

to be eligible. As often as a duty upon a foreign article makes an addition to its price, it causes an extra expense to the community, for the benefit of the domestic manufacturer. A bounty does no more: But it is in the interest of the society in each case, to submit to a temporary expense, which is more than compensated, by an increase in industry and wealth, by an augmentation of resources and independence; and by the circumstance of eventual cheapness, which has been noticed in another place.

It would deserve attention, however, in the employment of this species of encouragement in the United States, as a reason for moderating the degree of it in the instances, in which it might be deemed eligible, that the great distance of this country from Europe imposes very heavy charges on all the fabrics which are brought from thence, amounting from 15 to 30 percent on their value, according to their bulk.

A question has been made concerning the constitutional right of the government of the United States to apply this species of encouragement, but there is certainly no good foundation for such a question. The national legislature has express authority "To lay and Collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the *common defense* and *general welfare*" with no other qualifications than that "all duties, imposts and excises, shall be *uniform* throughout the United States, that no capitation or other direct tax shall be laid unless in proportion to numbers ascer-

tained by a census or enumeration taken on the principles prescribed in the Constitution," and that "no tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any state." These three qualifications excepted, the power to *raise money* is *plenary*, and *indefinite*; and the objects to which it may be *appropriated* are no less comprehensive, than the payment of the public debts and the providing for the common defense and "*general welfare*." The terms "general welfare" were doubtless intended to signify more than was expressed or imported in those which preceded; otherwise numerous exigencies incident to the affairs of a nation would have been left without a provision. The phrase is as comprehensive as any that could have been used; because it was not fit that the constitutional authority of the Union, to appropriate its revenues should have been restricted within narrower limits than the "general welfare" and because this necessarily embraces a vast variety of particulars, which are susceptible neither of specification nor of definition.

It is therefore of necessity left to the discretion of the national legislature, to pronounce, upon the objects, which concern the general welfare, and for which under that description, an appropriation of money is requisite and proper. And there seems to be no room for a doubt that whatever concerns the general interests of *learning* of *agriculture*, of *manufactures*, and of *commerce* are within the sphere of the national councils *as far as regards an application of money*.

## Thomas R. Malthus's new world order

Today, Baghdad in Iraq and Lima in Peru are both the victims of the same new world order policy of the malthusians. This policy is being implemented with slightly different methods and measures in the two cases, but it is designed to produce the same results. In the one case, it has been achieved via bombing sorties. In the other case, it is occurring through the policies of the International Monetary Fund. In both cases, it is a policy being forced through by George Bush. In both cases, the malthusian objective is to depopulate, and to eliminate the sovereignty of, the nations of the Third World in particular. It is this that produces the spread of diseases like cholera.



Parson Malthus (1766-1834), a paid employee of the British East India Company, said it over 200 years ago, in his 1798 book *Essay on the Principle of Population*:

"All children who are born, beyond what would be required to keep up the population to a desired level, must necessarily perish, unless room be made for them by the death of grown persons. . . . We should facilitate, instead of foolishly and vainly endeavoring to impede, the operations of nature in producing this mortality; and if we dread the too frequent visitation of the horrid form of famine, we should sedulously encourage the other forms of destruction, which we compel nature to use.

"Instead of recommending cleanliness to the poor, we should encourage contrary habits. In our towns we should make the streets narrower, crowd more people into the houses, and court the return of the plague. In the country, we should build our villages near stagnant pools, and particularly encourage settlement in all marshy and unwholesome situations. But above all, we should reprobate specific remedies for ravaging diseases and restrain those benevolent, but much mistaken men who have thought they are doing a service to mankind by protecting schemes for the total extirpation of particular disorders."

—Dennis Small