

SPEECH OF GENERAL LAFAYETTE,
On the Question of an Hereditary Peerage, in the
Chamber of Deputies on the 8th October.

The Question submitted to you, Gentlemen, is of such vast importance to the general cause of Liberty and Equality,—to the future Constitutional destinies of France, and to the honor of this House, upon which all eyes are fixed: the interests of an hereditary Peerage, have for a year past, though indirectly, exercised so great an influence upon the calculations, and, in my judgment, upon the mistakes of the government, that I look with satisfaction at the moment which is to resolve it definitively. I unite, therefore, with your committee in rejecting that temporary provision of Ministers, which, in resting one article of the Charter on a basis different from the others, would only prolong agitation and uncertainty; for I believe, without underrating other causes of disturbance, that it is the uncertainty of a system, balancing between the consequences of the revolution and the recollections of the restoration, which more than any thing else, prevents the return of public and private security. (Cheers from the left.) I owe you an apology, Gentlemen, at this late hour, and in so advanced a stage of the debate, for going over anew various parts of a discussion, which has been so fully and so ably maintained: the committee calls upon us for our opinions on the question of competency. I will give mine as a sworn witness might before a court of justice. But first of all, gentlemen, I am bound to reply to an attack which a very respectable speaker, whose voice we were all pleased again to hear from the tribune, has made against the dogma of national sovereignty, that inalienable right of peoples, that vital principle of our social existence: his lofty intellect pre-occupied with English notions as to the omnipotence of Parliament, I will not say with him, could not, but would not comprehend the nature of the constituent power. (All eyes are directed to M. Royer Collard, who smiled, and adjusted his wig.) The long habit of half a century, has rendered this idea very familiar and very easily intelligible to me. I admit with our colleague, that there is nothing just but justice, and therefore it is, that in the school to which I belong, it has been thought essential to preface written Constitutions with a simple declaration of the rights of man and of society, of those rights of which a whole nation is unable to deprive a single citizen. But at the same time, instead of trusting the application of these truths to constitutions, which are only secondary combinations—instead, I say, of trusting in this matter to a single individual, were it Plato himself, or even to a society of philosophers, it was thought best to trust to deputies expressly chosen to regulate what should afterwards become the fundamental law of the constituted authorities. I admit that our course has not been so regular, but I am far from saying, that what has occurred was the result of force. After our fruitful and glorious days of July, there remained nothing standing but the National Sovereignty and a victorious people; in their name the whole nation armed itself, named its officers, and signified to the royal family that they had ceased to reign, even before their fall was finally pronounced. In their name it was that the Deputies resident in Paris, in the exigency of the case, thought proper to possess themselves for the public good, of the constituent power, conferred the overthrow of the Royal family, erected a popular throne, and called to that throne, notwithstanding his relationship with the dethroned race, and from feelings of personal confidence and esteem, that one of our fellow citizens whom they had previously appointed Lieutenant General of the Kingdom. Perhaps, indeed, at that moment, gentlemen, a Constituent Assembly should have been convoked: I admit, indeed, that such was my first thought. But the necessity of combining opinions—numerous circumstances which are always judged of most advantageously after the event, the assurances which a victorious nation had the right, and were bound, to demand, and which are frankly received—all these considerations rallied the whole of us around the order of things then adopted. I ought to add, that from all parts of France (and no one better than myself was in a condition to judge of this matter,) the most full and abundant manifestations reached us of complete adherence to what we had done, to the throne we had erected and to the monarch we had chosen; this adherence was in truth the sanction of the opinions of almost the whole of France. At that time gentlemen, the Chamber of Deputies had struck out a part of the House of Peers; reserving the decision as to the residue of the Peers and as to the Peerage itself, to the ensuing Session; and whatever may have been the acquiescence of the Peers, whatever the Royal words or expressions, I declare it as my conviction that to the Chamber of Deputies alone was left that remnant of the constituent power relative to Art. 23 of the Charter; the creation of the throne, the establishment and foundation of that throne which is a thing completed, may establish relations between it and the Chamber even on the subject now before us, but it was not necessary for us to hear our honorable colleague (Mr. Berryer) yesterday to be satisfied that it does not belong to the House of Peers to judge in its own cause: that would not benefit either them, or us, or the occurrences of the revolution. Much has been said of commitments of which the nullity has been declared—of the commitments of each of us towards his constituents, and the example of 1789, has been quoted. The example is badly chosen: the fact is that in 1789 when several members of the nobility found themselves committed in spite of themselves by instructions opposed to their own views, they abstained from voting, as one of our honorable colleagues may remember.

