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. XIV. **EASTON, MD. SATURDAY EVENING, AUGUST 20, 1831** **NO. 34.**

PRINTED & PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY EVENING
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.

From the U. S Gazette.

TO THE PUBLIC.
LETTER 2.

Correspondence with Tho: Ritchie, Esq.

I find myself compelled to interrupt the regular current of these letters, and of course, to break in upon the consecutive details of past events, by a violent, personal, and scurrilous attack, from the pen of Thomas Ritchie, Esq. Editor of the Richmond Enquirer, who, to his other numerous functions of a public and political character, adds that of a defender of the Jackson faith, and especial guardian of the infallibility of the president. An assault from such a quarter demands attention. When Mr. Ritchie speaks, a nation listens; the fate of the country hangs trembling on his pen; and every disciple of reform bows his head,—as the voice of the Apostle announces the doctrines of truth in the tones of consistency and patriotism.

Effects cease to be wonderful, when the cause that produced them are expounded. The pique and mortification of a private letter, from me to Mr. Ritchie, has produced an effervescence of political rage, that no possible combination of public circumstances could, perhaps ever have brought forth, however formidable and threatening to the country. In this fact, while I perceive and acknowledge a fresh instance of his patriotism, I cannot omit to observe, that I should have felt more of that admiration which his pre-eminent consistency excites—had he shown more of the coolness of temper, and self-possession, that characterises age in his brief, but bitter phillipic against the Protocol of the Original Jackson men, which I challenge him to analyse or confute. While, however, I scarcely regret that a private wrong, and not a public grievance, has excited him so much from his wonted propriety, I cannot but rejoice that the infirmities which accompany old age, however piteous to behold, have afforded me an opportunity of revealing to Mr. Ritchie, some of those aberrations on the part of general Jackson, from his puritanical creed, of which he either remains in ignorance, or has the hypocrisy to discredit. As a venerable editor, I would fain treat Mr. Ritchie with all that deference and respect due to grey hairs—but that his age has failed to bring with it either the comity, the wisdom, or the virtue which should accompany the yellow leaf of the declining politician. Mr. Ritchie has been all in the wrong since 1828. He belongs to a past age. He is a piece of history—a monument of other times—a remnant of things lost in the political flood. His instincts—his perceptions—his judgment—are 100 years in the rear of this political epoch. As well might a mummy of Egypt uncoil its own bandages, as Mr. Ritchie fit himself for the political era of 1831. Had nature even reversed her laws, and given his mind vigor as his body decayed in strength—still would Mr. R- prove unequal to the task he has assumed—even supposing that flattery had not destroyed the little vigor which age and vanity had spared. But to business—

The principle charge adduced by Mr. Ritchie is having solicited general Jackson to stand a candidate for re-election.

The facts are these:—About January of this year, much speculation was afloat touching the identical point which is made the groundwork of the Protocol—whether general Jackson would forfeit his character for consistency and good faith by running for a second term? Understanding him even then—well acquainted with his inordinate ambition, and the little respect he paid to any principle in its gratification I ventured to maintain that he would press his suit for a re-election—whilst those in the interest of the Pennsylvania Inquirer, who were then opposed to him—took the opposite ground—insisting that he would retire, to save his character and fame. In order to ascertain the fact, I addressed a note to Major Eaton, asking the question. His answer was couched in the usual canting terms—that General Jackson neither sought nor declined office, and that if again nominated by the people, he would again be a candidate. An extract from this letter was published in the Pennsylvania Inquirer and formed the semi-official note that he was a candidate for re-election. I have no copy of my letter, but I have a distinct recollection, that it contained a mere request to know the determination of Gen. Jackson touching a second term and, although Mr. Ritchie appears to have agonised under a partial violation of the sanctuary of private correspondence, I can scarcely believe Eaton to have been so base, or Lewis so reckless, as to provoke that fatal retaliation, which such a dishonorable procedure might excite.

