

nine millions were actually expended that year.

But the high expenditures which have been stated in the debate on these resolutions, were those made during the late administration, in every year of which they borrowed money upon Treasury notes.

Should the present administration continue to borrow throughout the term, their opponents here, the friends of the late, will have nothing to boast of in that respect, much as we, who support the Government, may regret it.

In regard to being obliged to borrow money, the two administrations are alike.

Having thus shown that there is no foundation in fact for the argument of the honorable Senator, I suppose the argument itself is disposed of, and that their admitted extravagance is without pretext or excuse.

The question now to settle is, whether six millions a year, the amount estimated in the resolutions, is enough to deduct for the extravagance, on an average, of the entire four years of Mr. Van Buren.

The honorable Senator from New York says it is not. If his friends here who voted the appropriations, and those who spent them, agree with him in this, let them show how much more than six millions a year should be deducted from their expenditures, as useless and wasteful.

Let them take up their expenditures under each head, and confess that so much more was spent than was necessary on one branch, and so much on another, until they get through; and if they make out that, in the aggregate, they spent eight millions a year wastefully, and if we should consider the estimate correct and the confession a sincere and an honest one, I will agree to make it the basis of legislation, set down just two millions more to the score of their extravagance, and write twenty instead of twenty-two millions against their twenty-eight, for ordinary expenses.

Let them state this openly and above-board, so that the people can understand that it is for the purpose of economy, and not done under a cloak to deprive them of a fair protection for their labor, as there seems to be too much reason to fear is the object of the estimates and excuses now presented.

When I speak of estimates for the future revenue, I do not allude to any offered by the Senator from New York. He offered none. It was peculiar that he did not. An honorable Senator, a political friend of his, was remarking to me when he was speaking, that it was unsafe for any Senator to contend with the Senator from New York where calculations and figures were concerned.

At the very moment the Senator himself disclaimed all knowledge of such calculations, and therefore declined presenting any estimate whatever on the subject of the future revenue. But this part of the subject was taken up by the honorable Senator from New Hampshire, who declared at the outset that he had spent nearly half his life in what he called the drudgery of figures and calculations. Such an experience entitles his productions to consideration.

He has submitted so many and so various estimates for reducing the expenditures, that I cannot recollect their details; but the result of the whole seems to be, that the Government can be administered at an annual expense of from seventeen to twenty millions of dollars; thus showing that, in his opinion, from eight to ten millions a year, certainly, were spent by the late administration more than was necessary!

His account of the cause of this extravagance is different from the one given by the Senator from New York; although he took care to include the only one which that Senator relied upon—that of a surplus in the Treasury. The Senator from New Hampshire says that the Executive department, at the other end of the avenue, was in no wise responsible for these appropriations and expenditures, and read from his own reports to Congress, to show how sharply he had rebuked his friends here for making them.

Congress alone was responsible, he says, and acted against the wishes and in despite of this Executive rebuke. He certainly exhibits the Hon. Senator from New York (then at the head of the financial department in this body) in a new attitude, and in a very different position from that which he was supposed to occupy, in the quarter of the country from which I come. No one there, ever suspected the honorable Senator from New York of being ignorant of, or indisposed to carry out, the wishes of the Executive, or of his party.

We looked upon what he said or did "by authority," when it happened not to agree with what written in the report of the Secretary. And it must have been very different under that administration, from what it has been since I have had a seat in this body, if the party could not count upon its friends in Congress to carry out its views. I have seldom seen the time when they could not be counted to a man upon the ayes and noes in such a case. They had the majority in both Houses of Congress during the whole of Mr. Van Buren's term, although I grant it was not always so in Gen. Jackson's time.

Whatever may be said about the administration at the west end of the avenue as distinct from its friends at this, in those days, the country will forget that it was an unit party. Let that be as it may, the honorable Senator from New Hampshire will have no cause to complain if his opponents now pay as much respect to his estimates for expenditures, while he is a Senator, as his friends did when he was the head of the department whose duty it was to make them; especially if his opponents come nearer to them now than his friends did then. Compare them, sir, and see how this stands.