[Mr. Lameth claimed to speak.]

Gen. Lafayette—in continuation. The bailiwick were assembled in order to remove our scruples. I nevertheless thought myself sufficiently a member of the assembly to propose on the 11th July the first declaration of rights, and to have the honor of presiding over the assembly during the nights of 12th, 13th and 14th July. Such was the course of my deputies. I admit at the same time, that these imperative mandates, or instructions, were at that time annulled by a decree of the Constituent Assembly. But, gentlemen, what analogy is there between these mandates and the declarations which each of us has made to his constituents, as to our opinions and intention to vote on a question,

which every one had more or less examined and in regard to which opinions were already sufficiently made up. I ask you, too, whether in the English House of Commons there is a single member who has not been required explicitly to state his opinions respecting the great question of Reform—or whether you think if any one of them had hesitated about avowing his opinions on this point, his constituents would have been put off with a fine dissertation about the right of instruction. The great question about to be submitted to your deliberation (for by a strange combination of circumstances, it happens that the most sweeping amendment against the project of ministers, is that in favor of an hereditary peerage) the great question appears to me to tend higher than the mere organization of the legislative power. It tends, whatever may be said to the contrary, to re-establishing in France, and rooting in our soil an Aristocracy. I proclaimed from this tribune in the early period of our revolution, that aristocracy is a bad ingredient in politics. We have heard much of the independence of the aristocracy, of the great service it has rendered, and can still render to the throne. I have seen nothing of all that. The Swedish aristocracy, the Danish aristocracy, overshadowed the throne, but it was not independent, for it was controlled by the different courts of Europe, who arranged it as it were under their respective banners. You are told that the prosperity of England is due to the English aristocracy—a sort of eulogium has ever been pronounced upon it for having retarded for fifty years Catholic emancipation and parliamentary reform. Gentlemen, ask the Irish who have endured such troubles, so many ills, so much misery, if they are well pleased with these services of the English aristocracy? Ask the British nation which has groaned so long beneath the weight of taxation, and of endless wars against our revolution; ask them whether they do not think a House of Commons, under better auspices would not have avoided all their evils, whether it would not have prevented such an increase of dependents, who look on while the aristocracy possesses itself of all power and place,—and, to look at home,—was it not the aristocracy which struck the first blow against our national throne? I know it was, for I was of it; but I and my friends did what we did for the public good, others did it for their private interest: and when the third estate, for such was the language then, came to the States General full of love for the King and of wishes to overthrow an oppressive aristocracy, if the King, instead of hooking himself on (pardon the expression) to that aristocracy, had united himself frankly with the true French nationality, there would have been no cause to fear that the interests of the Court would be identified with those of the emigrants. If, in short, he had placed himself in the position in which, happily, Louis Philip is, of having for enemies that aristocracy, and those emigrants, then the throne and the royal family would not have been swallowed up with the aristocracy. One word as to the comparison instituted by one of the previous speakers, as to the prosperity which the aristocracy of England has assured to that country, and which, it is contended, democracy could not have done:—but the United States are democratic; that has been often enough thrown in my teeth. And is there less prosperity under the influence of American democracy than under that of English aristocracy? Is the industry of the United States less than that of England? On the contrary, it is certain that, comparatively speaking, commerce is more active and more beneficial in the first than in the last named country; and that relatively to population, the commercial tonnage is considerably greater there. Allusion has also been made to the valor in war of the English aristocracy. Certainly I am most willing to do justice to their courage, their talents and their glory; but is it forgotten that in the war, not of Independence, but of that since, and which one of our honorable colleagues seemed not to recollect,—there is not a single instance, or only one at the utmost, where the flag of the United States did not in equal combat triumph over that of England? Is it forgotten that American democracy obtained from English aristocracy an honorable peace, at a moment when all Europe being pacified, it remained to struggle alone with England; and that that peace was crowned by the battle of New Orleans?—Democracy there triumphed over aristocracy.

I return now to the question of a legislative hereditary Peerage. I have always been in favor of two Chambers. I know there are weighty authorities on the other side; Turgot and Franklin are of the number, and I might name other celebrated publicists of the present day. It has been said that the American States began, in imitation of England, with two Chambers, and had come to adopt a single one. The contrary is the fact: those States, which commenced with a single Chamber, have been taught by experience the advantage of a double representation; but not one was willing to adopt an hereditary chamber, nor any combination drawn from different elements.

