EASTON GAZETTE.

WHERE THE PRESS IS FREE—"Literature well or ill-conducted is the Great Engine by which all Popular States must ultimately be supported or overthrown—RELIGION purifies the Heart and teaches us our Duty—Morality refines the Manners—Agriculture makes us Rich, and Politics provides for the enjoyment of all."

VOL. XXV. EASTON, (MD.) SATURDAY MORNING, AUGUST 13, 1842. No. 33.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY *Saturday Morning*, BY

Alexander Graham.

TERMS.

TWO DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS Per annum, payable half yearly in advance

ADVERTISEMENTS

Not exceeding a square inserted three times for ONE DOLLAR; and TWENTY-FIVE CENTS for every subsequent insertion.

AGRICULTURAL PREMIUMS.

Mr. Graham:—Will you please give place to the inclosed reviews of the list of Agricultural premiums offered by the Prince George's County Agricultural Society.

It is not hazarding much to conjecture that they are from the pen of that zealous and constant advocate of the landed interest—J. S. SKINNER, Esq., Assistant Post Master General. The subject is one of obvious and great interest to every farmer in Maryland. Z.

From the Marlboro' Gazette.

AGRICULTURAL PREMIUMS.

REMARKS ON THE GENERAL SUBJECT—WITH FRIENDLY COMMENTARIES ON THE LIST OFFERED BY THE PRINCE GEORGE'S AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY.

In framing a list of premiums, more care should be taken, and more study should be bestowed on the subject, than is usually done—I do not say than was done in this case. We may better judge of that in the sequel, for as yet the list has not been strictly examined. There will be much more pleasure in approving than in finding fault; at any rate, the writer has no fear that his motives will be misinterpreted, by those whom he supposes to have had the principal agency in arranging the list.

In adjusting a scale of premiums, a comprehensive view should be taken of the condition and circumstances of those whose welfare is to be promoted; by this union of means and of energies, pecuniary and intellectual, to improve the agricultural practises and to advance the interests of the region within which the society is to operate. Regard should be had to the amount of resources at the command of the Society, and the question in every case should be put—As to the character and usefulness of the emulation to be excited, and the SORT AND DEGREE OF MERIT, which will be elicited by the stimulus offered, and proved by the prize, when gained. To these general propositions, no one it is presumed will object: They are even so plain as that it may be thought superfluous to lay them down! very well! let us by this standard test the list in question. We begin with

HORSES.

There appears to have been at the command of the Society, (my figuring is apt to be a little inaccurate) the sum of $335—and of this sum, except for cattle, the largest amount is offered to promote, what is supposed to constitute excellence, in the most expensive animal power to which man can have recourse for Agricultural purposes! But suppose it to be wise to stimulate the natural fondness of our countrymen for this favorite but short lived and expensive machine; requiring as it does so much oiling and greasing and constant attention! then the question is as to the KIND OF HORSE we should encourage the Farmers to adopt and rear.

