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 18, 1832. NO. 7.

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.

(CONCLUDED.)

I had intended, Mr. President, to have said something of the constitutional question, but have already taken up so much of your time, that I shall not now enter into it. I must be permitted, however, to remark, that the gentleman is mistaken in supposing that this objection to the protecting system is of recent origin.—Up to 1824, the question had not been much considered, simply because the protection which manufactures had derived was merely incidental to duties imposed for revenue. The act of 1790 was surely of that character; and even the act of 1816 provided for a diminution and not an increase of duties. But when, in 1824, the true character of this system was developed, the constitutional objection was plainly and strongly insisted upon. Here is the language, sir, that I, myself, held on that occasion, on this floor.

"Will gentlemen point out to me, if they can the power which this government possesses to adopt a system for the avowed purpose of encouraging particular branches of industry. It is my sober and deliberate opinion, that the Congress of the United States have no more power to pass laws for the purpose of directly or indirectly inducing any portion of the people to engage in manufactures, than they have to abolish trial by jury, or establish the inquisition."

Since that period, the Legislatures of every Southern State have denounced this system as a violation of their constitutional rights. It was but the last year, that South Carolina recorded on the journals of the Senate, her solemn protest against it as utterly unconstitutional, grossly unequal, and oppressive, and such an abuse of power as is incompatible with the principles of a free government and the great ends of civil society." I do not know, sir, where the constitutional objections to this system are better summed up, than in the very address of the Free Trade Convention of Philadelphia, to which the gentleman has referred for another purpose. The gentleman is certainly mistaken when he relies on that exposition as an authority in his favor. Sir, as I understand the argument, it is only admitted that incidental protection may be afforded by duties imposed merely for revenue, but that the right is expressly denied of "imposing any additional duty for the purpose of affording that protection.' I dismiss this branch of the subject, with the remark, that whether we be right or wrong in our views on this question, the opinion is conscientiously and almost universally entertained throughout the whole South, that the protecting system involves a gross violation of the solemn compact which is the bond of our Union.

I come now, sir, to the question of the policy which ought to be adopted at this important era in the history of our Government. We have arrived at a most interesting crisis in our national affairs—one to which the People have been looking up with intense anxiety for several years past. They have contemplated the extinction of the public debt as the great day of jubilee, when they were to be relieved from the oppressions which they have so long patiently endured? The People of the South, Sir, like the children of Israel of old have passed through the wilderness, and are now in sight of the promised land. They stand on the top of Mount Pisgah, and look, with delight, at the goodly prospect before them—and it is for you this day to determine, whether they shall perish in the wilderness, or be permitted to possess and enjoy their rich inheritance. Sir, I have shewn that the whole system of duties is oppressive and unequal—that the very action of the Government is so—yet I do not wish, gentlemen to suppose that we are disposed to push our claims to an unreasonable extent. No, we will not ask that northern manufactures shall be taxed, because duties, to whatever extent imposed, operate as a tax upon our industry. We are willing to agree that the revenue necessary for the ordinary purposes of the Government shall be levied by duties upon imports The facility with which indirect taxes may be collected affords an argument in their favor to which we are willing to yield, though we well know that they must operate most injuriously on our interests. But, in yieiding this much, we have surely a right to expect that no more money shall be levied in this way than shall be absolutely necessary. We think we have a right to insist, that on the extinction of the public debt the twelve millions of dollars heretofore annually appropriated to that object, should no longer be levied; and, further, that no more money shall be raised than may be necessary to meet the ordinary expenditures of the Government. Any other basis of reduction than this must be founded on the idea of a contemplated increase of the public expenditures. And why should they be increased. We have rather a right to expect that they should be diminished. The principal objects of expenditure, for many years past, have been connected with preparations for war, but with the progress of our works of defence, and the increase of our population, the necessity for this expenditure will, in a great measure cease. Indeed it does appear to me that it will be hardly necessary, hereafter, to seek other security against invasion than will be found in the strong arms and stout hearts of our fellow citizens. But the gentleman insists that our revenue shall not be reduced below eighteen millions of dollars, while we all know that twelve millions have heretofore furnished an abundant supply for every purpose, including a million a year for internal improvements. The gentleman admits that we ought not to provide for a surplus; and says, with great force and truth, that a division of it among the States would be a departure from all sound principles of government. For, said the gentleman, "to give it back to the States or the individuals from whom it was drawn, in the same proportion, would be a palpable absurdity while, to distribute it in different proportions, would be an act of gross injustice." I submit whether this argument is not equally applicable to internal improvements. But, waiving this point, I would ask, if we are to have no surplus, why raise eighteen millions of dollars—six millions more than the ordinary expenditures of the government? To provide, says the gentleman, for contingencies. But, sir, is it not morally certain that your receipts must exceed your estimates—the reduction of duties will increase importations—and, fix what standard you will my life upon it we shall have a surplus, and not a deficit, unless gentlemen mean to provide for some new and grand scheme of national expenditure. Besides, against accidental deficiencies, a sufficient provision will be found in the uncalled for appropriations, always to be found in the Treasury. Having shown the extent to which the revenue ought to be reduced, I proceed to consider the mode in which that reduction ought to be effected. The first scheme suggested by the gentleman, is a continuance of existing duties on the unprotected articles, & carrying up the duties on protected articles to prohibition. The gentleman says, however, that he is not in favour of this scheme, because he would put the manufacturers on their good behaviour, by exposing them to foreign competition. But what sort of competition is that to which they are exposed, when entrenched behind a protecting tariff, ranging from fifty to two hundred per cent.—I have shewn that the existing duties are, to a certain extent, prohibitory; and when the gentleman declares himself against prohibition, he seals the condemnation of his own resolution, which proposes to retain the existing system untouched, prohibitions and all.