But how did the people of Pennsylvania solicit general Jackson to become a candidate for re-election? The whole process is well known to me as combining the trick of the juggler with the art of the charlatan. A letter was written by Mr. Henry Toland, then residing with general Jackson, at Washington, to Mr. George Guier, a guager in the custom house of this city, urging him to call a public meeting to nominate the president for re-election. A similar letter was written to general Krepps, of the legislature at Harrisburg, franked by Gen. Jackson himself, and written by Mr. Andrew J. Donelson, his private secretary—urging Mr Krepps to call a caucus of the members to renominate him!!! At this period, Mr. John Pemberton, naval officer, of this port, was also at Washington, and was also active in this farce of a nomination of the people! when the whole proceeding emanated immediately from Gen. Jackson himself, or those holding commissions under him, or those deeply indebted to him for the highest obligations! The caucus at Harrisburg, was tended by a minority of the legislature—and the meeting in this city, by less than a hundred active persons. Comment on such a system is superfluous. It would insult the understanding of the people, were it necessary to tell them they were tricked, abused, and defrauded, by such a flagrant abuse of the power of government over public opinion: by such a mockery of all that has affinity to popular movements, popular predilections or popular nominations. No, Mr. Ritchie—when general Jackson is nominated for re-election, it must be through the people—not through his office-holders—not by letters from the palace—or implied promises of preferment by the president—but by the people in the mass—in their majesty—and in their purity! But this can never be again.

Of Gen. Jackson's ambition for power, *I* have the proofs in my possession; that he is not very scrupulous of the *means* he makes use of to gratify that dangerous passion, *I* have also proof, and may in time produce it. But I would save his laurels—he has done the State some service—and I would rather smooth the down-hill path of his life by urging him to a seasonable retirement than be compelled to plant a thorn in the pillow of his age. Can Mr Ritchie with all his *venerable sympathies about him* venture to say as much?

The occasion and character of the following correspondence is soon explained. It is well known, throughout this state, that, immediately upon my rejection by the senate, the legislature of Pennsylvania transmitted to the president a *unanimous request* for my appointment to an office of equal magnitude. This gave rise to much negociation on the part of Major Lewis, Mr. Jesper Harding, and others in the confidence of the President; a full history of which must be deferred to a future day Suffice it at present to say, that I had no reasonable cause to complain of the conduct of the president in respect to office. In the progress of this business Mr. Harding stated, that Major Lewis remarked that Mr. Ritchie had interposed his "veto" against my re-nomination to the senate—and declared that his state would secede from gen Jackson if I was again sent to the senate!—Major Lewis resented it as the sole obstacle to my appointment. A story so preposterous naturally excited incredulity; and, from a knowledge of Major Lewis's character I pronounced it a figment of his own brain. To satisfy Mr. Harding of this fact, *I* determined to address a letter to Mr. Ritchie, the *venerable and consistent* editor of the Richmond Inquirer, which resulted in the following correspondence. The reader will not fail to remark, with what *indifference* Mr. Ritchie replies to the charge of Gen Jackson having "arranged" the *Inquirer* & how *tenderly* he solicits me to *correspond* with Maj Lewis on the subject—or, in other words, to "continue in the party, and receive a consideration for concealing malpractices, that ought to shock even the callous nerves of the Patriot Ritchie!"

Copy of a letter from Stephen Simpson to Thomas Ritchie. Esq.

PHILADELPHIA, May 18, 1831.

SIR—

Having been given to understand, through a channel, entitled to full credit, that you have been consulted by some friends of the president, as to the influence which might be produced in *your state* by my re-appointment to an office within the circle of senatorial confirmation, and that your opinion was unfavorable to such an appointment, which you represented as calculated to *sour Virginia*; permit me to trespass so far on your candor and politeness as to inquire whether you did give such an opinion—and if you did, upon what ground you formed that opinion?

My object in thus inquiring, is far from being one of idle curiosity; it aims as much to vindicate you from what *I* believe an unjust imputation, as to afford me a true and proper perception of the conduct of others. You have not, to my knowledge, publicly avowed the opinion, that to have been once connected with the Press creates a disqualification to hold office during life! I now desire to know whether you hold this doctrine, and whether, under its impression, you have given advice to any of the friends of the president, (say Major Lewis) solicited by them?

