FROM THE LONDON COURIER.

Report of the commissioners of Naval Enquiry.

The examination of the right hon. lord viscount Melville, taken upon oath, the 5th of November, 1804:—

Q. It appearing by accounts laid before us, that the sums standing in your name as treasurer of the navy, at the bank, at the following period, were less than the sums with which you stood charged exclusive of the money advanced to your sub-accountants; and that the deficiencies were as follows:

December 31, 1786,	£56.000	0	0
1787,	53 000	0	0
1788,	48,100	0	0
1789,	53 100	0	0
1791,	19,988	9	8
1792,	26 476	19	8
1793,	27 025	17	9
1794,	21.758	7	9
1795,	30,316	16	1
1796,	75 413	5	0
1797,	58.640	14	0
1798,	54.140	15	0
1799,	44,150	15	0

Q. To what causes are such deficiencies to be attributed?

A. Although I take it for granted the sums are stated by the question accurately, I could not, on memory, state that they are so. I desired Mr. Trotter, so far as I was concerned to give you every information he could; and it was only in consequence of a conversation with him, immediately after the receipt of your letter to me, of date 26th June, that I learned, from the manner he kept his private accounts, it was impossible for him to give me the accurate information I required. The same reasons render it impossible for me to give you an answer to the question you put. I am aware that I am not bound to answer it, under the provision of the act establishing this commission, but I should not have dwelt on that objection, if there had been nothing of personal considerations to operate against my doing so; but for the reasons I hinted to you in my letter of the 30th June last, as I am not bound, so I will not feel myself warranted to give the explanations which your question points at.

Q. Upon what grounds does your lordship decline answering that question?

A. Upon the ground that I have already stated, under the 5th clause of the act of 43 Geo. III. chap. 16.

Q. Was any part of such sums in your hands?

A. They certainly came into my hands, but did not remain there.

Q. Did Mr. Alex. Trotter, while paymaster of the navy, lay out or apply, or cause to be laid out or applied, any of the money issued for carrying on the current service of the navy since the first of January 1786, for your benefit or advantage?

A. From the manner in which Mr. Trotter kept my accounts, it is impossible for me to answer that question; and I object to answer this question, upon the ground I have stated in answer to the first question.

Q. Did you direct or authorise him so to do?

A. To the best of my recollection I never did.

Q. Did you, between first Jan. 1786, and 31st May, 1800, derive any profit or advantage from the use or employment of money issued for carrying on the current service of the navy, under the act 29 Geo. III. chap. 31?

A. The same reasons which induced me to make the answer I have done to the first question, must induce me to repeat the same answer to this.

Does your lordship object to answer this question, under the provision of the 6th sect. of the act 43 Geo. III. chap. 16? I do, and upon the grounds stated in my answer to my first question.

Q. During the time you acted as treasurer of the navy, between the 1st of 1786, and 31st May 1800, was any of the money applicable to naval services advanced by you, or by your direction, for any other public service than that of the navy?

A. I decline to answer that question under the provisions of the 5th sect. of the act 43 Geo. III. chap. 16.

Q. Was any money issued for carrying on the current service of the navy, applied by your lordship, or by your direction, for any other public service than that of the navy, with the knowledge or consent of the navy board?

A. No; certainly not.

Q. Was there any official note or record made of the money issued for carrying on the current service of the navy, having been advanced by your direction for any other public purpose than that of the navy, or of the repayment of such money?

A. No; there was certainly no official note.

Q. Did you authorise the paymaster, in or about the year 1786, to draw the money applicable to naval purposes from the bank, and lodge it in the hands of a private banker?

A. I cannot precisely fix the time, but I am certain that I did permit Mr. Trotter to lodge any money drawn from the bank, for public services, in his private banker's hands, during the period it was not demanded, to the purposes for which it was drawn.

Q. What circumstances induced you to give such permission to the paymaster?

A. An opinion in which I still adhere, that if the whole monies necessarily drawn from the bank, in pursuance of orders from the competent boards, were lodged in the hands of a respectable banker, under the control of the paymaster of the navy, that it would add more facility to the conduct of the business of the officer, in the multitude of small payments to be made, than if the money were deposited, according to the constitution of the office, in an iron chest. I likewise had in contemplation, that in the receipt of the various small payments, made to such a variety of persons, they would be less liable to be imposed upon, by that mode of transacting the business, than if they were each to receive drafts for such small sums upon the bank, at such a distance from the office, after its removal to Somerset place.

