

A. S. Murphy, Esq.

MINERVA; or, ANTI-JACOBIN.

TWO & A HALF DOLS. PER ANNO. Payable half Yearly.

PUBLISHED (WEEKLY) BY WILLIAM BOYLAN.

TWO DOLLARS PER ANNO.

Vol. 8.]

RALEIGH, (N. C.) MONDAY, JANUARY 23, 1804.

[No. 406.]

WASHINGTON, DEC. 21, 1803.

We have not yet been able to publish the whole of the debate on the salaries of the officers. Those salaries which were formerly, and in a time of much greater scarcity and dearth than the present, opposed with the utmost warmth and vehemence, are now, when most of the necessaries of life are fallen in value, advocated with equal zeal and pertinacity. Such is democratic consistency and economy. The difference is, that Gallatin was then in Congress, and opposed the salaries; he is now enjoying them. The following speech of Mr. Goddard, exhibits most of the arguments urged by the federalists on this question.

Mr. Goddard—I am sensible, Mr. Speaker, that to oppose the passage of a bill, the object of which is to give an increased compensation to men who may be personally respected, is at any time an infamous task. Opposition to the passage of the bill now on your table is rendered peculiarly unpleasant, from the severe reprehension which gentlemen meet with, who take the liberty to state their sentiments against its provisions; and, although I think the salaries proposed to be given by this bill are too high, yet I do not know but I should have contented myself with a silent vote on the subject, had it not been for the very singular amendment which, on the motion of an honorable gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Eustis) has been introduced into the bill, and the notice which that, and another honorable gentleman (Mr. Randolph) have seen fit to take, of the few hasty remarks, which, on a former day, I had the honor of submitting to the House. Notwithstanding the remarks which have fallen from gentlemen respecting that amendment, I still think that, with gentlemen at least, with whom I have the honor generally to concur in opinion, it may form a solid objection against the passage of the bill, whatever may be their sentiments respecting its general provisions. By the terms of that amendment, the salaries are to be paid to the several officers therein named, "as established by the act of the 2d of March, 1799."—Now, sir, for what purpose is the amendment introduced? Not to have any effect upon the bill itself; for it can have no beneficial effect—and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Eustis) has told us that it is not for the purpose of casting any imputation or reproach upon those who passed the act of March, 1799, but simply for the purpose of recording a fact, and promulgating it to the people of the U. States. But will the gentleman from Massachusetts permit me to ask whether, if he and his political friends, had been in power at the time when the temporary act of March, 1799, passed, this amendment would ever have appeared in this bill? Would there, in that case, have been such solicitation to record this fact? If not, why introduce it now? The gentleman says, to serve as the proclamation which, he says I some days past proposed as a substitute for this amendment; and the gentleman is good enough to give me leave to carry it home for the benefit of my constituents in Connecticut.

Another gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Varnum) has added, that when the act of 2d of March, 1799, was revived and continued in force, by the act of the 14th of April, 1802, an attempt was made, and which excited some uneasiness among the people, to prove that those who passed the last act had raised the salaries of the executive officers of the government—and, sir, let me say that it was successfully done. I do not mean successful in any effect produced by it, but successful in proving the position that the salaries were raised by that act. How stands this matter? At the time when the act of 14th of April, 1802, passed, the Secretaries of State and the Treasury were each entitled, by the law then existing, to receive as a compensation for their services, the sum of 3500 dollars annually, and no more—By force of the act of April 14, 1802, they were severally entitled to receive the sum of 5000 dollars, and yet, by some political legerdemain, gentlemen attempt to prove that they did not raise those salaries! Such also is the case, with respect to every other officer named in the bill, and yet this amendment is to proclaim to the people of the United States, that under