In case my information should prove correct, will you do me the additional favor of stating your reasons for the conclusion you have assumed, that Virginia concurs with you in this opinion? whether it is an inference declared from the *conduct* of her Senators—whether they are identified with the State or whether you allude to the great mass of her patriotic and intelligent people? For I should require something more than assertion to induce me to credit that the *latter* cherished a sentiment so proscriptive—a sentiment so utterly at war with all our notions of liberty, and principles of right—and a proscription which no party has ventured to apply to any other class of citizens in the republic! It therefore becomes incredible, that one of our own fraternity should join in a denunciation of his brethren, and, through them, of himself!

I trust you will find, in the nature of this communication, a sufficient apology for its frankness. Your speedy answer will oblige me

Major Lewis has been in this city for some time negociating for the "purchase of a paper" through the equivalent of government patronage. This procedure may meet with the approbation of those whose fastidious patriotism would object to the appointment of a man who five years ago, was editor of a daily journal—holding an unchangeable course for principles and for men; but who never will sacrifice one to the other—an immutable good for a mutable evil.

With respect, *I* am, Sir, your fellow citizen,
STEPHEN SIMPSON.

THOMAS RITCHIE, Esq.
Editor Richmond Inquirer.
Richmond, Va.

P. S.—Should circumstances render it expedient, I promise myself the pleasure of addressing you a series of letters through the public papers.

[Thomas Ritchie, Esq. to Stephen Simpson.]

Sir—*I* have no recollection of ever having been consulted by any of the president's friends as to the effects of your re-appointment to office, or of my having expressed any opinion, as to the effect it might have in "souring Virginia."

Averse as *I* have been to executive appointments of editors to office, I have certainly never gone so far as to avow, or entertain the belief, "that to have been connected with the public press, creates a disqualification to hold office during life."

Each case must depend upon its own circumstances; but *I* could in no case wish to see our executive office so given, as to impugn the chastity of the press. Of the purity of the president's motives, *I* have no doubt.* *I* wish, I could entertain as little of the effect ultimately, of conferring so many offices upon Editors.

I have no knowledge of the proceedings you attribute to major Lewis But I hope and suspect that you have been misinformed. Would it not be better for you to communicate to him what you may have heard?

Yours, THO: RITCHIE.

Richmond, May 23, 1831.

To this letter of Mr. Ritchie, *I* transmitted the following response

*P*hilada. June 28 1831

Sir—Your letter of the 23d ult was duly received. It contains no sentiment to which I, or a pure republican, or a stern patriot can object; but it effectually fixes upon major Lewis a character which common fame had always appointed for him, and which my own experience confirms; it will brand him with the odious and degrading trait of systematic mendacity

The occasion of my addressing you was this, major Lewis, in a conversation with the proprietor, Mr. Harding—and Mr. Morris, the writer of the Pennsylvania Inquirer, had affirmed that Mr. Ritchie had been consulted, and he declared that if Mr. Simpson were re nominated, it would deprive Virginia from the support of General Jackson. In what manner you were empowered to speak on behalf of the state of Virginia, he did not explain, nor how the case of an individual, added to the large list of editorial appointments, could either infect or restore any supposed principle involved in the act.

You have completely exposed this gross, wanton and dastardly falsehood by a simple denial of the bare faced allegation of major Lewis

As it respects the offer of Lewis, to buy up the journal in question, I did not speak from rumor, but from knowledge. You may see the whole transaction exposed in the U. States' Telegraph,† and a confirmation of the fact in the columns of the paper alluded to—I mean that purchased. It would be extremely idle, therefore, to communicate to Major Lewis a fact which he well knows I am perfectly familiar with. In truth the unblushing corruptions of this administration have long formed a theme for my animadversions with the President himself: and at last, as a re election approached have become so flagrant and open, that no man can shut his eyes to the glare of pollution, whose beams penetrate every nook and corner of the Union, and flash upon every observer the conviction of a Walpole ministry, having the patronage of government now in their hands, which they abuse for the special purpose of securing a re-election. Does this, sir, meet with your approbation?

Time as it rolls on, gives birth to the most unexpected revolutions, and realises the most incredible predictions. To you belongs the peculiar sagacity of having foriseen, and announced in anticipation to the world, that Jackson's election would 'prove a curse to the country'—and to myself attaches the discredit of having been originally instrumental in producing the revolution, which eventuated in his success. We are both to blame—you for having supported a man, whose election you thought would bring a curse on the republic and *I* for having been so grossly deluded as to imagine that a mere military tact in Indian warfare & Indian negotiation, formed a qualification for the high functions of supreme government, in its civil duties, requiring enlarged science—profound jurisprudence, and practical and refined statesmanship.