Q. As the paymaster of the navy does not disburse any part of the public money, except for the payment of exchequer fees and other contingencies, does your lordship think it necessary that the paymaster should have in the iron chest or at a private banker's any of the money issued for carrying on the current service of the navy?

A. I do not think it necessary; but for reasons I have given, I think it expedient. The whole money drawn from the bank, and placed in the hands of the sub-accountants, pass through the hands of the paymaster of the navy; but though this is my opinion, I know many competent persons entertain a different opinon.

Q. Did you give permission to the paymaster to withdraw the money from the bank, and lodge it in the hands of a private banker, with a view to his deriving any advantage or emolument therefrom?

A. If it is meant to ask me whether I ever gave any direct authority to the paymaster to use the money in the manner above mentioned, I should certainly answer, no; but I have no hesitation in saying, that I believe and understood he did, and never prohibited him from doing so; and I believed it was so understood by others at different times, when the establishment of the navy pay office was under consideration, when certainly no competent provision was made for the person exercising that trust of great extent and responsibility.

Q. As the money applicable to naval services was directed to be lodged in the bank, by the act of 25 Geo. III. chap. 3. and not to be drawn from thence without specifying the services for which it is drawn; by what authority did you give permission to the paymaster of the navy to draw the money out of the bank, and lodge it in the hands of private bankers?

A. I take it for granted, it always was drawn under the heads of service pointed out in the act of parliament; and when I talk of permission, I mean it under the explanation contained in answer to a former question, in which I suppose the money drawn under competent authority.

Q. Do you know of any instance of a treasurer of the navy having made good any loss which had arisen from over payments, or other misapplications of the public money?

A. No; I do not.

Q. Did you derive any profit or advantage from the use or employment of money issued for carrying on the current service of the navy, between 19th August 1782, and 30th April, 1785, or between 1st Feb. 1784, and 31st Dec. 1785, during which periods you held the office of treasurer of the navy?

A. I decline answering this question under the 5th clause of the act 43 Geo. III. chap. 16, and for the reasons given in my first answer.

Q. Did you consider the addition granted by the king's sign manuel, upon your appointment to the office of treasurer of the navy, making your salary 4000l. a year, clear of all deductions, to be in full satisfaction for all wages, fees and other profits, and emoluments, previously enjoyed by former treasurers?

A. Certainly I did, with the exception of coals, candles, and some such small contingencies.

Q. When was it first discovered that Mr. Jellicoe was deficient in the balance of public money, with which he stood charged, as deputy paymaster to the navy?

A. I do not recollect the precise period; but the first thing that gave me any suspicion that there was danger of deficiency, was, by observing in the reports occasionally made to me, that his balance remained stationary, so far as never to get below a sum, I think of between 20 and 30 000 pounds. This led me to a particular conversation with him, when he confessed to me, that for a considerable number of years he had been embarrassed from some advance or engagements he had come under with a Mr. Cort; that from the high opinion I had of him, in consequence of the character of former treasurers of the navy, and my own observations, I had no reason to doubt the fidelity of his representation; and it was my belief, that if he had lived to superintend the business himself, and to bring the profits of the patent Mr. Cort had obtained to their proper bearing, that the loss might have been repaired. Upon this however, I do not pretend to give any positive opinion, as it appeared after his death, that his embarrassments had existed, and a balance become due, as early as 1782.

Q. How many years before the death of Mr. Jellicoe was it that you suspected he was deficient in his balance?

A. I cannot mention the precise time; but it was certainly more than one or two years.

Q. Was any enquiry made, upon the discovery, into the real state of his balance?

A. Certainly, it was minutely enquired into.

Q. Does it any where appear what was the exact state of his deficiency at that time?

A. I cannot state it from memory; but I dare say it does appear.

MELVILLE.

Charles M. Poole, *John Ford,*
Henry Nicholas, *Wm. M. Reid.*
Ewan Law,

From the London Morning Chronicle.

TENTH REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF NAVAL INQUIRY.

The second treasuryship of the right honorable Henry Dundas, Lord Viscount Melville.

Lord Melville was re-appointed on on the 5th of January, 1784, and continued in office until the 1st of June, 1800.

In speaking of the treasuryship, it will be necessary to divide it into two parts, as, from the 1st of January, 1786, the business was conducted under the provisions of the 25th of his present majesty, chap. 31, which instituted a new mode of account for the office of treasurer.

The old mode of account of course ceased on the 31st of December, 1785, at which time lord Melville stood charged with two hundred and seventy-five thousand eight hundred and twenty pounds fifteen shillings and eleven pence, out of which sum, and others advanced to him, he has continued to make payments as an ex-treasurer.

