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. XV. EASTON, MD. SATURDAY EVENING, FEBRUARY 11, 1832. NO. 6.

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.

Mr. Hayne's Speech on the Tariff.

(CONTINUED.)

The case which I have stated, of the bale of woollens, illustrates the unequal operation of this system upon the agricultural industry of the south, and the manufacturing industry of the north. What is true of a single bale, is true of the whole amount of foreign importations which are taxed for the protection of domestic manufacture—true of the eight millions of imports received in exchange for the productions of South Carolina—and of the forty millions received in exchange for the productions of the plantation States, or at least of so much thereof as embrace the protected articles. Our northern friends say, however, that part of our cotton and rice belongs to them. Be it so. Whatever remains to us, and is rightfully ours, is subjected to the unequal system which *I* have above described. Sir, it is put beyond all dispute, that the agricultural industry of the South is taxed, unequally unjustly, enormously taxed in its foreign exchanges, in order to render profitable the manufacturing industry of the North. Taxed, I will not say to what extent—but precisely to the amount of the duty imposed for protection, and the price added to the domestic article, whatever these may be. It is said, sir, that the consumer pays the tax, and that the tariff States pay their full portion of the tax on their consumption. Sir, I think this may be well doubted- our habits are different. A South Carolina farmer, whose crop is worth a thousand dollars, sends, perhaps, the whole of it to market and exchanges it for foreign productions, paying it may be, a duty of fifty per cent. His tax would be five hundred dollars; the northern or western farmer raising produce to the value of a thousand dollars, will consume nine hundred of it on his farm, and exchange but 100 of it for foreign articles, and be subjected to a duty of only $50. This difference of habits between the different parts of the country, is greater than would be supposed possible. I have known a wealthy planter in the neighborhood of Charleston, that did not raise a single article that was not sent to foreign markets, and who purchased everything that was consumed by himself or his slaves. His cloth from England, his wines from France, his horses, mules and hogs from the west—his corn from Maryland—wooden ware, potatoes, and other notions, from New England; and I assure our New England friends, that although we do not relish all of their notions, there are some that we prize very highly.

But, sir, if the consumer did in every case pay the whole amount of the tax, and the consumption was in exact proportion to the population, could gentlemen even then fail to see the wide difference in the operation of the protecting system on the two sections, when they consider that the tariff States are *remunerated* and more than remunerated, for any tax which they may pay, in the bounties they receive, while we receive no remuneration whatever. If this be doubted, I will apply a test, which, I think, cannot possibly deceive us. Do our New England brethren not understand their own interests? Do you think, sir that they would be very apt to fall in love with taxation and court the impositions of burthens? How comes it then that they have been taught to believe that 'taxation is no tyranny,' but on the contrary, the greatest of earthly blessings? Why is it, that they would regard as the heaviest of calamities, the reduction of the public burthens! Is it not clear, then, that they regard the duties as a bounty to their industry and that they know that they have the power to indemnify themselves for all that they pay in duties.

But, sir, there is another view of this matter which demonstrates, I think still more plainly, the inequality of the system *I* allude to its effect upon the people of he South, as producers of the articles which are exchanged for foreign commodities. There are very able men, sir, who have undertaken to prove that we suffer from this system chiefly in our character as producers. To my mind, it is morally certain that the people of the south, either as producers or comsumers, support a burthen nearly, if not entirely, equal to the whole amount of the tax levied on their importations. The precise manner in which this operates, is a problem not so easy of solution. *I* will endeavor to explain, however, very briefly, my conception of the process.

We will suppose a perfectly free trade to be carried on between the Southern States and Great Britain—that is to say, that the articles on both sides were admitted duty free. In this state of things a progressive tax, equal to five per cent per annum, is imposed on British manufactures for the protection of our own. The first duty of five per cent. would, doubtless be added to the price. Before this progressive duty had advanced many steps, however, the period would arrive when no additional charge could be sustained by the consumer without a reduction of his consumption. The next five per cent, then imposed, would have to be sustained by the merchant or the foreign manufacturer, or the producer of the cotton, and would most probably be divided among them In this manner, as the system progressed, the profits of the merchant would be reduced to the lowest scale; those of the manufacturer would also be brought down, and the Southern producer would, in his turn, be compelled to submit to a reduction in the price of his productions. Each successive step in the further progress of the system would sink lower and lower the price of his cotton, until it was reduced to the very lowest sum that would pay the expense of its production. The very next step must, of course, annihilate the trade by rendering it unprofitable to all concerned.—Sir, there may be a difference of opinion as to the point to which we have now arrived in the progress of the system, (for let it be remembered that the system is still progressing) but to my mind it is clear that we have long since passed the point at which any further reduction of profits could possibly be extorted from the merchant or the manufacturer; and that every successive increase of the tax, for years past, has fallen almost exclusively upon the producer.