this administration salaries are not raised! It is true, that in March, 1799, owing to the high price of living and other circumstances, a temporary act passed increasing the compensation, but for a limited time. It is expressed in so many words in that act, that it should continue in force for three years, and no longer. It expired, by its own limitation, on the 31st day of December, 1801, operating only upon the years 1799, 1800 & 1801—and it was a mere dead letter at the time of passing the act of April, 1802, and is it, sir, for the purpose of informing the people of the United States, that such an act passed, that this provision is introduced into a permanent law?—Whoever denied, and who does not know, that such an act passed at that time?—Does the gentleman seriously suppose that the people of this country are so ignorant as not to know this? Or that they need information on this subject? But, sir, the amendment purports to record a fact, which I do not consider as existing. It holds out the idea that the compensations given by this bill were established in 1799—the term established, conveys an idea of permanency, and it is agreed by all, that the act in question was of a temporary nature, and long since expired. If, as a gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Eustis) has said, the bill under consideration is so perfectly correct and proper, and its provisions so just, as to induce him to express his astonishment that any gentleman should oppose it, why, let me ask, not permit it to stand upon its own intrinsic merit, and not attempt in this strange manner, to ingratiate upon an act of his predecessors? Why are not gentlemen willing to take upon themselves the responsibility of their own acts? If measures are adopted which are deemed popular, I perceive no indisposition in gentlemen to claim the merit of them. Why then, let me ask, do they wish, in this manner, to devolve the odium of those which they think otherwise, upon their predecessors? I do not consider myself responsible for an act which may have been done by those who have gone before me, and whom I generally respect; and I had hoped, sir, if the quotation does not give offence to certain gentlemen, that the time might have arrived when it should no longer be said, politically, that the fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge. If therefore gentlemen are determined to persevere in legislating in this manner, I should consider myself perfectly justified in voting against the passage of this bill, whatever might be my sentiments respecting its general provisions.

But, sir, there are other objections in my mind against the passage of this bill, which do not apply to the question, whether the salaries generally are too high or too low.

I took the liberty on a former day to state some objections respecting the salary of the Attorney General, and will now to make myself understood on that subject, and I hope, sir, that what I may say will not be considered as having allusion to the gentleman who now sits in that office, for I was educated in habits of respect towards him; but I do conceive that error has crept in, and a misconception, been adopted, respecting the compensation given to that officer; and whether the salary is too high or too low, we are about to sanction that misconception, and increase the salary of the Attorney General much more in proportion than we do the other officers of government.

By a law which passed September 23d, 1789, the salary of the Attorney General was fixed at 1500 dollars.—By another law passed March 2, 1797, it was increased 500 dols. making in the whole 2000 dols. By another law afterwards passed, an additional annual compensation of 600 dols. was granted to that officer, for services to be performed under the 6th article of the British treaty, which was to be allowed him during the continuance of those services. Afterwards and before the Attorney General had ceased to perform services under the British treaty, and while he was in the reception of the sum of 600 dols. annually on account of those services, as well as the other sums which I have stated, the act of the 2d of March, 1799, passed, and

what, sir, were the terms of that law? "In lieu of the salaries heretofore allowed by law, the following annual compensations are hereby granted," &c. and then giving the Attorney General the sum of 3000 dols. Not sir, in lieu of the compensation which he was entitled to by any one or two laws, but in lieu of the salary heretofore allowed by law—by an existing law, comprehending, I believe, as well the 600 dols. for services under the 6th art. of the British treaty, as any or all other sums, to which by law he was entitled—and yet it has been said that the Attorney General has received under all these laws the sum of 600 dols. annually, by what construction I am unable to decide—and now, sir, when the performance of all services under the British treaty have wholly ceased, we are about to sanction a misconception of our laws, and render permanent the salary of the Attorney General at 3000 dols.

But, sir, in my opinion there is very good reason why the salary of that officer should not be high if he is selected from among professional gentlemen, who reside at the seat of government, it will be only paying him for some opinions which will not much interfere with his other business. If a gentleman is called from distant parts of the union, a man of talents and of great respectability will probably be selected, who will come to the seat of government under very favorable circumstances—the office will increase his reputation. The sessions of the supreme court of the United States will always be held here. Causes of the first magnitude from all parts of the union, and which will of course afford the largest fees, will there be litigated. The Attorney General we may suppose will be the first person applied to, and the office, in that way, will furnish him with much greater compensation than any other officers are entitled to.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have another objection to the passage of the bill on your table, of a special nature, and not relating to the question, whether the salaries are too high, or too low.

By this bill, the sum of 5000 dollars, is proposed to be given to the Secretary of the Treasury. In all that has been said on the subject of the comparative prices of provisions, and the expences of living in Philadelphia in the year 1799, and this place, at the present time, no gentleman say that they are greater now, than at that time. Some gentlemen undertake to prove, that they are not as great.