The late Mr. Andrew Douglass having also acted as paymaster to lord Melville during this part of his second treasuryship, we questioned Lord Melville, whether he had derived any profit or advantage from the use or employment of the money issued for carrying on the current service of the navy, between the 1st of February, 1784, and the 31st of December, 1785, which question his lordship objected to answering, under the provisions of the fifth clause of the act by which we are constituted, and upon the ground before stated alluded to in his letter.

We have entered in the appendix an account, shewing the annual amount of his receipts and payments, and of the balance remaining on the 31st of December, in each year, from 1786 to 1803. The balance of the latter period amounting to the sum of five thousand six hundred and forty-seven pounds and eleven pence, has not been paid over to lord Melville. A part thereof, two hundred and twenty nine pounds one shilling and eight pence, has been paid to personated seamen; the sum of four hundred and sixty-six pounds four shillings is in the hands of the sub accountant; and the remainder, four thousand nine hundred and fifty-one pounds fifteen shillings and three pence, is in the hands of Mr. Alexander Trotter, who was appointed paymaster in January 1786, by Lord Melville, and has held that office under the several succeeding treasurers, except Mr. Tierney. This disposition of the treasurer's balance appears to us more exceptionable than if it were in the hands of the treasurer, because the paymaster has the general control of every branch of the navy pay office, and it is part of his duty to bring forward the Treasurer's accounts, which the use of the money may incline him to delay.

The accountant's branch, consisting of principal and eight clerks, having been established by order in council, in August 1786, for the express purpose of bringing up the old, and keeping up the new accounts of the treasurers of the navy, we were surprised to learn that the accounts of the three ex-treasurers before noticed had not long since been made up and passed; but we find that all the clerks in the accountant's branch, as well as the accountant himself, instead of being employed in bringing up the old, and keeping up the new accounts of the treasurers, had been engaged, by the directors of the Paymaster, in the current business of the Pay Office, in consequence, as he states, of the great increase of business during the late war, and to avoid as much as possible the necessity of applying for additional clerks.

We disapprove this misemployment of a branch established for an express purpose, and that of much importance to the public, as well as the false economy in not augmenting the establishment of clerks in proportion to the increase of business. If the accountant's branch had been employed for the purposes for which it was established, and the necessary assistance had been rendered from the navy office, it is stated, that the accounts of the ex treasurers (whose balances on the 31st of December, 1803, amounted to fourteen thousand nine hundred and eighty seven pounds seven shillings and two pence half penny) would have been made up at least four years ago.

(To be continued.)

WASHINGTON CITY.

MONDAY, JUNE 17.

The New York Citizen says, the Governor of New York has ordered the Attorney General to institute a prosecution against Mr. Holt, the Editor of the Bee, for publishing a piece under the signature of *Aristides* on the Merchants Bank.

At a commencement, held in the University of Pennsylvania, on the 7th inst. the degree of Master of Arts was conferred on five gentlemen, that of Bachelor of Arts on four gentlemen, that of Doctor of Divinity on two gentlemen, and that of Doctor in Medicine on twenty-four gentlemen.

A proposition, offered in the legislature of Connecticut, instructing the several towns in the state, to choose as many delegates as they send representatives to the assembly, for the purpose of framing a constitution of government has been rejected.

Nine counsellors of the governor have been chosen by the joint ballot of the tow Houses of the legislature of Massachusetts. 330 votes were given, of which 186 were given to the federal candidates, who were consequently elected.

Vast numbers of an heretofore unknown and highly poisonous species of viper have recently been found in the Forest of Fontainbleau, in France. Several persons, and some dogs, bitten by these reptiles, have died immediately, and so great has the danger and alarm become, that the magistrates, with a view to exterminate the race, have offered a premium of 60 francs for every one that may be killed.

New Orleans, March 22.

The following message was laid before the Council.

"*Gentlemen of the Legislative Council.*

"I have given to the bill entitled "An act to prevent persons other than those who were inhabitants of Louisiana on the 30th day of April, 1803, or citizens of the United States," from holding any office under the government of this territory, the most respectful and attentive consideration. The principle of the bill is patriotic, and I cordially unite with you in opinion that offices of trust in this territory ought alone to be confided to the ancient inhabitants of the country, or other citizens of the United States, unless on occasions where a departure from so general a rule should be justified by some of those strong reasons which seldom occur; I, however, entertain doubts whether the object of the bill is a rightful object of territorial legislation; I am inclined to the opinion, that it is more properly a matter of constitutional provision. The law of Congress for the government of this territory, has vested in the executive an uncontroled discretion, as to certain appointments to office, and as I doubt the constitutionality of any act of the territorial legislature, which would abridge the powers of the office I have the honor to hold, it becomes my duty to reject the bill.