I come now to the schemes advocated by the gentleman himself. To take off the duties entirely from all the unprotected articles except wines and silks, and leave them as they are upon the protected articles,

The first objection to this scheme is, that it is proposed by it to take off only $6,000,000 of taxes, even after the Treasury is to be relieved from a charge of $12,000,000 by the extinction of the public debt. That it proposes, therefore, to create an annual surplus of six million dollars beyond the wants of the Government, not only without the smallest necessity but with the certain effect of changing the character of your Government, and corrupting the people. Why is this surplus to be created? Has the gentleman given a single reason in its favor; or has he not himself sealed the condemnation of his own proposition, when he admitted that no surplus ought to be created for distribution; for if it is not to be in one shape distributed, for what purpose is it to be raised?—The next objection to this scheme is, that it proposes to relieve luxuries from all taxation, while the taxes on the necessaries of life are to remain just as they are; subject to duties of from 50 to 100 per cent. It is true that the gentleman, seeing, *I* presume, the enormity of the proposition in its original form, now consents that some very moderate duty may be levied on wines and silks. But, sir, I should be glad to know, in what wines and silks differ from the numerous other articles which, by the gentleman's scheme are to come in duty free. Here is a list of some of them, and it will be for the Senate and the country to say how far it is reasonable or just, that the consumers of these articles shall contribute nothing to the public revenue, while the honest laboring man is to be taxed from 30 to 100 dollars on every hundred dollars which he expends on the woollens, and the flannels, the iron and the sugar, which are indispensable to the health and comfort of himself and family.

"It is one of the grandest farces ever attempted to be played off upon a free people, to see an attempt made to reduce the taxes on olives and capers, anchovies and brandy, fruits, mace, cloves, nutmegs, precious stones, alabaster ornaments, cordials, perfumery, artificial flowers, billiard balls, battle-dores and shuttle-cocks, coral beads and gold snuff boxes, silver spectacles and ivory headed canes, velvets and laces mull muslins and gros de Naples, camels hair shawls, morocco and prunella shoes, fine cambricks, plated chaffing dishes, porcelain and china dinner and tea setts, gold watches, Cologne water, Champaign and Burgundy wines, oranges and pine apples, embroidery, ivory fans, fine Irish linens, parasols, centre tables, gilt books, pier looking glasses, vermacelli and macaroni, Italian marble, mantel ornaments, rouge, essences and court plaster, chessmen, sweet scented soap, silk stockings, gold and silver thimbles, mantel time pieces, tooth powder, wax dolls, and a hundred other things used by the rich—we say, it is one of the grandest farces ever played off upon a free people, that such articles as these we have enumerated, should be exempted from taxation, whilst iron and sugar, woollen cloth and flannel, and many other necessaries of life, which are required to render the situation of our working people comfortable, should continue to be heavily and unequally burdened.

