let them be as free to fight *fairly, on agreement*, as to breathe the vital air. Let them, if they please, fight in public. So shall their combat be most likely to be fair, and faithfully narrated.

But suppose laws to be passed agreeably to my recommendation; and suppose a duel between two of our most valued citizens, who shall each receive a slight wound; no doubt, it would appear flattering to humanity, and to public opinion, that such men should be spared, and that the public should not ever lose their services. But, in the contemplation of consequences, how blutary would be such a law! Such a legal example above all other things, would tend to prevent the baneful shocking practice of men's killing each other in cold blood, without any intent, and merely in consequence, with a tolloon, which, in their hearts they abhor.

For my part, I would not hesitate to abolish the practice of duelling at the loss of half a dozen of our brilliant, but wild young men. Suppose a dubious opinion to be in two of the members of the judiciary, or of the executive, or of the senate, shall willingly, to procure a greater good to society, would I forgo the services of such a bold than degraded. But if, in consequence, am wrong, let men by judges, counsellors and senators be allowed to fight with legal impunity. Let them stand back to back, &c. &c. &c. I confess, that such a practice, ought appear in ridicule, and that *ridicule would be the essence of free government.* But I do not believe, that it would injure the cell of the community.

ANTI.

Annapolis, August 18, 1802.

Foreign Intelligence.

PARIS, August 1.

COUNCIL OF STATE.

Extract from the Register of Deliberations.—Sitting of the 27th Fructidor.

Opinions upon the different questions relative to the execution of the *Senatus Consultum* granting an Amnesty for the crime of Emigration.

On the Report of the Section of Legislation, to which Register had been added, the following questions were taken into consideration.

1. Those individuals provisionally or definitively inscribed on the 20th of October, 1800, to be called upon to submit to the conditions of the Amnesty.

2. Are those accused of emigration, and not definitively called, who have fled previous to the publication, to be considered as Amnestied?

3. Are those who, living at the time amnesty was published, die before the 23d September, 1802, without having fulfilled the conditions imposed by the *Senatus Consultum*, to be considered as Amnestied.

4. Are foreigners accused of Emigration, to be called upon to submit to the conditions of Amnesty?

The Council of State is of opinion, with respect to the first question, that it is answered by the first Article of the *Senatus Consultum*—"An Amnesty is granted for the crime of Emigration to every individual accused of it, and not definitively erased." As the provisional erasure from the List was a definitive erasure, it is evident it must mean those individuals who were properly so called. They must submit to the conditions prescribed by the arrete applying to them: those of the Amnesty do not apply to them.

With respect to the second question, the Council of State is of opinion, that the Amnesty having been principally granted in favour of the families of Emigrants, it is entirely conformable to the spirit of the *Senatus Consultum* to extend its grace to the heirs of the deceased, when death has put it out of the power of the accused himself to profit by it.

If he had lived, he would have been entitled to partake of the benefits granted by the 17th Article of the *Senatus Consultum*. How then can we refuse the same grace to his children, who have lived in the Republic, and who were born before the Emigration?

It is well understood, that this cannot apply to the heirs of those individuals who are comprized in the exceptions contained in the 10th Article of the *Senatus Consultum*.—Those individuals could never have personally profited by the Amnesty, if they had been living at the moment of its publication, their heirs cannot, therefore, partake of the same powerful considerations which operate in favour of the heirs of others.

With respect to the third question, the benefits of the Amnesty are only lost in case the emigrant neglects to fulfil its conditions before the 23d of September, 1802.—If he dies before the expiration of the period granted for that purpose, his right, which is not extinct, passes to his heirs, who is not excluded the benefit of the Amnesty until the moment, when the deceased himself would have been excluded.

It must be supposed here, as on the preceding question, that the deceased was not comprized in any of exceptions contained in the 10th Article of the *Senatus Consultum*.

It is to be observed, that most of the conditions imposed by the *Senatus Consultum* upon Emigrants, are impossible to their heirs. It is therefore sufficient, if the latter, before the 23d September, present themselves before the Prefect of their Department, and having proved the death of the Emigrant, they shall receive a Certificate of Amnesty.