(Signed)

WM. C. C. CLAIBORNE.

The governor has likewise given his negative to a bill recognising as legal any rate of interest stipulated by the contracting parties.

Boston, June 6.

We yesterday received, by capt. Stoddard, the Liverpool Cronicle of the 24th of April, which contains a truly interesting account of the proceedings of the Livery of the City of London, in common hall assembled, to frame a petition to the House of Commons, on the subject of Lord Melville's immense embezzlement of the public money of that unhappy nation. The subject was opened by Mr. Waithman, who in an impressive speech, investigated the privileges of the British people, and their right to call down punishment upon every violator of the law, however high in station the delinquent might be placed. The petition comprehended the following material heads, viz.

First, That it appears, from the reports of the commissioners for naval enquiry, that Lord Melville, late treasurer of His Majesty's navy, had been guilty of a gross violation of the law, and a high breach of duty, whereby immense sums of the public money have been put to hazard, by being employed in speculations for private emolument.

Second, That such gross and exaggerated breaches of fidelity in men, holding high offices of state, render it peculiarly necessary and important that every possible effect be given to the enquiries before parliament respecting the same, to that condign punishment may follow convicted criminality.

Third, That it is highly essential for the purpose of fully enquiring into the receipt, management and expenditure of the public money, and the conduct of the public offices; and for completely investigating all abuses, that the powers of the said commissioners should be prolonged and extended, and such other measures adopted as may appear necessary for the detection and punishment of all offenders; and for establishing such a system of vigilance and economy as may effectually guard against the recurrence of such flagrant abuses.

It is likewise resolved, that this petition be presented to the House of Commons, by the four representatives for London, who were severally thanked for their virtuous conduct in parliament, on this serious occasion.

The resolutions passed unanimously, and on the motion of Mr. Travers, the thanks of the livery were voted to the gallant lord St. Vincent, who had been eminently instrumental in bringing this nefarious transaction to light.

In the course of the proceeding, Mr. Waddington took occasion to quote a part of Mr. Jefferson's last inaugural speech, and placed in contrast the unprecedented economy of our present wise and exemplary government, with the wide spreading mischief and speculation so calamitously apparent in the management, or rather the mismanagement, of the progress of taxation in Britain. An American who loves the glory of his country cannot read this consoling contrast of expenditure without striking his bosom in extacy, and thanking Heaven that he is also a republican of the United States.

Similar meetings are advertised by the Sheriffs of Middlesex, Kent, Surry, and Hampshire, and will doubtless be general. So great a ferment has been excited by this novel discovery, that the foundation of Mr. Pitt's disastrous power seems to be tottering towards a fall; and the opinions of the first political circles are directed to the successor of the prime minister of Great Britain.

The indignation of a liberal mind must be particularly awakened on such a theme, by reflecting that while all this dreadful scene of fraud was going forward, the wretched community were drained to their last shilling, to support an endless war; as it was only during a season of hostility that the pretences for new imposts on labor could be bro't into effect, or that the corrupt minions of that corrupt government could bleed the nation in ephemeral security. We thank God, that we are far removed from such scenes; and we trust that the discernment and spirit of our fellow citizens, will continue to resist the introduction of such anglo-federal habits among us.

New York, June 10.

Capt. Clark of the brig Merchant, arrived on Saturday, from Honduras, informs, that the same restriction, in the exportation of Mahogany, is still continued, and that farther instructions, have been transmitted to colonel Gordon, the superintendent, to allow no greater quantity of logwood, to be shipped in American bottoms, than two tons, to every ten thousand feet of Mahogany, in consequence of which order the Merchant was refused a clearance, and was compelled to land all the logwood she had on board, although laden before the receipt of the instruction. Lumber, provisions, and naval stores, are permitted to an entry, other articles, are deemed contraband, and will subject the vessel and cargo to seizure.

Philadelphia, June 13.

We learn (says the Boston Palladium) by capt. Hewes, from Malaga, that letters had been received from Cadiz, announcing the junction of the Toulon fleet with that of Spain at that place, and that the combined fleets consisting of 18 ships of the line, 9 frigates, &c. sailed the next day after joining under the orders of Admiral Gravina. There were many conjectures as to the destination of the fleet. The most general was, that it