He estimated the expenses or appropriations, and it makes but little difference which is taken, for they did not differ but about one million in the whole four years, in the aggregate, at eighty millions eight hundred and thirty-two thousand three hundred and eighty-one dollars and fifty cents, equal to an average of twenty millions a year. His friends in Congress actually appropriated one hundred and twelve millions seven hun-

dred and eighty-six thousand six hundred and eleven dollars twenty-eight cents for the same four years—an average of twenty-eight millions per year. From this, it appears his friends varied in their acts from his estimates, on the average, about eight millions in each year; and taking a medium of the different views he has presented for the expenses in future, the estimates contained in the resolutions he is opposing, do not exceed his estimate one-half as much, as the appropriations of his friends exceeded his own previous official estimates.

As to the proposition to raise two millions, and apply it annually to the payment of the existing debt, and an equal amount for contingencies, and for a permanent sum of at least two millions, to be in the Treasury at all times, I do not understand the Senator as making any objections to that.

The next subject is the plan presented by the honorable Senator from New Hampshire, of his mode of raising a sufficient revenue to meet the wants of an economical administration of the Government. He presents an estimate starting with the amount of dutiable imports presented by the honorable Senator from Kentucky, and goes on to make various additions, which he presumes must have been overlooked by the mover of the resolutions; and carries up the amount from ninety-one millions to one hundred and twenty-six millions of dutiable goods, which, with eighteen millions of free articles, makes the aggregate value of the whole imports one hundred and forty-four millions. Upon this estimate of the value of dutiable goods, at one hundred and twenty-six millions, (thirty-five millions more than is estimated by the mover of the resolutions, for he (Mr. Clay) computed from the table of exports of last year, the most of which were at higher prices than at present,) the honorable Senator from New Hampshire computes his duties at twenty per cent., and can, of course, get revenue enough, on paper, either with or without including tea and coffee.

All his estimates show how easy it is to run up a calculation of income, when there is an object for it. I would not give a fig for an estimate which is not founded upon the recent experience of the country. Let us look at that, and on the difference between this new computation and the former views of the honorable Senator.

Twenty per cent., on his present calculation of income, when there is an object for it. I would not give a fig for an estimate which is not founded upon the recent experience of the country. Let us look at that, and on the difference between this new computation and the former views of the honorable Senator.

Twenty per cent., on his present calculation of income, when there is an object for it. I would not give a fig for an estimate which is not founded upon the recent experience of the country. Let us look at that, and on the difference between this new computation and the former views of the honorable Senator.

Twenty per cent., on his present calculation of income, when there is an object for it. I would not give a fig for an estimate which is not founded upon the recent experience of the country. Let us look at that, and on the difference between this new computation and the former views of the honorable Senator.

Twenty per cent., on his present calculation of income, when there is an object for it. I would not give a fig for an estimate which is not founded upon the recent experience of the country. Let us look at that, and on the difference between this new computation and the former views of the honorable Senator.

Twenty per cent., on his present calculation of income, when there is an object for it. I would not give a fig for an estimate which is not founded upon the recent experience of the country. Let us look at that, and on the difference between this new computation and the former views of the honorable Senator.

Twenty per cent., on his present calculation of income, when there is an object for it. I would not give a fig for an estimate which is not founded upon the recent experience of the country. Let us look at that, and on the difference between this new computation and the former views of the honorable Senator.

Twenty per cent., on his present calculation of income, when there is an object for it. I would not give a fig for an estimate which is not founded upon the recent experience of the country. Let us look at that, and on the difference between this new computation and the former views of the honorable Senator.

Twenty per cent., on his present calculation of income, when there is an object for it. I would not give a fig for an estimate which is not founded upon the recent experience of the country. Let us look at that, and on the difference between this new computation and the former views of the honorable Senator.

Twenty per cent., on his present calculation of income, when there is an object for it. I would not give a fig for an estimate which is not founded upon the recent experience of the country. Let us look at that, and on the difference between this new computation and the former views of the honorable Senator.

Twenty per cent., on his present calculation of income, when there is an object for it. I would not give a fig for an estimate which is not founded upon the recent experience of the country. Let us look at that, and on the difference between this new computation and the former views of the honorable Senator.