I ask for the reason for this distinction which relieves luxuries from taxation, and throws them upon the necessaries of life; which burdens the poor and exempts the rich; and I am told it is necessary to protection. Whose protection? Why, the wealthy proprietors of manufacturing stock, men who are realizing enormous dividends, drawn from the pockets of the people. Sir, no other reason for this distinction has been, or can be given; for it is acknowledged by all the world, that luxuries are the proper subjects for taxation, and ought rightfully to be taxed higher than the necessaries of life. But here the manufacturers interpose their claims, and the claims of justice are disregarded. Again, sir, these are articles of general consumption; at least among the wealthy; and consumed equally, too, all over the country; and yet they must come in duty free, and the whole revenue of the country be levied on articles, in relation to which the duties operate most unjustly and unequally; being in truth a bounty to certain portions of the people, and a burden upon others, and yet he Senator tells us he had hoped that such a proposition as this would not only have met the approbation of all parties, but would have been received as a concession to the complaints of the south. How it was possible for the gentleman to have indulged such an expectation, *I* am utterly unable to comprehend. Sir, what single concession, or the slightest approach towards it, is made by such a proposition?—Does it consist in agreeing to take off six millions of taxes, when the demands on the Treasury are to be reduced to double that amount? Has the South ever uttered one word of complaint against the duties which it is proposed to reduce? No. These were imposed for revenue; and against duties fairly levied for that purpose, they never complained It is against duties, imposed not for revenue, but protection, that they have been so long and so earnestly remonstrating, and to quiet their discontents, the proposition is gravely submitted, to take off all the revenue duties and to leave the protecting duties untouched. Sir, it is not so much the amount of this tax, as its inequality and injustice, which has roused the whole South to determined opposition. And how is it proposed to relieve our complaints? By aggravating that inequality, and extending and perpetuating that injustice. We tell you that the protecting duties operate as a tax upon us, & a bounty upon the tariff states We insist that it is a violation of the principles on which our Government is founded, and reduces us to a state of "colonial vassalage;" and this it substantially does, if we are not mistaken in its operation, and Mr. Grattan's definition of a colony is the true one—"a country governed in reference to the interests of another."—Sir, if we are right, this scheme amounts to neither more nor less than a proposition to relieve the tariff States from all taxation, and throw the whole burden of the government upon the other states. It is admitted, that, the protection enjoyed by the former, even now exceeds the amount of the taxes which they pay, but still they do pay their equal portion of duties on the unprotected articles. But when these are taken off they will be relieved from taxes altogether. Gentlemen who now hear me, remember, that when the tariff of 1828 was under discussion here, a Senator from a tariff State rose in his place, and supported the bill on the single ground that it operated as a bounty of a million of dollars per annum to the State he represented. Let us assume that calculation to have been correct, and that the State in question now pays half a million in taxes on the unprotected articles. When you take off the tax and leave the bounty, the bounty will obviously be increased by just half a million, and the State in question will be relieved entirely from taxation. Such is the compromise promised to the South. The evils of which we complain are to be increased—the protecting system is to be rivitted upon the country beyond all hope of relief, and, we are told, we ought to receive all this as a *concession*.

