

78,576 l. 18 s. 6 d. The reader concludes, that the exportation of these goods to *Africa* is owing to our *West-Indian* islands. But herein he mistakes. These goods were exported in 1761; and the *Examiner* informs us *, that this present year *the negroes sold at Guadaloupe were not fewer than 4000*, which he supposes amounted to 120,000 l. The negroes sold at *Guadaloupe* this year, were without doubt purchased by the goods exported to *Africa* the last: and therefore, there must be deducted from the account of the exports to *Africa*, occasioned by our own *West-Indian* commerce, the prime cost of the negroes sold at *Guadaloupe*, reckoning to that cost, the sunken value of those that died in the passage, and by one accident, and another, never arrived at market, which we will set at 78,576 l. 18 s. 6 d. the value of the *East-India* goods. I may have over-rated them, but think that trade sufficiently lucrative, that clears one third, to pay for freight and satisfy the merchant. How came the *Examiner* to take the exports to *Africa* of the year 1761, a year, in which they were greatly increased by the view of purchasing negroes for the market at *Guadaloupe*? Was it owing to artifice or oversight? If he had meant to have given his reader the true state of the case, he should have taken the exports to *Africa* before the war, he should have shewn how many of these goods, were bartered away for negroes, and not for gold-