"to the violation of law and the disturbance of the "peace of the country."

All the other European nations, having West African interests, approved this stipulation and acted accordingly.

It was a European, too, who made possible, the annexation of the State of Maryland in Liberia to the Republic, and although we have lost the greater portion of that beautiful territory, what remains is still a valuable province.

I need not continue a perhaps wearisome enumeration of the obligations under which we have been placed as a people, by the European.

Many favors received by us, not mentioned here, will spontaneously recur to you.

By our Organic Statute we shut him out from citizenship, and denied him the right of holding real estate in fee simple. No objection was offered to this by the European. The correctness of the principle was at once acknowledged.

The illustrous Washington, the first President of the United States of America, in his farewell address to his countrymen upon retirement from public life remarked: "that it is folly for one nation to look for disinterested favors from another."

The European having stood shoulder to shoulder with us in the organisation and building up of this State naturally expected his reward. Shut out from privilege and property, but one thing remained with which to compensate him for his services, that was *Commercial Freedom.*

The Fathers of the Country, the men who took the decisive step of declaring our independence, hastened to accord this to him. But our policy of Commercial freedom to the European lasted but fifteen short years

Within that period commenced those bitter party-struggles which for many years retarded the advancement and progress of the country. And so retrogression set in In 1853, on a suspicion that Europeans incited the natives to

rebel, but probably at the dictation of the Liberian traders, then all-powerful with the electorate. the Port of Entry bill was passed.

Our European friends protested, but they loyally obeyed the law and withdrew their factories and ships from the coast.

A suspicion became prevalent that we were ungrateful, and interest in Liberia and the Liberians gradually grew less.

The interests of the world are so linked that the decline of interest in us and in our affairs politically, reacted against us in more than one direction.

Our policy probably caused that slakening in missionary efforts and work in Liberia which after the passage of the port of entry law became more and more apparent in some directions each succeeding year.

But it is more, perhaps, to the purpose to inquire, whether we were helped by this departure from original lines?

The restrictive policy has been persisted in for forty years. Are our traders richer than they were in 1864? Has the national capital increased? Did the exclusion of the European trader prevent native wars? No, they went on as before and indeed became more formadable, and often were not allayed but by the assistance and direct intervention of that suspicious person.

He is still our banker. He still furnishes capital for our business enterprises. His money is still being poured out to build churches, to pay ministers, serving not only native but also Americo-Liberian congregations. He is still founding schools and colleges for our youth

Another question:—Did the chiefs of the State approve of the departure of 1853? It is understood that the most thoughtful and able among them regretted and condemned it. I mention Roberts, Benson, Warner President Payne sought to modify the law; President Cheeseman called a conference to discuss the possibility of a more liberal policy.

Maryland Historical Society

The Maryland State Colonization Society Papers

XV. Pamphlets (not in original collection)
18. Inaugural Address of A. Barclay, 26th President of Liberia, January 4, 1904, Monrovia

Monrovia, 1904