The proof of this is to be found in the fact that cotton has, within a few years, been gradually falling, until it has lost more than two thirds of its value, and now barely pays the expense of its production, bringing down with it the wages of our agricultural labor and capital to the very lowest point. Some gentlemen insist that the Southern producer now bears nearly the whole of the tax, while the gentlemen on the other side contend that it is a maxim universally true that the "consumer pays the tax." I am inclined to think that the truth lies in the middle. I can certainly conceive a state of things in which the producer would, as such, pay nearly the whole of the tax; but, except where the tax is a very moderate one, or is imposed upon the absolute necessaries of life, it is impossible that the whole of the weight could be thrown upon the consumer. No one, surely, would contend that if any community were in the habit of consuming fifty millions of foreign goods, imported duty free, they could afford to consume any thing like the same amount under a duty of 50 per cent., if the whole duty were added to the price. But whether the tax be in general paid by the producer or the consumer, or be divided between them, to my mind it is clear that in the actual condition of things, the burthen falls most unjustly and unequally on the Southern States. I will illustrate this. We will assume South Carolina annually exchanges eight millions of dollars' worth of cotton & rice for foreign goods, paying a duty of fifty per cent., equal to four millions of dollars.—Now, suppose the consumer to pay the whole tax, how would the account stand? Assume that no more than one half our importations are consumed at home say $4,000,000

The tax, at 50 per cent, would be 2,000,000
Suppose two millions exchanged with our northern brethren for protected articles, the increased price of which would be equal to the duty, this would be 1,000,000

Making $3,000,000

The remaining two millions being exchanged for unprotected articles, a tax of one million would be paid on the consumption by our Southern and Western brethren. From this state of the case it would follow, that, if the consumer pays the whole tax, we would pay as consumers three millions out of these four imposed upon the foreign articles received in exchange for our productions, though we should consume only half of them. But if we take it for granted that the tax cannot be added to the price, we would of course get back no part of the duties paid at the custom house and in that case we should bear the whole burthen. It has been said that the duties on imported articles fall chiefly on the merchant and the foreign manufacturer; but I hold this to be impossible, for surely two or three per cent. is the utmost reduction that can be made from the profits of the merchant, and not much more could be taken off from those of the manufacturer. Indeed, how could it be expected that the American demand for British manufactures would materially affect their price. when not more, probably, than a twentieth part of the whole finds a market on this country. It is on the American producer, therefore, that this tax must chiefly fall. Sir, the duties upon imports are either paid by the consumer or they are not. If they are paid by him, I have shown that the far greater portion of the duties on the goods received in exchange for our cotton falls upon the planter, and that for this he receives no remuneration whatever. If the duties are not paid by the consumer—that is to say, if they are not added to the price—then it is manifest that the whole amount of duties falls upon us without the possibility of relieving ourselves from any part of the burden. As to the popular notion that all consumers must pay equally, I will ask any gentleman to tell me how it is with those who consume the tax? Here is a tax of sixteen millions imposed directly or indirectly upon southern production. Fourteen millions of this amount are transferred to the north, and there consumed. Are the consumers of these fourteen millions taxed on their consumption paid as highly as those who have the whole amount?