The policy proposed in the amendment which *I* have submitted, is founded on the just principles I have advocated. The arrangement of the details we are willing to leave to the committee. We do not propose to destroy or even to injure, the manufacturers. We are willing they should have the incidental protection afforded by a fair revenue system, and on any plan of reduction, the duties and charges on the foreign manufacture will not fall much short of 33 1-3 per cent; and surely, Sir, if, with a protection equal to one third of the cost of the article our manufacturers cannot be maintained, they ought to be abandoned at once, since nothing can be clearer than that they would then be sustained at a certain loss to the country. We do not insist on an immediate reduction, to the lowest revenue standard. As the public debt is not yet paid we are willing that the reduction on the protected articles should be gradual, and spread, if gentlemen please, over two or three years; and, if they desire it, we will not object to making an immediate reduction on the unprotected articles, of 10 or 15 per cent. The immediate effect of this plan, so far from being injurious to the manufacturers, will, I am persuaded, serve rather to strengthen them, and even in its ultimate results, no manufacture will be injured that does not depend on protection for its existence, and is not sustained at the public expense. Suppose the duties on the protected articles were now reduced ten per cent below their present rates, and by subsequent steps carried down gradually to the true revenue standard, what would be the effect of this first reduction of ten per cent? If a yard of English cloth cost a dollar, paid a duty of fifty per cent., and, with the addition of charges, could be retailed at two dollars, the effect of this reduction would only be to reduce the price to one dollar and ninety cts. So that the protection to the American manufacturer would be lessened only five per cent. Now if this provision were accompanied by an immediate reduction of the duties on the unprotected articles from fifty per cent. to fifteen, would not the manufacturers derive some compensation in the diminished cost of every article which enters into their consumption? and if, in addition to this, there should be a considerable reduction of duties on the raw material, I would submit to their serious consideration whether their condition then would be worse than it is now. The true policy of the manufacturers, it appears to me, consists in obtaining their raw materials cheap, and having their expenses diminished by taking off unnecessary taxes on their consumption. Sir, if this is to become a manufacturing country, we must look to the markets of the world. A feeble and sickly existence may be preserved at home by a system of protection and of bounties—but to be put on a sure foundation, and to acquire that vigor, strength, and energy, which will enable them to enter into successful competition abroad, with the manufactures of other countries, it is necessary they should be prepared for the contest, by being left, in a great measure, to their own unaided efforts. In one respect, the U. States possesses an advantage over all the world of which it seems to me, it would be madness not to avail ourselves. We can reduce the cost of production in every department of industry, to the very lowest rates. Our people are not necessarily borne down by an almost insupportable weight of taxation. We have no debt which can never be paid—no burthensome establishments—No King, Lords, and commons, to eat out the substance of the People. In this consists our greatest advantage, and it would be our own fault if we do not avail ourselves of it to the fullest extent. This, sir, is not only the favorable moment for adjusting this great question, but if it be suffered to pass away, it can never be recalled. The manufacturers now can be let down without a shock, from the position to which they have been so unjustly elevated. They will now be remunerated for any diminution of their protection; but if the plan proposed in the gentleman's resolution should prevail, the immediate effect will be an increase of their protection, an enlargement of their bounty, and of course, if these are to be reduced hereafter, the shock will be much greater than that to which they would now be subjected. Sir, *I* do consider that, in making my proposition, I am proving myself a true friend to the manufacturers—and that they are their worst enemies (whatever they may themselves believe) who would adopt the policy embraced in the gentleman's resolution. In this opinion, sir, *I* find I am not singular. The manufacturers themselves, and some of their ablest and most zealous advocates have avowed the same sentiments. In a work just put into my hands, containing an exposition of evidence, about to be submitted to congress, in support of the memorial of the free trade convention, lately assembled at Philadelphia, (a work to which I earnestly invite the attention of every member of this body,) I find some extracts from the Register of Hezekiah Niles—certainly one of the most uncompromising champions of the protecting system, which furnishes decisive authority in favor of my opinion. I there find a letter from a person who is represented to be an extensive manufacturer, in which he says:

"The only true friends of the manufacturer are those who now seek to repeal the ridiculous tariff of 1828. Put a duty of revenue alone on cloths, and remove the duty on wool. It would be much better for us, if we were placed in England; for we could there, with our present hands and advantages make cloth, send it to New York, pay the duties, and make more money than we do now. The difference is in the stock; and this difference is attributable to the absurdities of the American system as it stands. The duties on dye stuffs, oil, soap and wool, taken in connexion with the derangement of trade, by making the manufacturer an exporter, amounts to a much higher protection to the foreigner, than all the tariff affords to us. Such are the facts, and such the fruits, of the 'System' which the American manufacturer has toiled to support."

Thus, sir, it will be seen that we who propose to repeal the tariff, of '28 are the only true "friends of the manufacturers," and that they are their enemies who are striving to perpetuate the "absurdities of the American System." Next we have the opinions of Mr. Niles himself "that the act of 1828 was the result of a political bargain, & passed on principles disreputable to a Congress of the United States," to which the enlightened author of the exposition very justly adds, "that nothing can be more obvious than the folly of pretending to encourage manufacturing industry, and at the same time to tax the raw materials, iron, hemp, flax, wool, lead, indigo, and other component parts of manufactures, and constituting the principal value of them, from fifty to two hundred per cent." And here I am willing to rest my case.