Of the purity of the President's motives I have little to say, and it as little concerns the people to know or to believe that good intentions will never atone for actions, or palliate ruinous measures; and all the patriotism of all the Romans could not justify him in sacrificing the country—its moral sense—its unsullied honor—its virtuous sympathies, and its political integrity; to the reputation of a political charlatan—the vanity of a favorite, without either principles or talents—or the character of a woman of at least dubious pretensions to an equality with Cæsars wife.

For the first time, in the history of this country, we behold the amazing spectacle of a DOUBLE cabinet a private irresponsible one—Eaton, Kendall, Lewis & Co.—and a nominal political one whose only qualifications is a ready acquiescence with the decrees of the former, and non-resistence to the caprice of a lady. Comment is supererogatory. This country has never before been visited by the degradation.

The original friends of Jackson nominated him, & were pledged to sustain him only for ONE TERM! Standing somewhat conspicuous in that part, I am bound to the people, as well as to my principles, to give him no support for a re-election. This I shall proclaim to the people, with my reasons, for a cause originally prompted by a desire to reform what *I* conceived to be gross abuses, subsequently confirmed by his own declarations, and since frequently attested by his avowals, his conversations, and his messages to congress.—(See note.)

Yours, &c.
STEPHEN SIMPSON.

Note.—It is impossible to conceive of more gross tergiversations and more inveterate ambition, than is shown in the discrepancy between the professions and actions of President Jackson, having abandoned all his old positions except that relating to the Bank of the United States, and even this he is now willing to *compromise*.

---

*This has now become a trite and fulsome compliment to power, to ascribe the pure motives to impure actions! The appointment of those editors, who had grossly villified the president and his wife, could not have been from pure motives. Touching my own appointment, I shall show in the course of these letters that it never would have occurred, but for my decided and avowed hostility to his administration. Mr Norvel holds his appointment as Post Master of Detroit, on the same grounds,—more of this hereafter. Yet Mr Ritchie palavers about the chastity of the press, and the purity of the president's motives!

The advice contained in the concluding sentence, was More friendly than pure; and how such a political anchorite as Mr. Ritchie, so exemplary a reformer, and so consistent a patriot, could ever have permitted its conception to soil his chaste mind, *I* cannot imagine. *It* proves, however, that he is perfectly conversant with the *means made use of by the administration to preserve its adherents.*

---

†Not communicated by me, but evidently coming from one familiar with the transactions.

Such was the correspondence, which has excited so violent an effusion of wrath and denunciation on the part of the venerable and consistent editor of the Richmond Inquirer—who as if ambitious to emulate "the roaring of the Lion," has so effectually lost sight of the dignity of the man, and the politeness of the gentleman. On a future occasion, I shall hold up to this autocrat of the press, a mirror that will reflect his real character, in colors calculated to disturb even his self complacency. I have complimented him for his *polite sagacity* in respect to General Jackson, but I shall never flatter him for his *honesty*, his *candor*, his *politeness* or his *principles*, or envy him for his wit, temper, or benevolence.

STEPHEN SIMPSON.

Hamilton, near Philada. Aug. 3, 1831.

From the U. S Gazette.

THE BRITISH W. INDIA TRADE.
V.

At the session of congress commencing in December, 1825, a memorial from Baltimore, praying for the repeal of the discriminating duties, gave occasion for a report from the committee on commerce, and the introduction of a bill providing for such repeal.

When this bill was introduced, the president and Mr. Clay, (being called on by some of its advocates) declared their entire willingness that it should be passed into a law; but they abstained from exerting any executive influence, either for or against it.

The decision of the Senate, which was not a party vote at all, after a full view of the whole ground, was against the repeal of the duties.

In the house of Representatives, the same subject was started, but no vote taken upon it.