Twenty per cent., on his present calculation of income, when there is an object for it. I would not give a fig for an estimate which is not founded upon the recent experience of the country. Let us look at that, and on the difference between this new computation and the former views of the honorable Senator.

Twenty per cent., on his present calculation of income, when there is an object for it. I would not give a fig for an estimate which is not founded upon the recent experience of the country. Let us look at that, and on the difference between this new computation and the former views of the honorable Senator.

Twenty per cent., on his present calculation of income, when there is an object for it. I would not give a fig for an estimate which is not founded upon the recent experience of the country. Let us look at that, and on the difference between this new computation and the former views of the honorable Senator.

Twenty per cent., on his present calculation of income, when there is an object for it. I would not give a fig for an estimate which is not founded upon the recent experience of the country. Let us look at that, and on the difference between this new computation and the former views of the honorable Senator.

Twenty per cent., on his present calculation of income, when there is an object for it. I would not give a fig for an estimate which is not founded upon the recent experience of the country. Let us look at that, and on the difference between this new computation and the former views of the honorable Senator.

Twenty per cent., on his present calculation of income, when there is an object for it. I would not give a fig for an estimate which is not founded upon the recent experience of the country. Let us look at that, and on the difference between this new computation and the former views of the honorable Senator.

Twenty per cent., on his present calculation of income, when there is an object for it. I would not give a fig for an estimate which is not founded upon the recent experience of the country. Let us look at that, and on the difference between this new computation and the former views of the honorable Senator.

Twenty per cent., on his present calculation of income, when there is an object for it. I would not give a fig for an estimate which is not founded upon the recent experience of the country. Let us look at that, and on the difference between this new computation and the former views of the honorable Senator.

Twenty per cent., on his present calculation of income, when there is an object for it. I would not give a fig for an estimate which is not founded upon the recent experience of the country. Let us look at that, and on the difference between this new computation and the former views of the honorable Senator.

Twenty per cent., on his present calculation of income, when there is an object for it. I would not give a fig for an estimate which is not founded upon the recent experience of the country. Let us look at that, and on the difference between this new computation and the former views of the honorable Senator.

Twenty per cent., on his present calculation of income, when there is an object for it. I would not give a fig for an estimate which is not founded upon the recent experience of the country. Let us look at that, and on the difference between this new computation and the former views of the honorable Senator.

Twenty per cent., on his present calculation of income, when there is an object for it. I would not give a fig for an estimate which is not founded upon the recent experience of the country. Let us look at that, and on the difference between this new computation and the former views of the honorable Senator.

would have been fifty-two millions, instead of fourteen millions and a half as he estimated—a mistake of thirty-eight millions instead of thirty-one and a half millions. This was the report made just before the law passed for depositing the surplus money with the States.

In looking over these reports to get at facts, I have noticed one error which appears to be of a graver character than these mistakes; for by them no money is lost; they may not have been intended even to mislead the Congress in its legislative duties. In the account of receipts for the year 1837, exhibited in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, made in 1838, (after all the accounts must have been received,) there is credited the expenses for the year 1837—

Amounting to \$31,916,409 91 And the amount received charged at 22,643,973 53

This sum appears to have been received as follows, viz:

From Customs \$11,169,290 39 Lands 6,776,236 52 Miscellaneous 1,705,457 47 Treasury notes 2,992,989 15

But by the Register's account, it appears that the receipts from customs for that year were over two millions and a half more than is here accounted for! This difference, I should suppose, if it were any other kind of an account, must yet remain to be accounted for, or paid over.

If any merchant should make such an error in rendering an account, and it was afterwards detected, he would expect to pay it; and I hope it may be so with this, or else explained in some more satisfactory manner, than by some other error as large.