For the best thorough bred STALLION $10. There ought to be a condition attached, and perhaps there may be in the bye laws of the Society; to wit: that the stallion taking the premium, should be one of uncommon merit in himself, and that he should remain at least twelve months in the county for the propagation of his stock. The second premium is but $5—only half the first, and yet it is for a Horse which, according to the description, must combine all that can be desired in a stallion to get horses for general use, to wit: capacity to get the best saddle and harness horses. These two should be put on an equality, and except with a redundant treasury, I would give nothing but certificates of merit for any other sort of horse on the list—Why offer a premium for a horse of slow draft—all horses are slow enough. What is wanting for the wagon or the plough is strength and bottom—or lastingness combined with action—and these have much less relation to size than to conformation and blood. Blood should ever be kept in view, and when the day arrives that no attention is paid to pedigree there will follow a general and lamentable deterioration in the stock of our horses. It is the only guarantee for keeping them up to the mark of excellence. Let the society secure the use of the best stallions, and the improvement they wish to promote and keep up is sure to follow. What merit, warranting the bestowment of the slender funds of the society, in a gentleman's happening to own the best mare, that he may sell away out of the county the next day? besides—how is the merit of a BROOD mare to be decided? except by her being a SURE breeder and that of a succession of the best coats, and being a good suckler besides? As for the "best brood mare adapted to slow draught" it is not easy to divine what class of people would be benefited by the establishment of slow-draught breed of horses, unless it be sleepy drivers—and as for giving premiums for colts, its expediency may be doubted; for besides that these premioms are too apt to be awarded to the biggest and the fattest, it is not a subject to which public attention can be attracted with a hope of augmenting the Agricultural wealth of the county, although it would be very well as a means of swelling the show in the estimation of boys and the people who can be tickled with straws. Would it not be attended with more useful results, were a portion of the money offered for mares and colts to be given in shape of a piece of plate, for a prize memorial to the Legislature, to be circulated in every county of the State, on the policy of licensing stallions, and forbidding the public use of any which a committee, of the best judges in each county, to be appointed by the Levy Court, should say were mere garons, unworthy to propagate the race, and therefore to be condemned to the loss of their commissions? and then as to the best saddle horse or mare—What merit does it evince that a gentleman should happen to own the best saddle horse in the county, unless you require that he should have bred and raised him? In this latter case, the premium may be supposed to have generated a spirit of emulation among Farmers generally, which would be followed by a general improvement of their stock of horses for the saddle. That would be a very desirable thing and would be best secured by securing the best stallions and by compelling those who own worthless beasts to pay a premium for using them, so heavy as to lead to prohibition.

The mere ownership of the best saddle horse or mare, implies no other merit and requires no other skill than that of placing the longest purse in the hands of the smartest jockey to pick you up the best saddle horse to be had in the Baltimore or Philadelphia market.

Out of this sum of $76 appropriated to premiums for slow stallions and slow mares, and best colts, would it not conduce to economy and the increase of Agricultural wealth, had a premium been offered to him whose capital invested in horses should bear the smallest proportion, to the amount of sales from his Plantation? For what after all is the true desideratum? Is it not to achieve the greatest results, by means the least expensive, to the end that the nett profit should be increased in proportion? So much for the premiums offered for horses These remarks which have been very hastily sketched, in a spirit of warm approbation of the objects of the society, and admiration of the patriotic zeal of its founders, will be more fully illustrated, perhaps more justly and kindly appreciated, when I come to speak of Mules and Cattle.

S. S. I.

July 23, 1842.

REVIEW OF THE PREMIUMS.

Offered by the Agricultural Society of Prince Georges County Md.

For the best Jack $5—For the best Jenny $5—For the best pair of Mules $5.

The prejudice against the Mule, seems to be as inveterate as that which impels the "heel" of every son of Adam to "bruise the serpent's head;" whether it be the head of the innocent water, or the harmless black snake, or the viper or copper-head, bloated with poison. Does this aversion to breeding Mules owe its orgin too, to a divine command—"thou shalt not let thy cattle gender with a diverse kind"? But the same prohibitory command addressed to the Jews, forbade also 'the mixing of seed," yet who deems it therefore unchristian to mingle the seed of clover and timothy?

Instead of this invidious distinction by the Committee, in favor of the Horse, offering the highest premiums for that very expensive animal, in all his ages, forms and sexes—young and old, quick and slow, male and female, it were better, we should think, to have held up the highest premium to him whose MULE POWER should bear the greatest, and HORSE POWER the least proportion, the one to the other in use, on his plantation! As for rewarding the mere exhibition of the "best pair of Mules," what length of merit can be discerned in that, unless it be that it implies length of purse to give the highest price? If driven to the ground in the owners own carriage, in lieu of a pair of $500 Vermont Horses; that would be quite a different matter.—The mode of taking the last CENSUS was very defective in many respects: For example, it only gives us the number of "HORSES AND MULES" in the aggregate; while here, at once, is an agricultural problem which requires for its investigation that we should have accurately and separately stated the number of EACH.