Sir, I have done with this branch of the subject. Great as are the present evils of the system to the South, there are greater still—in prospect. We are seriously threatened with the entire loss of the foreign markets for our productions. All trade is but an exchange of equivalents, and is founded on the maxim of "give and take." If you exclude British goods from our market, you, in effect, exclude our cotton from their markets. It is in vain to tell us that England must have our cotton. You may force her to do without it. Even now she supplies herself, to a great extent, from other countries; from the East *India* possessions, Egypt, Brazil, and elsewhere; and you will make it her interest, in the end, to give up the American trade entirely. Even now she is looking to this as a possible event. You find her encouraging the production of cotton in the East Indies, by a discriminating duty to which you have forced her, and stimulating the production of the article in South America, where she is furnished with a market for her manufactures, almost duty free. Can we, then, be blind to the fate that awaits us when the American System shall be consummated, and we shall be cut off from a market for seven hundred thousand bales of our cotton; an event that it is hardly necessary for me to say, would involve the whole South in irretrievable ruin. It is idle for gentlemen to pretend that the North can ever furnish a home market for all the cotton of the South. Two or three hundred thousand bales is the utmost extent to which we could find a market in that quarter. The catalogue of the evils of this system, however, is not yet completed. It is not merely the mischief it has done, and the still greater evils which it threatens, but it has arrested our march to greatness and prevented us from fulfilling our high destinies. What would have been the condition of this country now, if we had never been deprived of the blessings of free trade? Why is it that our tonnage and our exports have not grown with our growth, and strengthened with our strength? It is because our prosperity has been blasted by the restrictive system. Look, sir, at this picture. In 1810, with a population of seven millions, we had a tonnage of one million four hundred thousand. In 1831, with a population of thirteen millions, our tonnage is reduced to one million two hundred thousand; and, going still further back, in the year 1800, our exports amounted to eighty one millions, while now, with a population of thirteen millions, our exports are reduced to seventy two millions.