A respectable colleague has said "you might as well merely separate the Chamber by a partition." By a partition not—but it would be gaining a good deal, to have two Chambers distinct from each other, discussing separately, and one after the other, the same laws; special provisions of easy adoption would soon impress upon each a distinct character—such provisions as, without going into detail, might relate to age, property, &c. But an hereditary Chamber, it is said, would be a prop to the throne. Many publicists have been quoted on this point. Permit me to quote one who certainly will not be taxed with enmity to monarchs, nor be accused of democracy, or republicanism, it is the philosophic historian Hume. Well then, when this publicist was endeavoring in his essays to shadow forth the outline of a perfect monarchy, he said, that if there was in England a sound representation of the Commons, the Hereditary House would not be strong enough, because it would not possess public confidence, and could neither support the throne, nor sustain itself; he therefore suggests means for securing confidence in his Senate or House of Peers.—I may indeed differ with him as to these means, but his opinion was, that an hereditary Chamber would be wanting in strength, and that some other combination was necessary. What is said in favor of the hereditary principle because of the education it insures to the sons of Peers, applies equally to notaries, to lawyers, to judges, for they too may bring up their chil-

dren in the notion that they are to pursue the profession of their fathers; and yet if any one of us should declare in his will, that his children and descendants for ever, should be obliged to avail of the services of the children and descendants of his notary and lawyer, the will would be set aside on the score of mental derangement. This consideration therefore, is not happily chosen.

I will not enter into the detail of the various projects which have been, or may be, proposed. I will limit myself to a positive declaration against the hereditary principle. I will also vote against the King's having the sole right of creating Peers, because in such case this second Chamber would not be in fact, a legislative power—it would represent no one—and would present no idea in common with a representative government. I will in the end sustain the opinion which shall approach nearest to mine, or rather, despairing of doing better, I shall probably vote for the proposition least in opposition to my own opinion, which may have the best chance of success.

From the Lexington (Ky.) Gazette.

MR. CLAY AND THE ANTI-MASONS.

Having casually heard the following correspondence spoken of, and presuming that our readers would take an interest in perusing it, we have requested and procured a copy of it for publication.

HANOVER, IND. Sept. 2, 1831.

Hon. Henry Clay.

Sir—Having been appointed by an Anti-Masonic meeting in Hanover, Indiana, to open a correspondence with you for the purpose of ascertaining your sentiments with respect to masonry, we take this opportunity of addressing you on the subject. We feel ourselves impelled to this duty, and to the taking of this step, from the consideration that in us is placed a part of the sovereignty of this country; that on us, as constituent parts of this government, depend the perpetuity of our republican institutions, the character and prosperity of our nation, the happiness of its citizens, and the destiny of millions yet unborn. As citizens of this republic we feel it our bounden duty to watch over the destinies of our nation, to guard with studious care our rights, and to detect and exterminate whatever has a tendency to corrupt our republican institutions, or set aside our laws. The subject of free masonry is one which has of late engrossed the attention of the people in many parts of the United States. It is a subject which is of vital importance, and demands the serious attention of every christian, patriot and republican.—What may be your sentiments on this subject, we know not. By some it is affirmed, that you are now a mason of the highest order, and a zealous supporter of the masonic institution; and by others, that though you were once a mason, you have of late abandoned the society and are now opposed to the institution; so that we have been unable as yet to ascertain with certainty your sentiments on this subject. As we are again shortly to be called upon to choose a man to preside over the councils of our nation; as it will then be our duty and privilege to raise our humble but independent voice in favor of him whom we may deem most worthy of our suffrage; and as you now stand a candidate for a high and important station, as your friends and fellow citizens, we would solicit from you a frank and candid statement of your sentiments on this subject. We solicit this with the more confidence, because we believe you have always sustained the character of the frank and affable friend, and the faithful and undisguised politician, and that you would scorn to obtain the suffrage of the people by concealing your sentiments.

Yours respectfully,

JAMES A. WATSON,
NOBLE BUTLER,
JAMES H. THOMSON.

MR. CLAY'S ANSWER.

ASHLAND, October 8, 1831.

Gentlemen:

I hope you will excuse the delay in acknowledging the receipt of your letter of the 2nd ult. which has arisen from my absence from home and from various engagements.