Twenty years ago it was estimated that the Horses in England consumed the product of twenty millions of highly cultivated acres; and Sir John Sinclair calculated the keep of one Horse to be equal to the product of five acres. Let us suppose constant work to be provided, as it should be for every horse that is kept on a plantation; do not true economy as well as humanity and justice demand, that each Horse so worked should be well fed? and if so, may not each Horse be estimated to consume, at 2½ gallons a day $56 of corn. Add to this $14 for other provender and shoeing and physicking; and you have an outlay of not less than $75 a year for every work Horse, to say nothing of idle brood Mares, Colts, carriage Horses, and other NON-PRODUCERS; a sum for each Horse equal to the purchase of a first rate Mule, while the average life of the former will not more than half equal that of the latter.

Among Planters in the South, whose position and circumstances are so identical with those of Maryland, the economy and advantages of the Mule, over the Horse, are universally admitted. The Report of another Agricultural society of South Carolina, in relation to this subject may here be quoted where it asserts: 'The Mule is more easily raised than the 'Horse more able to bear heavy burdens, 'equally strong for the draft, more patient, 'equally docile, will live twice or thrice 'as long capable of enduring much more 'labour, will do as much work in the same 'time, and will not be more than one half 'the expense, as they will not eat more 'than one half the grain, will make use 'of long forage which the delicacy of the 'Horse will reject, and will bear the heat 'full as well, perhaps better."

Should not these considerations induce Planters to ponder and reflect how far it is expedient to aggravate, by their highest honors and rewards, that natural and costly predilection of our countrymen for Horses, which may be said already to amount to a passion—one which had its orgin in deeds and days long past of.

"——Christian service and true chivalry;"

But no more congenial with this utilitarian, money-saving age of ours, than would be the vagaries of the Knight of la Mancha himself.

The last census gives for Prince George's County, Md, 4,618 Horses and Mules. This we believe to be much short of the real number. The aggregate of both for the State is returned at 92,220.

It is not extravagant to assume that 60,000 horses in Maryland might be well superseded by Mules, and taking only ten dollars as the clear saving for each, here would be a reduction of annual expenditure—in other words an increase amounting to 600,000 dollars, equal to the interest on the State's debt.

In all steady continued draft, as in threshing, grinding, and other machinery now so much in vogue, the excellence of the Mule is most remarkable, and especially in his less liability to gald—an evil to which the Horse is peculiarly subject; where his locomotion in harness is CIRCULAR On their value in service that consists of constant, steady hauling, an extract, may here be made from some editorial remarks in an old volume of the American, then conducted by Mr. Skinner, now of Washington Speaking of the decided preference given by the late General Ridgely, of Hampton, to Mules in the heavy hauling connected with his iron works, it is observed: "For some time the General indulged an old servant in keeping a single team of Horses, but it was found that the Mule teams performed their day's journey hauling equal weight, sooner than the Horses by one hour; and the greater value of the Mules has been so well established, in the course of his ample experience, that they have superceded Horses with entire conviction of the great saving accomplished by the change. This information first derived from his manager, Mr. Green, was fully confirmed by the General himself.

Why then, let it be repeated, in reference to these two animals, make fish of one and flesh of the other?—offering $76 in premiums for the Horse and $15 only for 'Jack, Jenny and Mules?" and that too under the authority and sanction of gentlemen who cannot be to much admired for their public spirit and honorable intentions; nor too closely imitated in their individual practice and general management?

As to the more general use of the Mule in light harness for the road, the common impression is, that he can't be made to TRAVEL FAST ENOUGH. No body likes rapid motion more than the writer of these crude but well meant and respectful strictures; and he would take leave to inquire, who has given to this neglected hyorid, a patient and fair trial to see how much his speed may be improved? Let it be considered how long it takes to bring a crack trotter, such as Ripton or Confidence to his best! Hiram Woodruff or Bill Wheelan, the American Chifney's among trotting jockies, never think of taking a Horse in hand, to train him for this pace until after he reaches his sixth or seventh year; and they can hardly be said to get their best work until they fall into their teens—Old Topgallant performed his CHEF D'ŒUVRES after he was twenty! When the Mule has been in like manner taken up and systematically trained for the trot, and it is found that he cannot be driven at the rate of eight miles an hour, it will be time enough to pronounce him impracticable in that pace; but the writer knows him to be master of that rate, for he has ridden with two others besides General James Shelby who drives nothing else in his private carriage, from Lexington out to his magnificent blue grass farm eight miles from Lexington, behind two Mules of about 15 hands, within the hour, and without a touch of the whip; and learned from the General that he had driven a pair to the Blue-lick a distance of forty miles in six hours, stopping one hour on the way.