At the same session, the nomination of Mr. Gallatin, as successor to Mr. King, was made and confirmed. He sailed early in the summer for Europe, and was furnished with instructions drawn up by Mr. Clay, which directed him to inquire, whether if an act of congress were passed repealing all the restrictions, and admitting the British idea of *coasting trade* between London or Halifax and Jamaica, &c. and abolishing all discriminating duties the British government would meet such a measure with corresponding regulations, on terms of reciprocity.

The proposition comprised in this enquiry was, therefore, that the direct trade should be open to the vessels of both nations, without *alien* duties on either side. American vessels departing from the islands might go *any where*, except to other British ports. British vessels departing from the United States, to go any where, except to other ports of the United States. And whatever goods might be carried by British vessels from our ports to the colonial ports, might equally be carried in American vessels.

This differed from the former proposition in leaving to the British to impose whatever rate of duties they might think proper, on their own vessels coming into the colonial ports, from other colonial ports, or from England.

The principle of reciprocity was perfectly guarded, and the utmost freedom of commercial intercourse was contemplated, in this proposal.

It will be seen that the position thus assumed for the nation by Mr. Clay, was subsequently and not long ago, almost unanimously approved by Congress; but has been shamefully abandoned by Mr McLane and president Jackson.

The refusal of congress to repeal the discriminating duties, gave umbrage to the British government; or was used at least as a plea for another change of their plans.

After the appointment of Mr. Gallatin was made known, and within a few days of his arrival in England, an order of council was issued closing the colonial ports, absolutely, against the commerce of the United States, but keeping them open to all other nations.

The alledged reason for this strange and almost hostile proceeding, was that the United States had not placed the commerce of England and her possessions, on the footing of the most favored nation!

The hollowness of this pretext, we have already seen. Mr. Van Buren's instructions, as above cited, state the case fairly. A preliminary explanation was *necessary*, was indispensable and was not offered; when asked for it, was not given. Discriminating or alien duties were *actually* levied on American vessels in *some* of the british colonial ports. The British government had agreed to adopt reciprocity as the basis of an arrangement; it would not be expected therefore, that while their alien duties on our vessels were continued, congress would be willing to repeal our alien duties on *their* vessels

It would have been a most ill timed abandonment of the *principle* to which we had adhered since 1789—which we had *compelled* them to adopt in practice, as to the trade between this country and England—and in *theory* by the admission of its justice and propriety, as to the colonial trade itself.

As to what the executive department of the government might have done—it is also plain that having called upon the official representative of the British government, to say whether the commerce with this country was to be affected by the British construction of their recent act of parliament—nothing more could be done while congress had the matter before them in a bill reported and under discussion. It is not according to the spirit of our institutions for the executive to control, nullify or dictate the determination of the representatives of the people, in the national legislature

It was not until late in May, 1826, when congress adjourned without having passed the bill on their table that the executive could with constitutional propriety, take any decisive step in the business; Mr Gallatin was dispatched forthwith, and furnished with instructions to make an overture of the most unexceptionable character.

Mr Canning, at that time prime minister as well as secretary for foreign affairs, was much puzzled to find good reason for this proceeding of his government, particularly as Russia and France being nations without colonies, had equally with the United States omitted to put British commerce, in their ports, on the footing of that of the most favoured nation. He suddenly resorted to the obsolete doctrines of colonial trade, and told Mr. Gallatin that it was entirely a mistake to suppose that reciprocity had any thing to do in the matter;—that all trade with colonies, was a mere indulgence and boon to other nations; and therefore, to be regulated by the irresponsible will of the mother country, and by that alone.

Whether Mr. Canning preserved a grave countenance when he was writing that letter, is not recorded; certainly the shift was somewhat ludicrous. But two years previous, his government had declared that reciprocity was the very basis on which they desired to found an arrangement. This was of course disavowed by the new doctrine; and the notion of a coasting trade was equally *nullified*.

Mr. Canning had now taken a position which even his fine powers of eloquence could not possibly maintain. He knew very well that the logical batteries of Mr Gallatin and Mr. Clay would tear him to pieces. He dreaded the encounter; and shrinking from the discussion he announced the administration of the British government (that is of himself) not to make this business the subject of any further negociation.

This was after Mr. Addington and Mr. Huskinson had been specially appointed to negotiate: after an express understanding that negociation should be resumed; and after reciprocity had been conceded as the proper basis of an arrangement. But Mr Canning had advanced a notion so Chinese and preposterous—that no resource was left but the dogged resolution to say no more and listen to no more upon the subject.

