

It may tend to avoid future embarrassments, that such abolitions and drawbacks, as shall be deemed expedient, with a view to promoting manufactures, shall accompany the establishment and appropriation of whatever further duties may be laid, for the object in contemplation.

And may be found convenient to qualify the appropriation of the surplus which is to be applied to that object, so as to let in such other appropriations during the session as occurrences may suggest.

An estimate of the additional revenue which may be expected from the proposed duties is subjoined.

It will occur to the House, that the credit allowed for the duties will require an anticipation of the product by a temporary loan, for which provision in the law will be requisite.

All which is humbly submitted.

ALEXANDER HAMILTON,
Secretary of the Treasury.

ESTIMATE OF PROBABLE ADDITIONAL REVENUE FROM THE PROPOSED DUTIES.

	Dols.
Madeira wine 300,000 gallons, average increase 12 cents per gallon,	36,000
Other wines 700,000 gallons, average increase 3 cents per gallon,	21,000
Distilled spirits 3,600,000 gallons average increase, allowing for proposed deduction from the duties on domestic spirits, 2 cents,	72,000
Salt, from the equalizing regulation proposed, will probably yield 1-6 more, or 2 cents per bushel on 2,000,000 bushels	40,000
Malt liquors 200,000 gallons at 2 1/2 cents	5,000
Nails and spikes 1,800,000lb. at 1 cent,	18,000
Cocoa 800,000lb. at 1 cent,	8,000
Playing cards, 20,000 at 15 cents,	3,000
Other enumerated articles ad valorem at 15 per cent.	10,000
Increased duty on articles rated permanently at 10 per cent. ad valorem, computed at 2 millions of dollars, in value at 3 per cent.	60,000
Temporary addition of 2 1/2 per cent. on the articles now rated at 5, computed on 10,000,000 of dollars,	250,000
	Dollars, 523,500

CONGRESS.

PHILADELPHIA.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 16.

IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE.
On the Representation Bill.

[CONTINUED.]

MR. PAGE.—I rise not to enter into a debate on the question before you, Sir, because, as I said yesterday, it being out of order, it did not admit of debate: it is true the question is now a little varied, but it comes to the same thing; for if we vote in favor of it, we must vote contrary to a solemn decision of this very committee. What I wish to observe, Sir, is in reply to the member from New Hampshire, who seemed dissatisfied with my ideas of order; and to make one remark on what the member from Massachusetts (Mr. Ames) said as to *truth* being his aim. As to the point of order, it must be most evident that it is to no purpose to put a question in a committee of the whole, if when the sense of the committee has been taken, another question may be proposed, which may lead to a decision directly contrary to that before made:—but the gentleman tells us that the committee were taken in, that they began too at the wrong end; but surely, Sir, this cannot be said, for the blank in the 16th line was not filled up till after solemn debate; and it was generally understood, that by filling it up, we should fix the principle of the bill. On that question, the ratio of 1 for 30,000 was established, and applied in a clause respecting South-Carolina in such a manner as, without inconsistency, must lead the committee to fill up the blanks now under consideration. But, Sir, if such debating as is contended for be allowable, when can the business before us be finished? How many amendments of this sort may not be proposed? Is it not sufficient for gentlemen to vote against the motion if they dislike it—and then in the House, where they will have a right to be heard, to propose their own amendments? There, if they can convince the House that the committee were in an error, they may correct it—but surely, Sir, the committee cannot now, without violating order, and being charged with a great inconsistency, agree to the motion before you. Truth is my aim, said the member from Massachusetts: it is *mine* as much as his:—but, without pretending to decide whether his construction of the constitution is right or not, I will ask him, how are we to arrive at the truth we now aim at; that is, how find the numbers to be inserted in the blanks, if his construction be right? For, according to that construction, we must apply the ratio to the whole federal number of the United States, before we can find the number of representatives for any one state; and can this be done till South-Carolina has made the return of the census?—and if this construction be right, may not South-Carolina, if it be the interest of that state to retain its present representation, keep back that return? This construction then is attended with an insuperable difficulty; and indeed I think with my colleague (Mr. Madison) was never thought of till lately within this House. Our constituents put the construction which the majority of the committee and of the House have hitherto put on the constitution; and several states have shewn by their acts that their construction is the same.