In lieu then of some of the premiums bestowed on breeding stock to give animals of slow draft, and on sucking colts, would it not be more politic to lend the countenance of the society to the rearing and more general adoption, for the road as well as for the field, of a more economical and enduring animal power? might not a premium be well offered in the shape of a set of KNITTING NEEDLES in silver case, or a butter cooler of ground glass with a cow reposing on its silver lid, to the wife of the Planter who shall accompany him to the cattle show in a plain light carriage drawn by the pair of BEST BROKE MULES? —to the WIFE, because it is doubtful whether, without her Ladyship's consent this great desideratum in rural economy ever can, or perhaps, we should add, ever OUGHT TO BE ACHIEVED! Where it to be imagined that the fact would have any weight with our republican house wives, it might be added that the medals struck in honor of Aggrippina, a heroine whose life was adorned with the most noble virtues, bear on them the image of a Mule; and a gentleman at my elbow reminds me, that he has seen Charles the X setting out for his Royal Palace at Fontainebleau, 13 leagues from Paris, driving six splendid black Spanish Mules of Andalusian blood! But it would be a libel, of which I should never be guilty, to suppose that an American Matron could be influenced by any motive so strong as her ambition to promote the independence of her husband; and to set to her friends and neighbors an example of economy and good sense.

"Whoso findeth [such] a wife findeth a good thing."

S. S. I.

REMARKS OF MR. I. D. JONES, OF MARYLAND,

On the Apportionment Bill, delivered in the House of Representatives U. S. June 16, 1842.

MR. JONES rose, and addressed the House as follows:

Mr. Speaker: I regret to trouble the House with any remarks at this late hour of the day & at this late stage of the proceedings, upon this bill; but having been unavoidably absent from the House when this bill has been heretofore discussed here, (having voted upon it yesterday, for the first time, when I voted to recede from our disagreement to the amendment of the Senate relative to the ratio of representation,) I trust the House will indulge me in giving, very briefly, my views, both upon the general merits of the question and upon the attitude in which the bill now stands in reference to the two Houses.

It is now perfectly evident that the bill is threatened with an entire failure, in consequence of the difference of opinion between the two Houses of Congress, particularly as to the ratio of representation. This House passed the bill with a ratio of 50,179; the Senate amended it by substituting 70 680. The ratio proposed by the House would have given a House of Representatives of 305 members; the amendment of the Senate, with their proposed fractional representation, would make the House consist of 223, and, without the representation of fractions, of 217 members. The House returned the bill to the Senate with their disagreement to both of their amendmen's after a debate here, in which, I understand, some of the most prominent members of this House denounced the Senate as an "aristocratic body," and as insolently presumptuous in attempting to change the ratio fixed by this House.—The Senate vote to insist upon their amendments, and return the bill to us with a message to that effect. Here, it was apparent, a serious difficulty was likely to ensue. In the aspect of the case then presented, it was evident that, without a spirit of calm deliberation, of forbearance, conciliation, and compromise on the part of both Houses, the bill must be lost. But what has been the character of the debate here? I could the more readily have excused the harsh language, the excited and intemperate remarks uppon the Senate by the young member from New York, (Mr. Gordon,) but what apology or justification can be made for the extraordinary course of remark of the venerable member from Massachusetts (Mr. Adams?)

[Mr. Gordon rose and said he would like to know how much older the gentleman from Maryland was than himself.]

Mr. Jones said, I beg the gentleman's pardon. I do not claim to be so old as that gentleman. The contrast I intended was not between that gentleman and myself, but between that gentleman and the venerable gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. Adams.) I think the gentleman is not so old as the member from Massachusetts.