Waiving the considerations that I have no knowledge of the existence of an anti-Masonic meeting in Hanover, Indiana, other than that which is derived from your letter, nor of your appointment as a Committee to correspond with me, other than your statement, nor the satisfaction of a personal acquaintance with you, I will proceed at once to reply to your letter. Its professed object is to ascertain my sentiments on the subject of masonry; and the reason assigned by you for this inquiry is thus stated by yourselves: "As we are again shortly to be called upon to choose a man to preside over the councils of our nation; and as it will then be our duty and privilege to raise our humble but independent voice in favor of our suffrage; and as you now stand a candidate for a high and important station, as your friends and fellow citizens, we would solicit from you a frank and candid statement of your sentiments on this subject."

I do not know a solitary provision in the Constitution of the United States which conveys the slightest authority to the General Government to interfere, one way or the other, with either Masonry or Anti-Masonry. If therefore a President of the United States, or any other functionary of that Government, were to employ his official power to sustain or to abolish, or to advance the interests of Masonry or Anti-Masonry, it would be an act of usurpation or tyranny.

You have not called upon me for my opinion upon any great practical measure falling within the scope of Federal power; but passing by every question of vital interest, within the sphere of its operation, you demand my sentiments upon a subject with which I humbly conceive it has nothing to do; and you place this demand on the ground of the influence which my sentiments might exert upon the exercise of an undoubted and important privilege which you possess as citizens of the United States.

A compliance on my part, with your demand would amount to an implied admission, that individual sentiments, on the subject of Masonry, formed a proper consideration in regulating the exercise of the elective franchise in respect to officers of the Federal Government. I can make no such admission. I cannot believe that, whether I am hostile or friendly to Masonry or

Anti-Masonry, is at all material in the formation of any judgment, on the part of my fellow citizens, concerning my fitness for any office under the Government of the United States. That elevated office, to which you allude, should, in my opinion, be filled by one who is capable, unswayed by sectarian feelings or passions, of administering its high duties impartially towards the whole people of the United States, however divided into religious, social, benevolent or literary associations.

Entertaining these views, I have constantly refused to make myself a party to the unhappy contest raging, distant from me, in the other parts of the Union, between Masons and anti-masons. Whilst these views remain uncorrected I must adhere to that determination. If, indeed, you gentlemen, will point to the provision in the Federal Constitution, which can be legitimately made to operate upon the subject in question, I would not hesitate promptly to comply with your request. In the meantime, in declining it, I hope you will consider me as not wanting in proper respect to you or to those whom you represent, but as acting from a conviction of the impropriety of blending an alien ingredient with a question, already sufficiently complex; and also from a sense of personal independence.

I am with great respect, your obedient servant.

H. CLAY.

MESSRS. JAMES A. WATSON,
NOBLE BUTLER,
JAMES H. THOMSON.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, Nov. 24.

Mr. Mebane introduced a bill for the purpose of extending to the scholars of all schools in North Carolina the same privileges as are enjoyed by the officers and students in Colleges and Universities established by law, exempting them from militia duty, &c. Read the first time, and passed.

Mr. Polk presented a number of resolutions founded on subjects contained in the Governor's Message, which, on Mr. Sawyer's motion, were ordered to lie on the table, viz:

That a select committee of five be appointed to consider that part of it which relates to slaves, free persons of color and incendiary publications; that portion which relates to Internal Improvement and the manner of drawing out any part of the fund for Internal Improvement be referred to the committee on that subject; that a joint select committee of five on the part of each house, be raised on so much of the message as relates to the Banks, circulating medium, and the proper disposition and investment of the funds of the State in Bank Stock; that that part of it which relates to the Literary Fund be referred to the committee on Education; and likewise that portion of it relating to the communications from the Governor's sundry States on the subject of the powers of the General Government, in relation to the Tariff and Internal Improvement, be referred to a joint select committee, and that they have leave to report by bill or otherwise.

Friday, Nov. 26.

A message was received from the Senate agreeing to the several propositions of reference contained in the message of this House, and stating who were appointed on the several committees. On the subject of slaves, free persons of color, &c. the committee on the part of the House of Commons are Messrs. Cox, Sherman, Peoples, Gwynn and Bell. On Banks, circulating medium, &c. Messrs. Mebane, Garland, M'Laurin, Emmitt and Freeman. Communications of Governor's of several States on the subject of the powers of the General Government in relation to Tariff and Internal Improvement—Messrs. Outlaw, M'Queen, Hogan, Long and Weaver.