Thus, while our population has increased nearly threefold, our foreign commerce has not advanced at all. Sir, if Washington's free trade system had continued unto this day, (for be it remembered that Alexander Hamilton's protecting system was essentially a system of free trade, imposing duties only of from five to seven and a half per cent.) can it be doubted that we should now have had a tonnage of two millions and a half, & that our exports would have amounted to one hundred and fifty millions. I am told that one of the ablest financiers in this country has recently declared that he should consider an average duty of twelve or fifteen per cent ad valorum as abundantly sufficient for all the purposes of revenue; and that, under such a system, our imports and exports would in his opinion, exceed a hundred millions of dollars the very first year. I know, Mr. President, that it has sometimes been said that the evils under which the South is suffering arise from the over-production of cotton; but this is not so. Cotton is an article the production of which cannot be overdone. It is the cheapest of all known raw materials. It is fast superseding silk, wool, hemp and flax, all over the world. As a proof of this, I will advert to the fact, that during a period in England, when her woollen manufactures advanced from five millions of pounds sterling to six, the cotton manufactures progressed from one million to more than thirty. If you would take off your duties and throw open to us the markets of the world, American cottons would, to a great extent, supersede all others, and we should find a market not for one, but two millions of bales. The whole South would then, indeed, become a 'garden spot.' But it is insisted by the supporters of the protecting system, that its only effect is to make our goods come cheaper. Sir, if this were true, I will venture to assert, that the manufacturers themselves would be the very first to abandon the system. Their object, certainly, is not to lessen, but to increase their prices. Even if this were the case, however, I am unable to discover how the cotton planter could be compensated for the loss of his market. How is this supposed reduction to be brought about? By competition, say the gentlemen, between the British and American manufacturer But if it is competition that is to produce this reduction of prices, the manufacturer, on both sides, must be put on an equal footing.—What sort of competition is this which is founded on a discrimination of fifty per cent in favor of one of the parties—and if, in spite of such a discrimination, the contest can be maintained at all is it not, by that fact, put beyond dispute, that but for the tax, the prices would be still further reduced? Gentlemen take it for granted that the competition among the foreign manufacturers is not sufficiently great to reduce the price to the very lowest rate. They even tell us of combinations among them to keep up their prices. Sir, such combinations are utterly impossible. How are the manufacturers of iron in Sweden, Russia, and England, or the cotton and silk manufacturers of France to enter into a combination? The thing is ridiculous. No, sir, if the duties were taken off, the prices of goods would be reduced to their minimum, and much lower than they are now in this country, and it is for this reason, and this only, that the manufacturers are protesting against it. But, sir, where is the evidence to be found that the tariff has produced any reduction whatever, in the price of the protected articles. Is there any other foundation for the assertion than this: that the prices of cottons, woollens, and iron, have actually fallen since 1824? But all other articles have likewise fallen, protected and unprotected. Real and personal estate, cotton, flour, and tobacco, all—all have gone down; and most of them have fallen in a much greater degree than woollens, cottons, and iron. Has the tariff done all this?—What say the gentlemen? I have here a price current containing the prices of 250 articles, in 1816 and 1831. From this it appears that there has been an universal reduction in the price of articles of every description, and that those admitted duty free have been reduced, at least in an equal ratio with those paying duties—Indeed sir, *I* think that a careful examination of this table will shew, that reduction in the protected articles has not been so great as in the others. But the reduction has not been confined to this country. It has taken place in England, and all over the world, in an equal way, in a greater degree. The very articles most highly protected in this country, cottons woollens, and iron, are now selling in England much lower than they can be obtained here. This is a fact perfectly notorious to every importing merchant, and I have abundant evidence of it now in my hands. Here are statements shewing that such goods have actually been imported within the last year, in Philadelphia, New York, and elsewhere, and after paying duties of from fifty to one hundred per cent, have been sold as low as the domestic manufacture. Sir, I ascertained, before I left home, that the whole quantity of cotton goods imported into Charleston during the last year, paid an average duty of fifty per cent, and then they were sold as low as American cottons of the same quality. But I am really ashamed to argue a question so self-evident. How can taxes possibly lessen prices? How can protection diminish the cost of production? What are the elements of price? Are they not the cost of the raw material—the wages of labor—& the interest of capital; and how can these be lessened by a tax on the article? To say so, is to reverse all the rules of proportion. Gentleman might as well contend that two added to five make three, as that fifty per cent added to the cost of an imported article, lessens its price. If gentlemen can believe this, they may believe anything. But the truth is, Mr. President, this whole matter of the reduction in the price of goods is very easily explained. It depends on general causes, which have operated to a certain extent all over the world. From a thorough investigation of the subject, which has taken place in Great Britain, it is found to have resulted from the appreciation of the currency, improvements in machinery, and general restoration of peace. The resumption of specie payments, and the diminished supply of the precious metals, is calculated to have lessened the circulating medium to the amount of upwards of £500,000 000. The effect of this single cause has been, within the last ten years, the reduction of prices in that country to the amount of thirty-five per cent to which fifteen per cent may be added for the other causes above mentioned—making in the whole a reduction of almost fifty per cent in the money price of all articles. The same thing has taken place in this country, and therefore, when gentlemen allege that the price of manufactures has fallen, the naked fact proves nothing, unless they can show that they have fallen in a greater degree than other articles in this country, and similar articles abroad. But this is so far from being the fact, that the truth is, that the protected articles have fallen less in proportion than those which receive no protection. Cotton is a striking example, which has, in a few years, fallen to one third of its value, while no protected article has, in the same period, fallen one half.

I trust, sir, that we have now made out our case; that we have shown the unjust and unequal operation, in every point of view, of this system, and that as far as the South is concerned, and the west also, though not in the same degree, it is an unmitigated system of burdens. And, even with regard to the favored section, I would submit, how far it is wise to insist upon a system which can only be maintained at the expense of other sections. Sir, I feel too much confidence in the justice and magnanimity of our Northern brethren to suffer myself to doubt their willingness to abandon this system if they could see it in the light that we do. It may enrich them for the moment, but the prosperity it creates is artificial, and will assuredly be unsubstantial. No country can be permanently benefitted by a system of bounties. This system may destroy the South, but it will not permanently advance the prosperity of the North. It may depress us, but cannot elevate them. Besides, sir, if persevered in, it must annihilate that portion of the country from which the resources are to be drawn, that are to enrich the Northern manufacturers. And it may be well for gentlemen to reflect, whether adhering to this policy, would not be acting like the man who 'killed the goose which laid the golden eggs.' Let gentlemen be assured, that this is a system which cannot possibly last. It will, sooner or later, be utterly overthrown.—Would it not be well, therefore, for them to seize this favorable occasion to make some sacrifice of their peculiar interests to the general welfare?