The gentleman complains of frauds upon the revenue—fraudulent invoices, and smuggling—but it is his system which has produced these evils. Smuggling, from the very nature of things, must exist, when the duties exceed the risk and expense of the illicit intercourse. For a season, sir, the high moral sense of a young and uncorrupted people, may oppose some obstacle to these practices. No government on earth can prevent them. Napoleon, in the plenitude of his power, was unable to maintain his continental system. His prohibitions and restrictions were constantly violated with impunity. Yes; sir, he who sported with kingdoms, who constructed thrones on the ruins of empires, and appointed the officers of his household to fill them; whose armies were his custom house officers, who drew his cordon around the nations which he conquered, was utterly unable to put down the great principles of free trade. It has been well said, sir, "that when all Europe was obedient to his nod—the smuggler disputed his commands, set at nought his edicts, laughed to scorn his power, and overthrew his policy.' How is it with England, that sea girt Isle surrounded with a thousand ships, and thirty thousand guardians of her revenue? Sir, do we not all know that smuggling is there a profitable trade, and that the revenue laws of England are constantly violated with impunity? And how is it with Spain? A modern traveller asserts that there are a hundred thousand persons in that unhappy country who live by smuggling, and that there are thirty thousand others, paid by the government, to detect their practice but who are in league with the offenders. And as to the condition of things in our own country, the gentleman has told us a tale this day, which if he be not himself deceived, shows what fearful progress these practices have already made. The time was when smuggling was absolutely unknown any where, in this country, as it still is in the Southern States. It is your protecting system which has introduced it. It is the natural consequence of high duties—the evil was foretold, and, as we predicted, it has come upon us. The protecting system has already, in the minds of many, removed the odium which formerly rested on this practice. Sir, when these sentiments shall become prevalent, what think you will become of that system? How long will it last after the payment of duties shall come to be considered as a badge of servitude?

Mr. President, the proposition of the Senator from Kentucky is that the protecting system as it now stands upon your statute book, shall remain untouched—that all its contradictory provisions, its absurdities, injustice, and inequality, shall be maintained inviolate. Let us look, then, at some of the existing provisions of this system. Some of them in the exposition to which I have before referred, are detailed with a clearness to which nothing can be added by me. Here are tables of the duties on woollens, flannels, baizes, and carpeting, ranging from 45 to upwards of two hundred per cent. I will read a few extracts in illustration of the effects of the duties. Here Mr. Hayne read several extracts from the work in question, showing that the duties on coarse woollens, such as are used by stage drivers, watermen, and other laborers, for great coats, peajackets, &c are so exhorbitantly taxed, as to raise the cost of the articles to about "three times the price which the English laborer has to pay for the same kind of clothing;"—that the western farmer, in consequence of the high duty, is compelled to pay four dollars a yard for cloth which costs the English farmer but one dollar seventy five cents; that flannels, so indispensible to all the women and children in the country, are subjected to a duty of from ninety to one hundred and fifty per cent, whereby an article which cost in England from eight to nine cents, is sold here for twenty cents, and that which cost in England twenty nine cents, our manufacturer can obtain fifty cents for; that cottons are charged with a duty of from twenty five to two hundred per cent. whereby the cost to the American consumer is, in many instances, increased one half; and that the duty upon iron is from an hundred and fifty to two hundred and eighty per cent. On this point, Mr. Hayne read from the report on the blacksmith's petition, made to the Senate during their last session, and quoted the testimony of John Sarchet, a witness examined on oath before the Committee, from which it appeared "that under the existing rate of duties a ton of hammers and sledges can be imported for the use of the American manufacturer of those articles, at a less cost than the bar iron from which they are made, that wheel-tire has actually been imported, in a finished state for about forty seven dollars a ton, while bar iron, suitable for the purpose, is selling for about ninety dollars the ton, that tea-trays can be imported for half the price of the raw material out of which they are manufactured, knitting needles for a hundred and forty three dollars a ton less than the raw materials out of which they are made, that a ton of chain cables can now be imported into this country at a less cost than the rods out of which they are made, and that the necessary consequence has been that a number of workers in iron, and of mechanics, estimated at one hundred thousand, had their profits so diminished, that Mr. Sarchet had declared, that he had never seen any blacksmiths so poor or carrying on a less prosperous business, than those of the United States, owing as he believed, to the high duties they are compelled to pay on their raw iron."