I listened to the remarks of the venerable and learned gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Adams) with mingled emotions of surprise and regret. That gentleman's advanced years, long political experience, and the lessons of profound philosophy which his long and eventful public life has afforded him preeminent opportunities to acquire, ought to have given us a guaranty that in such a crisis as this we should have had from him a dignified forbearance and the calm counsels of profound wisdom to smooth the way towards a speedy and friendly adjustment of the difference in opinion between the two Houses; but, instead of pouring the oil of conciliation upon the troubled waters, under the impulses of manifestly deeply excited feelings, he poured forth torrents of bitterness, and aided, by all his mighty energies, to increase the storm. He announces his preference for the most harsh proceeding toward the Senate, which is known to parliamentary law.—He would pass over the usual and conciliatory mode of insisting upon our disagreement, and inviting a conference by committees, and vote at once to adhere to our disagreement! To accomplish this, he invokes against the Senate the resentment of this House; admonishes us against crouching to the Senate; against yielding to their supercilious and presumptuous pretensions; and utters denunciations calculated to excite the prejudices of the ignorant and thoughtless against that co-ordinate branch of the National Legislature. He announces, very emphatically, that he is a *democrat!* and would protect the privileges of this House "against the encroachments of that ARISTOCRATIC BODY!"

Whilst I lament the tone and temper of these remarks as peculiarly unfortunate, unbecoming, and inappropriate to the occasion, I feel called upon to repel the imputation of ARISTOCRACY, which is thus, from so eminent a source, attempted to be cast upon the Senate. On the contrary, I maintain that it is, in all its purposes, powers, and duties, under the Constitution, ESSENTIALLY DEMOCRATIC. Gentlemen smile and seem to consider it a paradox; but if they will give me their attention for a few moments, I will demonstrate the truth of my assertion.—Democracy, when applied to the science of government, means a government of the people; that is, where the laws by which the people are governed are enacted, as far as practicable, with the consent of the whole people. A democracy, constituted upon the principle of the absolute right of the numerical majority to govern the minority at will, may degenerate, in its practical operation, into as oppressive a despotism as if it were the tyranny of one man. It is for this reason that this Government was not constituted upon that principle, but upon the admirable basis that the laws, by which the people are to be governed, shall have the sanction, not only of that numerical majority which is represented in this House, but also of a majority of the States, which are represented in the Senate; & in extreme cases, by a vote of two thirds of both Houses. This is the true American democracy: the real republicanism of our Government, approaching as nearly as practicable, to a government of the whole, for the good of the whole, and not of a bare majority, for the interest of that majority.

For instance, in a community of one thousand persons, with the absolute right of government in a bare majority, the lives, liberty, and property of four hundred and ninety nine, would be governed by laws passed by five hundred and one. This, the gentleman from Massachusetts would call democracy.—But suppose the government of this community should be so constituted, by compact among its citizens, as to require the concurrence of three-fourths of the citizens before any law could operate, then the minority of two hundred and fifty would be governed by a majority of seven hundred and fifty. Would not that be a much nearer approach to a government of the whole people than the other? And would a feature of the government which thus required a larger proportion than a bare majority to enact laws, be justly liable to the charge of being aristocratic?

Without, therefore, detaining the House with any special remarks upon the powers and duties of the Senate, I may ask if, in its very design and operation, it is not apparent that it does ensure such a concurrence of the representatives of the States in legislation, and in the discharge of its other functions, not only more effectively to protect the rights of the minority, but to render the government more democratic, more a government of the whole people, than if the people of this Union were at the mercy of a consoidated government, with the right in a bare majority to control, by its legislation, the lives, liberty, and property of the rest? I regard the Senate as one of the most admirable features of the Federal Government, as one of the proudest monuments of the wisdom of our forefathers; as the sheet anchor of the Constitution; the bulwark of liberty; the impregnable fortress which guards the reserved rights of the States.