By a recurrence to the journals of this house, at the time when the temporary act of 1799 passed, annexing for a limited time, to that office, the same salary which is now proposed to be given, I find the name of that gentleman who now holds that office, and who was then a distinguished member of this house, recorded against the passage of that law. He thereby has declared to the world, that the sum now proposed to be given, is too great for the performance of the duties of that office.

This is the best evidence in the present case. Was not that gentleman a competent judge? If he was, shall we give to a public officer a greater sum of money, than he himself thinks his services are worth?

He cannot in consequence receive a greater salary than that fixed by the law of 1789.—And if we persevere in passing this bill, we shall place that officer, in a very delicate situation; we shall compel him to take a greater compensation for his services, than he believes they merit.

I find also on examining the same journal, that more than twenty gentlemen, who were members of this house in 1799, when the act so often referred to, passed, and who voted against its passage, are now members of this house, and not one of them, I believe, on any of the questions which have been taken, respecting this bill, have voted against it. Some of them have spoken in its favor. Gentlemen may be confident in doing this, and I dare say they have reasons which, in their own minds, justify their votes; what they are, is not for me to enquire. One gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Skinner) who voted against that bill, has indeed told us, that if gentlemen should change some of

their opinions once in the course of five years, he does not think it expedient to be the charge of inconsistency—I can certainly have no objection to gentlemen's acknowledging that they were formerly in an error, and I am very willing, that the work of reformation should progress, and that gentlemen should correct other errors which they then entertained.

Having made these remarks, I might content myself to vote against this bill, finding it liable to the several objections which I have stated. But, sir, with the patience of the house, while I submit a few remarks, upon its general provisions.

I have listened with much attention to the arguments of an honorable gentleman from New-York, (Mr. S. Mitchell) on this subject.—The first part of his remarks went to prove, that the pecuniary compensation generally given to professional men is very inadequate to their services. This argument, as a gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. R. law fit to observe, respecting that of an honorable and very respectable member from Massachusetts, (Mr. Taegart) I should be glad to have printed—not too much for the use of members of this house, as for the benefit of a certain class of people, called clients. But the gentleman from New-York adds, that professional men take a part of their compensation in money, and a part in fame. Of this latter article, that gentleman has received a large share, and I do not know but he has also, of the former—but he has proceeded to shew, by a course of ingenious reasoning, that high salaries are necessary to be given to support a republican government. A few years ago, arguments in abundance were used, to prove that low salaries were essentially necessary to support a republican government.

I speak not of any used by the gentleman from New-York, for I do not know what were his sentiments formerly.—But it now seems very easy to prove that high salaries are necessary to be given to call men from the low and middle walks of life, and induce them to aspire to your first offices.—Here Mr. Mitchell rose and said, that he had not contended that high salaries were necessary for this purpose.—Mr. G. proceeded—High and low are relative terms—I am sensible the gentleman advocates, only the salaries to be given by the bill on your table—that gentleman may call them low, I call them high—and considering them as high, I say, that it is now easy to prove, that high salaries are necessary to be given to support republicanism; and I do not know to what extent they may not ultimately be raised, to do this.—In the French Republic, many millions of livres annually, are not thought high to be given to the First Consul, to support his Republican Government, &c. I know not how soon similar provisions may be thought necessary, to support her sister republic, in America. A compensation has certainly been given there, sufficient to call, from the middle walks of life, a Corsican Soldier, to support by his talents, that republic. And we have the more reason to fear, that similar inducement will be held out here, as according to the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. R.) on a former day, nothing is consistent but keeping salaries, in the ascending series—for that gentleman, seemed to suppose that gentlemen who formerly voted against the present salaries might now, very consistently vote for them, but that those who formerly voted for them, would now vote very inconsistently to vote against them; and to what extent this sort of consistency is to be carried, I do not know, but we may conjecture from the opinion which has been here expressed, of the almost incalculable value of the services of some officers, and their claim upon the public gratitude.

But permit me sir, to state my view of this subject generally, I am perfectly content to give to the officers of government, a reasonable and just compensation for the services which they render.—It is difficult to determine the abstract question, what that is. In my opinion we ought not to consider it in an abstract point of view, but relatively only.—It ought to be adapted to the nature,