

conduct of France was very different from what was to have been wished, as well as from what was contemplated by the marquis la Fayette, who had patronized the interest of these fishermen, yet that the project of tempting them to emigrate had originated in Great-Britain, and was a *counter-proje* on the part of France. How the gentleman happened to omit the antecedent attempt of Great-Britain, and thereby exaggerate that of France, Mr. M. did not undertake to explain: but it was the more extraordinary, as the whole account of the transaction was contained in the same page of the report, nay in the same paragraph, from which the gentleman had extracted his information.

Here he read the passage in that report, and produced the British statute, inviting the whale fisherman, by an offer of certain privileges to emigrate to Great Britain.

A further charge against the Secretary of State is, that in his statement of the tonnage of the United States employed in the trade with the French and British dominions, he founded it, not on the *actual number of ships*, but on the number of *entries*. This charge was as singular as it was uncaudid.

The report stated the fact, that the American tonnage entering our ports from the several nations with which the United States traded, was so and so; and in this statement, it pursued the official returns made on the subject. What more was to be required?

In giving the fact, the secretary imposed on no one, because he stated the tonnage to be entry tonnage, as it really was.

He followed the best guide that existed, an official return from the proper officers.

No return of the *actual* tonnage, as distinguished from the *entry* tonnage, had at the time, ever been made from any office, or called for by any act of Congress.

The first return ever made in the latter form, was called for since the resolutions on the table were proposed.

These considerations might have restrained the gentleman from this unwarranted attack on the accuracy of the report.

But he ought at least to have been sure, that whilst he was charging the Secretary with following an erroneous guide, he was himself following one that was not erroneous. The examination of this point involved facts which merited the particular attention of the committee.

The statement of the *entry tonnage* of the United States in *foreign* trade for 1792 lately called for and reported, is 415,331 tons. The statement of the *actual tonnage* for the same year is 289,394 tons.

On comparing these two quantities, it was evident that both could not be right. If the *entry* tonnage was no more than was stated, it was inconceivable that the *actual* tonnage could be as much as was stated. It would allow the vessels in the European and West India trades together but somewhat more than one voyage and a third a year. It could never be supposed, that this corresponded with the fact. How then was the inconsistency in the two statements to be explained?

Mr. M. said, as he did not know by what rule the actual tonnage was made up, he would form no conjecture on the subject. He hoped, and wished that some gentleman more conversant with it, would solve the phenomenon. He did not call on the gentleman from South Carolina, because he most of all, must be puzzled to account for it; having stated that our vessels in the trade to Europe make *two* voyages, and in the West India trade *four* voyages a year.

Besides the evidence contained in this comparison of the aggregate tonnage in the two different forms, in which it had been reported, the existence of error somewhere, and probably in the account of the actual tonnage resulted from a comparative view of our exports to the British dominions, for the two years of 1790 and 1792, and of the whole tonnage American and British employed in conveying them.

In the former year the exports were 9,363,416 dollars. In the latter 8,269,495 dollars; the excess for 1790, 1,093,921 dollars.

The entry tonnage, British and American for 1790, was 272,580 tons.

The British entry tonnage for 1792, was 206,384 tons. The *actual* American tonnage for 1792, was according to the official statement, 66,582 tons; which

turned into entry tonnage, according to the proportion of the whole actual, to the whole entry tonnage for that year, makes the American entry tonnage, in the trade to Great Britain about 95,000 tons.

Adding this to the British entry tonnage of 296,384 tons, the British and American together for 1792, amounts to 391,384 tons; which exceeds the tonnage of 1790 no less than 27,804 tons.

According to this calculation, which embraces the actual tonnage as stated to the house, there would be 27,804 tons more, employed in transporting 1,093,921 dollars less; making our tonnage to increase in that proportion as the employment of it decreased.

There was a possibility, Mr. M. observed, that the course of trade in the two years, might be such that more of the vessels employed in the exportations to Great Britain might be entered in 1790 as coming from some other country, than in 1792; but as there was no known circumstance which authorized this solution, and as it seemed demonstrable in general, that error existed somewhere in the statements, and most probably in those of the actual tonnage, he concluded that it ought to be referred to that source; and consequently, that the guide followed by the Secretary of State, to wit, the entry tonnage, the only one he had to follow, was not more inaccurate, than the actual tonnage would have been, which guided the member from South Carolina.