To return to the estimates of the honorable Senator for the future revenue, and to the objects of them which he contends provide that there is no necessity for taxing tea and coffee, or raising the taxes, by which I understand him to mean, raising the rates of duty. Upon this point I will say a few words. One of the amendments proposed by the honorable Senator from New York is intended, no doubt, to create the same impression. It says that the distribution bill created an instant necessity for increased taxation—or words of like import.—Both intended to convey the idea, that these resolutions propose a higher rate of duty than existed upon the dutiable articles under the past administration. The truth is otherwise. The most that can fairly be said of the resolutions is, that they propose not to have the rates reduced so low as it was provided (by a law passed nine years ago) they should be, upon an estimate that fifteen millions were sufficient for the annual expenses of Government. If the Secretary's estimates of the expenses had proved correct, we have already seen that that sum may be raised by a duty of 20 per cent provided the imports continue as for the last four years. But upon the most productive dutiable articles, such as wool, woollens, iron, coal, ready-made clothing, &c., the rates of duty averaged more than forty per cent. during the whole term of Mr. Van Buren's administration. Upon the articles referred to, paying the lowest rates, the average duties, for the whole time, were forty-one per cent. Generally, these articles paid a duty at or over fifty per cent. in 1833—in 1837 they paid forty-four per cent.—in 1838 and 1839 forty-one per cent.—and in 1840 thirty-eight per cent making an average for the four years of forty-one per cent. And yet, with this rate of duty, that administration spent between twelve and thirteen millions a year more than they collected from duties, during the whole period. Its friends now complain of an opposite resolution, because those resolutions declare that sufficient revenue cannot be raised with a rate of duty reduced to less than half of what was levied during their term; and the honorable Senator insists that it can be.

There is another mode of testing this; and that is, by seeing what was spent during the term of the late administration, which did not come either from customs or lands, but was spent in addition to what was received from both those sources. They spent the money on hand at the beginning of the first year which (including what they stopped from going to the States at their extra session) was \$18,236,000 00

Received from the sale of bank stock, 8,000,000 35 And the amount owing when the late administration left, variously stated from four to twelve millions, say 6,000,000 00

\$32,236,000 35 Deduct the amount then on hand, say 1,000,000 00 \$31,236,000 00

This being averaged, makes nearly eight millions a year; and if to this be added the amount spent, which was received for land, it will show that they spent near thirteen millions a year, over and above the receipts from all sources, besides Treasury notes left for their successors to pay. All this was done while they levied taxes at over forty per cent.

(CONCLUDED NEXT WEEK.)

RIFE AND ENRIE—A DIALOGUE. Child—Pa, what did Mr. Folger mean, when he said in his temperance address the other day, that "moderate drinkers are ripening for drunkards?"

Father. Do you not remember, my child, how a cherry looks when it is ripening?

Child. O yes, and now I understand it. Squire Russell is a moderate drinker, and he is turning red on the end of his nose and upon his cheek bones. Old Joe Lovell is dead ripe; for his nose and his face are purple. Essex News Letter.

Hard Times. "The hardest by far I ever experienced," said an old codger, was the time when I got lost in the woods;—when for four days I slept on a rock, and cracked butternuts with my teeth for a living. Them was hard times, I tell you."

THE MESSENGER.

D. R. McANALLY & J. ROBERTS, EDITORS.

ASHEVILLE, N. C.

Friday, May 6, 1842.

REPUBLICAN WHIG TICKET.

For Governor, JOHN M. MOREHEAD.

ELECTION FIRST THURSDAY IN AUGUST.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

A communication giving an account of a recent Temperance movement in Waynesville, has been received, but crowded out this week. It will appear next week.

The communication of J. M. E. ditto.

Mr. Simmon's Speech.

We commence this week the publication of Mr. SIMMONS' speech. Its great length compels us to publish it in different numbers of our paper. We again recommend it most seriously to the attention of all who wish to be informed on the important subjects of which it treats. It should be carefully laid by, that its facts may subsequently be referred to.

A great complaint is made by some of the democratic party in this part of the State against Gov. MOREHEAD for having appointed some of his relations to some offices in the State. We have thought it might be well to remind them of the course pursued in this respect by some of the heads of the Jackson and Van Buren administrations—administrations which were looked upon by those very men as perfect models of all excellence and perfection.—The matter here was stirred up by Mr.