In concluding, Mr. President, what I have to say on this branch of the subject, I must take the liberty of presenting a few general considerations. In a broad view of the question, it never can be expedient to introduce into a country the manufacture of any article that cannot be produced as cheaply at home as it can be obtained from abroad. There are some such now made in this country and their ability to sustain themselves, without protection, is unquestionable The only exception *I* would admit to the rule I have laid down, relates to articles strictly necessary to national defence. I do not allude to the habiliments of a soldier, or to articles necessary to his consumption, but to *arms* and *munitions of war*. It is the true policy of all nations to "buy where they can buy cheapest." This is the very instinct of our nature and when we depart from it in national concerns, we violate the soundest principles of political economy, a science which is in fact but the lessons of wisdom and an enlightened experience applied to the affairs of nations. Sir, the restrictive policy is founded on the triumph of the selfish principle. It assumes that the natural position of nations towards each other is one of enmity and rivalship, founded on a supposed opposition of interests. The doctrine of the old school was, that, what was gained by one nation, was necessarily lost by another.

The plain and seemingly obvious truth that in a fair and equal exchange of commodities, all parties gained, is a noble discovery of modern times. The contrary principle naturally led to commercial rivalries, wars, and abuses of all sorts. The benefits of commerce being regarded as a stake to be won, or an advantage to be wrested from others by fraud or by force governments naturally strove to secure them to their own subjects; and when they once set out in this wrong direction it was quite natural that they should not stop short till they ended in binding, in the bonds of restriction, not only the whole country, but all its parts Thus we are told that England first protected by her restrictive policy, her whole empire against all the world, then Great Britain against the colonies, then the British isles against each other, and ended by vainly attempting to protect all the great interests and employments of the State by balancing them against each other. Sir such a system carried fully out, is not confined to rival nations but protects one town against another, considers villages and even families as rivals; and cannot stop short of "Robinson Crusoe in his goat skins" It takes but one step further to make every man his own lawyer, doctor, farmer and shoemaker—and, if *I* may be allowed an Irishism, his own seamstress and washerwoman.—The doctrine of free trade, on the contrary, is founded on the true social system. It looks on all mankind as children of a common parent—and the great family of nations as linked together by mutual interests Sir, as there is a religion, so I believe there is a *politics of nature*. Cast your eyes over this various earth—see its surface diversified with hills and valleys, rocks and fertile fields. Notice its different productions—its infinite varieties of soil and climate. See the mighty rivers winding their way to the very mountain's base, and thence guiding man to the vast ocean, dividing yet connecting nations. Can any man who considers these things with the eye of a philosopher, not read the design of the great Creator (written legibly in his works) that his children should be drawn together in a free commercial intercourse, and mutual exchanges of the various gifts with which a bountiful Providence has blessed them Commerce, sir, restricted even as she has been has been the great source of civilization and refinement all over the world. Next to the Christian religion, I consider FREE TRADE in its largest sense as the greatest blessing that can be conferred upon any people. Hear sir what Patrick Henry, the great orator of Virginia, whose soul was the very temple of freedom, says on this subject—

"Why should we fetter commerce? If a man is in chains, he droops and bows to the earth, because his spirits are broken, but let him twist the fetters from his legs, and he will stand erect. Fetter not Commerce! Let her be as free as the air. She will range the whole creation, and return on the four winds of Heaven to bless the land with plenty.'

But, it has been said, that free trade would do very well; if all nations would adopt it; but as it is, every nation must protect itself from the effect of restrictions by countervailing measures. I am persuaded, sir, that it is a great a most fatal error. If retaliation is resorted to for the honest purpose of producing a redress of the grievance, and while adhered to no longer than there is a hope of success, it may, like war itself, be sometimes just and necessary. But if it have no such object, "it is the unprofitable combat of seeing which can do the other the most harm." The case can hardly be conceived in which permanent restrictions, as a measure of retaliation, could be profitable. In every possible situation, a trade, whether more or less restricted, is profitable or it is not. This can only be decided by experience, and if the trade be left to regulate itself, water would not more naturally seek its level, than the intercourse adjust itself to the true interests of the parties. Sir, as to this idea of the regulation by government of the pursuits of men, I consider it as a remnant of barbarism disgraceful to an enlightened age, and inconsistent with the first principles of rational liberty. I hold government to be utterly incapable from its position, of exercising such a power wisely prudently, or justly. Are the rulers of the world the depositories of its collected wisdom? Sir, can we forget the advice of a great statesman to his son "Go, see the world my son, that you may learn with how little wisdom mankind is governed" And is our own government an exception to this rule, or do we not find here as every where else, that

"Man, proud man,
Robed in a little brief authority,
Plays such fantastic tricks before high *Heav'n*
As make the angels weep.'