Look, continued Mr Hayne, through your whole protecting system; your duties every where are so arranged as to fall most heavily upon the poor.—The poor man is taxed five dollars upon a coat, which cost him ten, and a rich man ten upon one which cost him forty—a tax of eight dollars upon coarse cottons for his wife and children, which cost no more than eight; and the rich man but eight dollars, for what costs him upwards of thirty. Can any thing be conceived more monstrous than the system of minimums to impose a duty of thirty five per centum ad valorem on cotton goods but to provide that if they should cost less than forty-five cents per square yard they shall be deemed and taken to have cost thirty five cents and pay duty accordingly—to provide that a duty of forty five per centum ad valorem shall be imposed upon woollens, but that goods which costs more than one dollar, shall be deemed and taken to have cost two dollars and a half. This is like imposing an income tax of fifty per cent. and then providing that every man's income shall be deemed and taken to be three thousand dollars; or a tax of fifty cents per gallon upon stills, and providing that every still shall be considered as containing fifty gallons. Now are gentlemen perpared to say that such a system as this, with all its imperfections on its head, is to be held as sacred as the laws of the Medes and Persians? I trust not.

Let not gentlemen so far deceive themselves as to suppose that the opposition of the South to the protecting system is not based on high and lofty principles. It has nothing to do with party politics, or the mere elevation of men.—It rises far above all such consideration Nor is it influenced chiefly by calculations of interest but is founded in much nobler impulses—The instinct of self-interest might have taught us an easier way of relieving ourselves with every article embraced in the protective system free of duty, without any other participation on our part than a simple consent to receive them. But, sir, we have scorned in a contest for our rights to resort to any but open and fair means to maintain them. The spirit with which we have entered into this business is a kin to that which was kindled in the bosom of our fathers, when they were made the victims of oppression and if it has not displayed itself in the same way, it is because we have ever cherished the strongest feelings of confraternity towards our brethren, and the warmest and most devoted attachment to the Union. If we have been in any degree divided among ourselves in this matter, the source of that division let gentlemen be assured, has not arisen so much from any difference of opinion, as to the true character of the oppression, as from the different degrees of hope of redress. All parties have for years past been looking forward to this crisis for the fulfilment of their hopes, or the confirmation of their fears. And God grant that the result may be auspicious.

Sir, I call upon gentlemen on all sides of the House to meet us in the true spirit of conciliation and concession. Remove I earnestly beseech you from among us this never failing source of contention. Dry up at its source this fountain of the waters of bitterness. Restore that harmony which has been disturbed, that mutual affection and confidence which has been impaired And it is in your power to do it this day—but there is but one means under Heaven, by which it can be effected- by doing equal justice to all. And be assured, that he to whom the country shall be indebted for this blessing, will be considered as the second founder of the Republic. He will be regarded in all after times, as the ministering angel visiting the troubled waters of our political dissentions, and restoring to the element its healing virtues.

I will conclude by invoking the authority of one whose name is deservedly dear to the American People, whose life was the practice of virtue; from whose lips there constantly flowed the lessons of political wisdom, and whose example will be to the remotest generations a light to our feet, and a lamp to our path. The restorer of that liberty which Washington achieved; the man 'who saved the Constitution even at its last gasp'—I mean Thomas Jefferson.

In Mr. Jefferson's Inaugural Address, he bears the following strong testimony in favor of the true American System:

'Entertaining a true sense of our equal rights to the use of our own faculties, to the acquisitions of our own industry * * enlightened by a benign religion * * with all these blessings, what more is necessary to make us a happy and a prosperous people?

Still one thing more fellow-citizens – a wise and frugal government, which, restraining men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement—and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government; and this is necessary to close the circle of our felicities."

That God may inspire us, gentlemen, and all who are entrusted with the administration of our public affairs, with such dispositions, is my constant prayer to Him who holds in his hands the destinies of nations.

Price of Slaves.—For a man, 9 ounces, (doubloons) or 216 yards of cloth, or 9 rolls of tobacco, or 36 gallons of spirits, or 139 handkerchiefs. For a woman 8 ounces, or 192 yards, or 8 rolls, or 32 gallons, or 128 handkerchiefs. For a child 6 ounces, or 144 yards, or 6 rolls, or 24 gallons, or 96 handkerchiefs. Actual State of the Slave Trade on the Coast of Africa.

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc2940_scm11030-0212.jpg