Another position of the Secretary of State on which a charge is founded, is, "that the greater part of what Great Britain receives from the United States is re-exported." This position, Mr. M. reminded the committee, related to Great Britain without comprehending the West India islands, which formed a distinct branch in the Secretary's report. How far it was liable to the exceptions taken against it, would appear from an examination of facts.

To obviate criticisms, Mr. M. said he would take for the basis of his calculations, the statement given in detail by the gentleman himself, of the exports for 1790, to the French and British dominions; which though not extended to every item, approached so near to a full view of the trade, as to be adequate to the purpose.

In this statement the exports to Great Britain stand at 6,651,429 dollars; from which must be subtracted, for the comparison, the amount of the several re-exportations as far as they can be liquidated.

TOBACCO. It appears from an official document, that the tobacco exported to Great Britain in 1791, was 67,216 hogheads. A return for another year states the quantity to be 52,505 hogheads. It appeared from the revenue returns of Great Britain, that the consumption of this article amounted to 9,600 hogheads. The proportion re-exported might then be reasonably set down at four-fifths of the quantity imported.

RICE. To obtain the proportion of rice re-exported, we may take the medium quantity imported for three years, immediately preceding the revolution, which, accordingly to a table in Anderson's History of Commerce, was 486,543 cwt. By another table for the same period, the medium quantity exported was 349,653 cwt. The difference marks the consumption, and is 136,890 cwt. The quantity exported to Great Britain from the United States in 1792, was 58,978 barrels, equal to 294,890 cwt. Comparing the quantity consumed with this quantity, it appears that more than half, tho' less than two thirds, is re-exported—call the re-exportation one half only of the present importation.

INDIGO. According to a statement in Anderson, the medium importations into Great-Britain, for three years immediately preceding the revolution, were about thrice the medium quantity re-exported. Call the proportion re-exported now, however, one-fifth only, which is probably below the fact.

From these proportions, and the data furnished by the gentleman's own statements, results the following justification of the report of the Secretary on this point.

	Dollars.
Exports to Great Britain	6,651,429
	Dollars.
Tobacco	2,754,493
Consumed 1-5	550,898
Re-exported	2,205,395

Rice	773,852
Consumed 1-2	386,926
Re-exported	386,926
Indigo	473,830
Consumed 4-5	379,064
Re-exported	94,766
Wheat and flour, perhaps the whole re-exported:—And more was carried to Great-Britain, in the two succeeding years, tho' the aggregate exports thither were less than in the year here taken: Say, however, that one fourth was consumed, and let the amount stand according to the gentleman's statement—at	1,087,840
Consumed 1-4	271,960
Re-exported	815,880
	3,501,067

Here, then, it appears, that the re-exportations of the four articles alone, of Tobacco, Rice, Indigo and Wheat, are greater than the whole consumption in Great Britain, of the articles imported from the United States, although the most unfavorable year has been taken, for the enquiry; and, consequently, that the position of the Secretary of State, was well founded.

(Speech to be continued.)

MR. FENNO,

You are requested to give the inclosed remarks made by Mr. Giles, a place in your paper as soon as may consist with the arrangements of your press—it is the rather requested, because the manner in which you have stated the transaction, to which they relate, was not calculated to convey the truth of the case.*

From the General Advertiser.

Substance of the remarks made by Mr. Giles, in the House of Representatives, on the 24th of February, 1794;—upon a motion for entering into the consideration of the resolutions proposed in the early part of the session; requiring an examination into the state of the Treasury Department, by committee.

Mr. Giles observed that very shortly after the meeting of Congress, he had laid this resolution on the table, under a conviction of the propriety of the measure, and the hope of a speedy decision upon it. An occurrence took place a few days afterwards, which produced a temporary delay. An individual presented a memorial to Congress, containing some suggestions against the official conduct of the gentleman at the head of the Department; and to have pressed the enquiry into the general state of the Treasury, during the pendency of those suggestions, might have been deemed a violation of delicacy and propriety: Very soon after the imputations from that source, were done away, by report of a committee; he had called up the resolution; but the House acting under the impressions produced by the delicate crisis of our external affairs, refused to enter into the consideration of the subject at that time.