The gentleman has appealed to the example of other nations Sir they are all against him. They have had restrictions enough, to be sure, but they are getting heartily sick of them and in England particularly, would willingly get rid of them, if they could. We have been assured, by the declaration of a Minister of the Crown, from his place in Parliament, "that there is a growing conviction, among all men of sense and reflection in that country that the true policy of all nations is to be found in unrestricted industry." Sir, in England they are now retracing their steps, and endeavoring to relieve themselves of the system as fast as they can Within a few years past, upwards of three hundred statutes, imposing restrictions in that country, have been repealed; and a case has recently occurred there, which seems to leave no doubt that, if Great Britain has grown great, it is as Mr Huskisson has declared, 'not in consequence of, but in spite of their restrictions." The silk manufacture, protected by enormous bounties was found to be in such a declining condition, that the government was obliged to do something to save it from total ruin. And what did they do? They considerably reduced the duty on foreign silks, both on the raw material and the manufactured article. The consequence was, the immediate revival of the silk manufacture, which has since been nearly doubled.

Sir, the experience of France is equally decisive. Bonaparte's effort to introduce cotton and sugar has cost that country millions; and, but the other day, a foolish attempt to protect the iron mines spread devastation through half of France, and nearly ruined the wine trade, on which one-fifth of her citizens depend for subsistence As to Spain unhappy Spain, "fenced round with restrictions," her experience, one would suppose, would convince us, if any thing could, that the protecting system in politics, like bigotry in religion, was utterly at war with sound principles and a liberal and enlightened policy. Sir I say in the words of the philosophical statesman of England 'leave a generous nation free to seek their own road to perfection" Thank God, the night is passing away, and we have lived to see the dawn of a glorious day The cause of free trade must and will prosper, and finally triumph.—The political economist is abroad, light has come into the world, and, in this instance at least men will not prefer darkness rather than light.' Sir, let it not be said, in after times that the statesmen of America were behind the age in which they lived--that they initiated this young and vigorous country into the enervating and corrupting practices of European nations- and that, at the moment when the whole world were looking to us for an example, we arrayed ourselves in the cast-off follies and exploded errors of the old world, and, by the introduction of a vile system of artificial stimulants and political gambling, impaired the healthful vigour of the body politic and brought on a decrepitude and premature dissolution.

(*To be Concluded.*)

DEBATE IN THE SENATE,
On Mr. Van Buren's Nomination.

REMARKS OF MR. WEBSTER.

Mr. President, as it is highly probable that our proceedings on this nomination will be published, I deem it proper to state shortly the considerations which influenced my opinion, and will decide my vote.

I regard this as a very important and delicate question. It is full of responsibility; and I feel the whole force of all that responsibility. While I have been in the Senate, I have opposed no nomination of the President except for cause; and I have at all times thought that such cause should be plain, and sufficient; that it should be real and substantial, not unfounded or fanciful.

I have never desired, and do not now desire, to encroach in the slightest degree on the constitutional powers of the Chief Magistrate of the Nation. I have heretofore gone far, very far, in assenting to nominations which have been submitted to us. I voted for the appointment of all the gentlemen who composed the first cabinet—I have opposed no nomination of a foreign minister; and I have not opposed the nominations recently before us for the re-organization of the administration. I have always been especially anxious, that in all matters relating to our intercourse with other nations, the utmost harmony, the greatest unity of purpose, should exist between the president and the senate. I know how much of usefulness such harmony and union are calculated to produce.

I am now fully aware. Sir, that it is a serious, a very serious matter, to vote a

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc2940_scm11030-0208.jpg