This House, too, has its high powers and prerogatives under the Constitution, and no member here will be found readier than I to maintain and defend it to the utmost of my poor abilities, in all its constitutional privileges, and against every unjust imputation. There are bills which the Constitution has provided shall originate only in this House, but this is not one of them. The Senate had the constitutional right to originate a bill upon this subject, and to have sent it to us. In all cases, they have the heretofore unquestioned right of amending any bill which this house may pass.

I do not perceive, then, any good reason for all this extraordinary excitement, feeling, and furious denunciation against the Senate, for proposing to amend this bill, as if reciprocal amendments, by the two *Houses*, of bills which have passed the one or the other, was some unusual occurrence. Gentlemen seem to suppose that, because this bill refers exclusively to the organization of this House, fixing the number of which it shall consist under the last census, the Senate ought to have taken this bill and passed it as we sent it to to them. There is nothing in the Constitution to this effect. There is nothing to this effect in reason or in common sense. All the reasons why the Senate should have the right of amending any bill apply, at least with equal force to this; nor can I see why they should be required to give a mere formal concurrence to this bill, as passed by this House, rather than consider it as a matter submitted to them, under the Constitution, for the exercise of their best judgment, and in the conscientious discharge of this solemn duty, propose such amendments as they deemed requisite and proper.

The Senate have considered it their duty to propose amendments. This House have DISAGREED to those amendments. The Senate have INSISTED upon their amendments. This House have insisted upon their DISAGREEMENT. And the motion now pending is, that we reconsider our vote to insist upon our disagreement. If this should not prevail, I hope we shall adopt the usual proceedings in such cases, according to the parliamentary law—appoint a committee of the most considerate, discreet, and conciliatory members, to meet a similar committee on the part of the Senate, and let that joint committe of conference adjust the difference of opinion between the two Houses. If neither the ratio of the House nor Senate can be agreed upon, I do not doubt that some intermediate ratio may be selected upon, which the two Houses may unite.

But I would fain hope, if pride of opinion be not too firmly entrenched behind the breastwork of prejudice and resentment, which I fear, may have been interposed by excited denunciation, that a cool, calm, and impartial review of the real merits of the chief question at issue (to wit, the ratio of representation) will induce the House to reconsider their vote, and recede from their disagreement to that amendment of the Senate. I have no hesitation in avowing my decided preferecce for the ratio of the Senate over that of the House, and I will briefly state the grounds of that preference.

I voted against the Senate's amendment giving an additional member to those States which have a fraction over a moiety of the ratio, because, not having had time to consider the subject fully, and finding that General Washington vetoed the first apportionment bill, and that one of the grounds of his veto was this very feature, of fractional representation, I was not satisfied of the propriety of that feature, and I thought it the safest rule, when in doubt, to vote in the negative. But if the House should adopt both of the Senate's amendments, we should have a House of 223 members, instead of 305, as proposed by the House's ratio.

Now, I consider the question as to whether this House shall consist of the one number or the other as a mere question of expediency—of convenience and economy. I cannot agree with the gentlemen who represent it as a question of momentous political PRINCIPLE, and one involving the vital interests of free representative government, that this House shall be largely increased in numbers.

The argument for the smaller ratio and large House is, that there may be greater facilities for a mutual personal acquaintance between the Representative and the constituency; that the Representative may know the local wants and particular interests and wishes of those whom he represents; that his responsibility may be concentrated, and his services rendered more efficient.

It is certainly admitted that the Representative should be well acquainted with the duties which he is required to perform; and a personal acquaintance with his constituents is desirable, as far as may be practicable. But the question is, is there any thing in the *difference* between the two ratios which can so *materially* affect in the results the relation of the Representative to his constituency, so as in the one case to increase, and in the other to impair, his efficiency?

This inquiry will lead us to look a little into the Constitution of our National Government, to consider the nature and extent of its powers, and the consequent duties of Representatives in Congress.—If gentlemen will consider the peculiarities of our system of government, they will perceive that analogies drawn from the House of Commons in Great Britain and the Chamber of Duputies of France are utterly inapplicable to the House of

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc2940_scm11032-0091.jpg