Mr. Giles remarked, that whilst on the one hand, he was desirous of looking into a subject which he deemed important to the public welfare, as well as to gratify an officer in a request, which he conceived, had been impelled by the delicacy of his situation; he was not unwilling on the other hand, to yield to the opinion of the House, which induced an immediate attention to our affairs with foreign nations. The subjects of commercial regulations, and the naval armament, being now out of the view of the House, at least for some days, he hoped the chasm would be filled by the consideration of the resolution he had proposed. He could not help remarking, that at an early period of the session, this resolution had been termed the torch of discord. He thought if it could be viewed with impartiality, and according to its own design, it would not be found to possess that character. The primary object of the resolution, is to ascertain the boundaries of discretion and authority, between the Legislature, and the Treasury Department. To effect this

* If there has been any misrepresentation of this subject, in this Gazette, it is unknown to the Editor.

object, it becomes necessary to have a knowledge of the state of the Treasury Department; This appeared to him, an obvious duty of the House of Representatives, operating equally upon every individual of whom it is composed; it therefore seemed strange to him, that an attempt to discharge an essential duty, should be construed into a design to interrupt the harmony of deliberation.

If to require a full and comprehensive view of the public finances, and the modes in which they are contributed, and distributed; be construed into an effort at discord: it must arise either from the opinion, that Congress already possess this view, or from the principle that they ought not to possess it; but that the whole knowledge of this subject should be left to the Treasury officers. If this doctrine be contended for, he thought it ought to stimulate the exertions of those, who believed it to be subversive of the primary principle of the constitution.

He requested the House to accompany him in making a few reflections upon this subject.

The debt of the United States, forms an important item of legislation: Its system is intricate; its extent unknown; it embraces the interests of a very sagacious and powerful class of citizens: It is made by the constitution, the peculiar province of the Representatives, immediately chosen by the people, to superintend the contributions, and the distributions of all public monies. This may be deemed the highest duty of the Representatives. It may be asked, how this most important of duties, can be understandingly performed, but by a knowledge of the whole machinery of the Treasury Department? There can be no prospect of *acting wisely*, where there are no means of *judging rightly*. The omission to discharge this important legislative function, by the Representatives, will necessarily cause it to be performed by the Head of the Department. A species of laws will grow out of an inattention to, and a consequent ignorance of this subject, which may be called, *the rules of office; the forms of the Treasury; the practical constructions of laws*, contravening the legal constructions. In all conflicts between this species of laws, and the laws pronounced by the constitutional tribunal, the advantage would be in favor of the Treasury system: Because *this* would be the *practical*, that the *theoretic* system of legislation. An inattention to this subject, which is an intricate and complicated one, and a consequent ignorance of it, might in a course of time, leave to the Legislature, the mere right of registering Treasury edicts. It may be said, that this is not the case at present: It is not proposed to give any opinion on this point; the remarks have been intended to shew the probable tendency of intrusting this important branch of legislation, to the Treasury Department; which would be the infallible consequence of the ignorance of the Legislature, of the Treasury proceedings.

The propriety of placing confidence, in the Executive Officers, is an argument very familiar to this House. To a certain extent, it is in every respect proper. It is proper, so long as the officer confines himself to his legal designated functions: If in any case, he should exceed these, it becomes the duty of the Legislature, to notice the proceeding. It is also the duty of the Legislature to ascertain his functions by law, and to limit his discretion. This argument of confidence in the executive officers, may easily be carried to a dangerous excess. The people have confidence in their Representatives; they bestow on them certain trusts, and impose on them certain duties. The representatives have confidence in the executive officers. They transfer to them, these trusts and these duties. What would be the result? A complete and radical change in the most essential character of the government.

Instead of the Legislature prescribing rules of conduct to the people, the executive officers would prescribe them; and the Legislature would be of no other use than to legalize executive proceedings. This would be a desertion of the trust reposed in the representative. The consideration of individual case, would always operate in favor of this idea. The argument of individual interest might possibly aid it in some instances, and the argument of policy in others; for there may be some individuals, who might possibly prefer that, to the constitutional state of things. These remarks had been made to shew, in very