A message was received from the Senate, agreeing to the proposition that a joint select committee, consisting of five members from each House, be raised on so much of the Governor's message as relates to the militia, and the better defence of the State, and stating what members of that House had been appointed a committee, Messrs. Nicholson, Hart, Larkins, Harper and Rand form the committee on the part of this House.

SENATE.

Friday Nov. 25.

Mr. Mosely presented the memorial of several citizens of the county of Lenoir, praying the passage of an act to authorize the County Court of Lenoir to exclude from the limits of the county all colored retailers of spirituous liquors, or other articles of merchandise, except such as shall procure from the said County Court a license authorizing them to retail such articles. On motion of Mr. Mosely, the memorial was ordered to be laid upon the table.

On motion of Mr. Montgomery of Hertford ordered, that a message be sent to the House of Commons, proposing to raise a joint select committee of 5 members from each House on so much of the Governor's message as relates to opening a communication from the waters of the Albemarle Sound to the Atlantic Ocean.

Mr. Seawell presented a bill making an appropriation, and appointing commissioners, for the rebuilding of the Capitol in the city of Raleigh. Read the first time and passed.

On motion of Mr. Spaight, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution presented yesterday by Mr. M'Farland, and laid upon the table; and the resolution being read, the question on the adoption of it was decided in the affirmative.

Saturday, Nov. 26.

Mr. Montgomery of Orange, presented the following resolution, which was read the first time and passed, to wit:

Resolved, That the Public Treasurer be authorized and instructed to procure at his discretion, in specie change of the coin of the United States, any sum not exceeding ten thousand dollars, provided the cost shall not exceed two and one half per cent.

On motion of Mr. Mosely, ordered that the memorial of sundry citizens of Lenoir, presented by him yesterday, be referred to the committee on so much of the Governor's message as relates to slaves, free persons of color, and incendiary publications.

On motion of Mr. Dick, ordered that bill making an appropriation and appointing commissioners for the rebuilding of the Capitol in the city of Raleigh, be made the order of the day for Monday week next.

On motion of Mr. Dick, ordered, that the bill to erect out of a portion of the counties of Burke and Buncombe, a separate and distinct county by the name of Yancey, be made the order of the day for Friday next.

Mr. Dobson presented a bill to repeal part of an act, passed in 1827, prescribing the manner in which lands should thereafter be advertised for taxes in the counties of Anson and Surry; which was read the first, second and third time and passed, and ordered to be engrossed.

Mr. Spaight presented the following resolution, which passed its several readings in this House, and was ordered to be engrossed, viz:

Be it resolved, &c.—That the Clerk of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Commons purchase for the use of each House three copies of the revised laws of North Carolina, and Taylor's Revision, and the Public Treasurer is hereby authorized to pay for the same from any moneys in the Treasury, not otherwise appropriated.

Monday, Nov. 28.

Mr. Spaight presented the certificates of allowance of the County Court of Craven in favor of Capt. John Rhem, Thos. Ewell and Christopher Bexley, pen-

sioners of the State. Read, and, on motion of Mr. Spaight, ordered, to be countersigned by the Speaker of the Senate, and sent to the Commons.

On motion of Mr. Askew.

Resolved, That the committee on the militia laws and the public arms be instructed to inquire into the expediency of passing a law giving the Governor power to furnish the different volunteer companies in this State with arms, and that they report by bill or otherwise.

Mr. Montgomery, of Orange, presented the following resolution, which was read, and, on his motion, ordered to lie upon the table, viz:

Resolved, &c.—That our Senators in Congress be instructed and our Representatives be requested to resist and oppose an extension or revival of the charter of the Bank of the United States.

Mr. M'Farland presented the following resolution, which was adopted:

Whereas much dissatisfaction exists among the citizens of this State, owing to the late insurrectionary movements along our negro population, which was instigated by a fanatical negro preacher; therefore,

Resolved, That the Judiciary committee be instructed to inquire into the expediency of so amending the laws of this State, as to prevent Negroes, bond or free from preaching; also to impose a penalty on all persons who shall, directly or indirectly, allow negroes to assemble on his or their land, either by night or day, except it be at a preaching by white persons.

On motion of Mr. Cowper, of Gates,

Resolved, That the committee on so much of the Governor's message as relates to slaves, free persons of color, and incendiary publications, be instructed to inquire into the expediency of prohibiting every owner from allowing his slave to go at large, and make or propose any contracts, or undertake any work whatsoever, or to execute any jobs in any form or mode, unless such owners shall have previously, in every such case, made the contract himself; and also stipulated to receive the proceeds himself, with leave to report by bill or otherwise.