Mr. Vining said, if by consolidation is meant a consolidation of interests, he gloried in the idea; but if a consolidation of states is intended, he

was opposed to such an idea as much as any member on the floor. Adverting to Mr. Findley's idea of local interests being represented, he contended he had given up the contest; for if the gentleman is sincere, he must concede that the proposition now under consideration, more perfectly accorded with that idea than his own—Virginia represented as Delaware, would have but about 10 members—are the local interests then of Delaware represented by one member, when Virginia is represented by 21?

Mr. Murray hoped that number would not be inserted. If however the motion were carried, he wished its friends would, if consistent with order, amend the preliminary section of the bill, by inserting the principle under which this motion is made. The principle is, that the ratio of 30,000 is to be applied to the aggregate number of the continent, and not to the aggregate number of each state. He could not, on the fullest and most liberal reflection, give his assent to such a principle; but observed that at all events some principle, whatever it might be, ought to show that the vote of the house was regulated by rule rather than expedience. On a question so important as that of representation, the measure agreed to ought to result from some established principle. As the bill now stands, it will appear altogether arbitrary; and rights in which all are concerned, seem to flow more from grace, and the strength of majority, than settled system. If there is a principle in the bill, it is to be discovered merely in its provisions—whereas on such a subject its light, destined to guide the understanding, ought to be steady and apparent, and not glimmer dimly through the intricate windings of various provisions—these ought to have been natural conclusions, resulting from the principle, rather than the sources from which it is to be inferred. It ought to have been settled as soon as the bill came in, and before a vote indicative of it had been moved. As the whole of this subject had been hitherto completely sifted, he would make but one or two remarks. The framers of the constitution could never have thought of this mode of applying a ratio. All the guards in favor of state governments, show that the states were viewed respectively and severally. The laws relative to elections, are entirely and exclusively in the hands of the states. Had the convention intended the aggregate of the whole, and not of states, should be the object of apportionment by ratio, they would have kept the election law in the hands of Congress—they would have empowered Congress to divide the continent into districts. If New-Hampshire has 5 members here, and her aggregate divided by 30,000 would give her but 4 (which is the case) she will have an undue influence on this floor; as the weight and power that any state has here, ought to be but equal to her numbers. It has been laid down as doctrine here, that every member represents the whole. He could not comprehend the force of that position in the use and latitude in which it was applied. He would not annex any meaning to theoretical truths, which did not admit of a wholesome practice. A member here represents his constituents—he legislates for the whole. The people whose rights and interests are the subject of legislation, are a whole—from their unity of interests, and from their union of government, results the general duty of the representative. His responsibility to his own circle of constituents, is on his duty discharged or neglected to the whole; because the true good of the several parts consists in the general prosperity of the whole. Where, he said, a member represents one district, he meant to give, and show, a truth, on the use of which alone he could conceive a practical operation to the principle of responsibility could be obtained. Any other idea of responsibility which he had ever heard, was too refined for common use. If a member from one part of the union is to be the representative of a part which does not elect him, agreeably to this fractional doctrine, he cannot be held in check or controul by them; and the very reason that may make him hateful to them, may ingratiate him among those from whom he actually comes. Instead of cementing confidence, such a predominance given any one state beyond what her numbers entitle her to, will sow discord and jealousy.—He had an amendment ready to offer, which was, to strike out the words in the fifth line, "within the several states," and to insert these words, "agreeably to a ratio of one member for every 30,000." He would vote against the motion, and against the principle on which it was founded, which, though not specified in the bill, was obvious, and take the liberty of moving his amendment, if the motion now before the committee failed, which he hoped would be the case.

Mr. Boudinot said he could have wished that, as the house had gone into a committee of the whole, the gentleman (Mr. Murray) had brought forward a proposition, as he is abundantly able to do, which would give the bill the consistency he wished for. He then entered into a defence of the proposition, and justified its friends from the charge of inconsistency. He had been in fa-

vor of 40,000—if that had been agreed to, he should have applied it as it is now proposed in respect to 30,000. He replied to several objections, by explaining the constitution.

Mr. Benson moved an amendment as a substitute for Mr. Vining's proposition, expressly apportioning the representation on the aggregate number of the people of the United States—this he moved in conformity to the idea of Mr. Murray, who contended that there was no principle in the bill.