Mr. Gallatin had other business in hand and remained in London

When congress met in December 1826, the whole correspondence, &c. was of course laid before them by the President.

My next communication will bring the narrative down to the time when the present administration came into office. X. Y.

VI.

The session of Congress of 1826-7, being the second in the period of Mr Adams' administration, passed away also without the adoption of any decisive measure of legislation.

The instructions of Mr. Clay to Mr Gallatin, and the correspondence of Mr. Gallatin with Mr. Canning—the correspondence also of Mr. Clay with Mr. Vaughan, and the order of council closing the British colonial ports, were laid before congress, with a recommendation of the whole subject to their attention, and a suggestion that congress should proceed in the matter with a single view, to the best interests of American commerce.

A report from the committee of commerce, in the house of representatives, and another from the similar committee of the senate, *both* sustained fully the course which had been taken by the executive. Bills being introduced into each house, were fully discussed, and that of the senate was passed and sent to the lower house, for concurrence.

Amendments being made, in which the senate refused to concur, the bill failed, on the day before the close of the session.

It was afterwards ascertained, that the bill, either as passed by the senate, or as amended by the house, would not have been considered satisfactory by the British ministry. The difference between the schemes of the two houses was not material to the principle involved; but related chiefly to the over-land trade with Canada.

In the course of the discussions, nothing was said against the positions taken by Mr. Clay, in his instructions to Mr. Gallatin; but Gen Smith (the Senator from Maryland) who had led the previous effort to repeal the discriminating duties expressly disavowed any intention to censure the administration and declared distinctly, that the omission to act on the British proposal, comprised in their law of July 5, 1825, had been the omission of *congress* entirely.

In the same year, the death of Mr. Canning, and accession of a new ministry in England, gave occasion to Mr. Gallatin to enquire of the new secretary for foreign affairs, whether the British government would now meet the advance of the American, if an act of congress should be passed, removing the interdict on our part, &c.

The answer of Lord Dudly was, that the British government could not say they would be satisfied with any act of Congress that could be passed; that it would depend on the details of the act, and the actual condition and disposition of Great Britain at the moment; and finally, that no reply would be given to such enquiries, because any stipulation on the subject would be a departure from the determination of the British government, not to make this business again the subject of a negociation.

The actual interdict on our part, upon British vessels; coming from the interdicted ports followed as a matter of course, under the provisions, of the act of 1822; which congress not being chosen to repeal, it was the duty of the executive to carry into effect.

At the meeting of congress, in December 1827, the following view of the subject was presented in the president's message:

'At the commencement of the last session of Congress, they were informed of the sudden and unexpected exclusion, by the British Government, of access, in vessels of the United States, to all their colonial ports, except those immediately bordering upon our own territories. In the amicable discussions which have succeeded the adoption of this measure, which as it affected harshly the interests of the United States, became a subject of expostulation on our part, the principles upon which its justification has been placed, have been of a *diversified* character. It has been once ascribed to a mere recurrence to the old long established principle of colonial monopoly, and at the same time to a feeling of resentment, because the offers of an Act of Parliament opening the colonial ports upon certain conditions had not been grasped at with sufficient eagerness by an instantaneous conformity to them. At a subsequent period, it has been intimated that the new exclusion was in resentment because a prior Act of Parliament, of 1822 opening certain colonial ports, under heavy and burthensome restrictions to vessels of the United States had not been reciprocated by an admission of British vessels from the colonies and their cargoes *without any restriction* or discrimination whatever. But, be the motive for the interdiction what it may the British Government have manifested no disposition either by negociations, or by corresponding legislative enactments, to recede from it, and we have been given distinctly to understand, that neither of the bills which were under the consideration of Congress at their last session, would have been deemed sufficient, in their concessions to be *rewarded* by any relaxation from the British interdict."

* * * * * * * * * *

'It becomes not the self respect of the United States, either to solicit gratuitous favors, or to accept *as the grant of a favor* that for which an ample equivalent is exacted. It remains to be determined by the respective governments whether the trade shall be opened by acts of

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc2940_scm11030-0112.jpg