RAIL-ROADS.

The first year of travelling on the Liverpool and Manchester railway has expired—during a part of the time, however, there was not full accommodation for either passengers or goods, yet it seems that 416,000 persons have travelled its whole distance, and about 34,000 persons short distances—a total of 450,000—and whose fares reach 399,600 stg.—a prodigious sum. The exact sum produced by the carriage of goods is not ascertained, but it is estimated at 790,000. This is surely a convincing proof of the utility of Rail-roads, and the favor with which they are regarded by the community. In this country we have no doubt they will prove as profitable and popular.

The Glasgow and Grankirk railway was formally opened at the end of September. The locomotive engines performed their journeys in capital style, conveying elegant carriages and barouches filled with passengers at the rate of twenty miles an hour. It presented another splendid triumph of science and art.

THE DESCRIPTIVE.—In the recently published memoirs of Lord Byron, by his friend Moore, we find the following graphic description of a dinner party:—"Yesterday I dined out with a larger party: like other parties of the kind, it was first silent, then talky, then argumentative, then disputatious, then unintelligible, then altogether, then inarticulate, then drunk. I carried away much wine, which had previously carried away my memory; so that all was hiccup and happiness for the last hour or so."

NEWBERN PRICES CURRENT.

CORRECTED EVERY TUESDAY.

BEEFWAX, lb.	17	21
BUTTER, do.	20	25
CANDLES, do.	12	14
COFFEE, do.	18	14
CORN; bbl. quantity,	2	00
CORN MEAL, bushel,	50	60
CORDAGE, cwt.	14	18
COTTON, do.	7	00
COTTON BAGGING, Hemp, yd.	18	20
FLAX, lb.	12	15
FLAX, do.	8	10
FLOUR, Rochester, bbl.	6	50
do., Baltimore, do.	6	50
do., North Carolina, do.	5	00
IRON,—Bar, American, lb.	5	61
do., Russia & Swedes, do.	6	10
LARD, lb.	8	
LEATHER, Sole, lb.	25	
do., Dressed, Neats, do.	1	50
do., Calf skins, dozen,	22	00
LUMBER, Flooring, 1 1/2 in., M.	12	14
do., 1 in. boards, do.	8	0
do., Scantling, do.	8	0
do., Square Timber, do.	17	18
Shingles, Cypress, do.	1	50
Staves, w. o. hhd. do.	18	20
Do. red oak, do.	7	8
Do. w. o. bbl. do.	8	
Heading, hhd. do.	18	20
Do. bbl. do.	8	10
MOLASSES, gallon,	26	80
NAILS, Cut, all sizes above 4d. lb.	8	
do., 4d. and 3d. do.	8	
do., wrought, do.	16	
NAVAL STORES, Tar, bbl.	90	1 00
do., Turpentine, do.	1	50
do., Pitch, do.	1	50
do., Rosin, do.	1	50
Spirits Turpentine, gall.	30	
Varnish, do.	25	
OIL, Sperm, do.	90	1 40
do., Whale & Porpoise, do.	33	
do., Linseed, do.	1	00
PAINTS, Red Lead, lb.	15	18
do., White Lead, ground in oil, cwt.	15	16
PROVISIONS, Bacon, lb.	7	
do., Hams, do.	9	10
do., Beef, bbl.	12	13
do., Pork, mess, do.	12	13
do., prime, do.	9	50
do., Do. cargo, do.	11	50
SALT, T. Island, bushel, quantity,	65	
do., Beaufort, do. (none.)	75	1
do., Liverpool, fine, do.	75	1
SHOT, cwt.	8	0
SPIRITS, Brandy, French, gall.	1	40
do., Apple Brandy, do.	45	
do., Peach do.	50	60
do., Rum, Jamaica, do.	1	20
do., Do. windward I'd do.	1	20
do., Do. New England, do.	45	
do., Gin, Holland, do.	1	25
do., do., American, do.	40	
do., Whiskey, do.	40	
STEEL, German, lb.	16	18
do., English, blistered, do.	10	12
SUGAR, Loaf, do.	19	20
do., Lump, do.	16	18
do., Brown, do.	7	
TEA, Imperial, do.	1	60
do., Gunpowder, do.	1	60
do., Hyson, do.	1	50
do., Black, do.	80	
TALLOW, do.	3	8
WINE, Madaga, do.	3	
do., Teneriffe do.	1	60