Mr. Vining, on this, withdrew his proposition. The debate was continued on Mr. Benson's motion, and was finally negatived—33 to 24.

FRIDAY, MARCH 23.

On the motion to recede from the disagreement of the House to the amendments of the Senate to the Representation Bill—the ayes and noes are as follow:

A Y E S.

Messrs. Ames, Benson, Boudinot, S. Bourne, B. Bourne, Clark, Fitzsimons, Gerry, Gilman, Goodhue, Gordon, Hartley, Jacobs, Kitchell, Kittera, Lawrance, Learned, Livermore, Muhlenberg, Niles, Schoonmaker, Sedgwick, J. Smith, I. Smith, Steele, Sylvester, Thatcher, Treadwell, Vining, Wadsworth, Ward—31.

N O E S.

Messrs. Ashe, Baldwin, Barnwell, Brown, Findley, Giles, Gregg, Grove, Heister, Hillhouse, Huger, Key, Lee, Macon, Madison, Mercer, Moore, Page, Parker, Seney, W. Smith, Sterrett, Sturges, Sumpter, Tucker, Venable, White, Williamson, Wyllis—29.

The Senate's amendments being adopted by the House, the bill is reduced to a single section, as follows:

"Be it enacted, &c. that, from and after the 2d day of March, in the year 1793, the House of Representatives shall be composed of 120 members, elected within the several states, according to the following apportionment: that is to say, within the state of New-Hampshire, 5; within the state of Massachusetts, 16; within the state of Vermont, 3; within the state of Rhode-Island, 2; within the state of Connecticut, 8; within the state of New-York, 11; within the state of New-Jersey, 6; within the state of Pennsylvania, 14; within the state of Delaware, 2; within the state of Maryland, 9; within the state of Virginia, 21; within the state of Kentucky, 2; within the state of North-Carolina, 12; within the state of South-Carolina, 7; and within the state of Georgia, 2."

SATURDAY, MARCH 24.

A memorial was read from the merchants and traders of Philadelphia, remonstrating against the additional duties proposed in the report on Ways and Means.

The bill for extending the time prescribed by law for the payment of the duties on teas, was read the first and second time, and made the order of the day for Tuesday next.

In committee of the whole on the bill for establishing a Mint, and regulating the Coins of the United States. The committee proceeded thro' the discussion of the bill, and made one amendment, which was reported to the House.

This amendment was, to strike out the clause which provides that the coin shall bear the impress of the President's head for the time being. On the question to agree to this amendment, the Ayes and Noes were as follow:

A Y E S.

Messrs. Baldwin, Clark, Fitzsimons, Giles, Gregg, Heister, Kitchell, Kittera, Lawrance, Lee, Macon, Madison, Moore, Niles, Page, Seney, J. Smith, Sterrett, Schoonmaker, Sumpter, Tucker, Treadwell, Venable, White, Williamson, Wyllis—26.

N A Y S.

Messrs. Barnwell, Benson, Boudinot, B. Bourne, S. Bourne, Brown, Gilman, Gordon, Goodhue, Huger, Hartley, Hillhouse, Key, Learned, Livermore, Sturges, Sedgwick, W. Smith, Sylvester, Thatcher, Wadsworth, Ward—22.

It was then voted to substitute the words "a device emblematical of Liberty, with an inscription of the word Liberty."—The bill was then ordered to be engrossed for a third reading on Monday next. Adjourned.

MONDAY, MARCH 26.

The bill for establishing a Mint, and to regulate the Coins of the United States, was read the third time, and, after some debate, was passed—The Ayes and Noes being as follow:

A Y E S.

Messrs. Ames, Ashe, Baldwin, Barnwell, Benson, Boudinot, S. Bourne, B. Bourne, Brown, Gerry, Gilman, Goodhue, Hartley, Heister, Huger, Key, Kittera, Lawrance, Learned, Livermore, Mercer, Muhlenberg, Page, Sedgwick, W. Smith, Sterrett, Sturges, Sylvester, Vining, Wadsworth, Ward, Williamson—32.

N O E S.

Messrs. Clark, Findley, Giles, Gordon, Grove, Hillhouse, Jacobs, Kitchell, Lee, Macon, Madison, Moore, Niles, Parker, Schoonmaker, Seney, I. Smith, Sumpter, Thatcher, Treadwell, Venable, White—22.