Henry in his speech at this place, by whom this conduct in Gov. MOREHEAD was held up as too intolerable to be borne. We confess we look upon the whole as small game, and can see no good reason why Gen. Jackson, Mr. Van Buren, Governor Morehead, or any one else may not as well appoint his relatives to office as any other persons, provided they are competent to discharge the duties belonging to the office.

As to the charge made against Gov. Morehead that he appointed a relative to an important office who could not, or could scarce write his name, it needs proof beyond the bare assertion of any one man, particularly an interested democrat, to have any weight with us; and descending to such shows plainly the hopelessness of the cause they would feign build up.

We merely allude to the following facts to show our good friends who are so bitter in their denunciations of Gov. Morehead, that they who "live in glass houses should not throw stones":

These are only a few of many cases—all of whom for aught we know were good and faithful officers, and so we have reason to believe are those appointed by Governor Morehead. Should Mr. Henry be elected Governor, we venture to predict that after all his boisterous declamation on this subject, he will follow "in the footsteps of his illustrious predecessors."

Gen. Jackson had several relations in office. Mr. Van Buren appointed his son Martin, Jr. private Secretary for signing land patents. Salary \$1500.

Mr. Woodbury's brother in law, J. O. Barnes, was Naval officer at Boston. Salary \$3,000. His uncle in law A. H. Quincy, was a clerk. Salary \$1,400.

E. F. Bunnell, Deputy Naval officer. Another connexion. His son Charles Woodbury, Secretary to the Committee on public buildings. Salary \$600 to 800.

His father in law, special agent to Havana. Mr. Polinett promoted a brother in law. Mr. Forayth appointed a son in law for office. Mr. Crawford brought the following relations of his into office: Alexander Kyle, father in law. Salary not known.

Alexander Kyle Jr., brother in law. Salary \$1200. Samuel Kendall, Jr. nephew. Salary \$1400. George M. Kendall, brother. Salary \$1000. John E. Kendall, travelling P. M. Salary \$800.

REPORT OF THE INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS. The facts brought to light by this Committee, relative to the foolish, wicked, and unprecedented extravagance of the late Van Buren administration, are of the most astounding character, and serve to show, in part, why the nation has become bankrupt. We published week before last an article from the Knoxville Post, setting forth a few items in the expenditures of the Florida war. To these we subjoin a few more items of expense in the same region, in order that the farmers and mechanics of the country may see how the public money has been squandered by what they were urged to believe was a very careful, economical administration. Here are a few thousands paid for hauling as follows:

Amount paid Samuel H. Peck, for ten wagons, engaged in transporting public stores 39 days, at \$10 per day, \$4,095

Amount paid for transportation from Augusta to Columbus, at \$12 50 per hundred !! For six teams transporting baggage from Fort Jessup to Fort Towson, 30 days, each team to carry 1800 pounds, and travel 12 miles per day, \$30 per day, \$3,600

Wagons of North Carolina, would you not like to get such a job as that these hard times? Only think—TWENTY DOLLARS per day for driving twelve miles and carrying eighteen hundred pounds!!!!

But, perhaps, the most wasteful extravagance was in the hire of steamboats. Boats worth from ten to fifteen thousand dollars were hired at from three hundred to a thousand dollars per day!!! In regard to this, the Baltimore Patriot of a late date, through its Washington correspondent, holds the following language:

"In regard to some of the expenditures of the Army, the committee say, and abundantly prove, (see House Report 458) that the existence of the Florida war has afforded an ample occasion for draining the public treasury. In every department of the most unprecedented character has been indulged. In the purchase of supplies, in the transportation, by land or water, of soldiers or stores, the public money has been wasted by those charged with its disbursement. Already has there been expended many millions of dollars in prosecution of a war against a band of savages, which, from the outset, has not furnished as many hundred warriors to oppose. The committee have ascertained that, within two years from the outbreak of hostilities in that Territory, between the 1st of January, 1839, and 1st of January, 1841, there has been employed in the transportation service seven hundred and thirty-seven steamboats, brigs and schooners. Many of them have been employed at a per diem pay, until the price of hire has quadrupled the sum at which, originally, they could have been purchased. In reference to the hire of the steamboat John Crowell, General Jessup, in reply to the call of the committee, says that she was hired at the price of 'three hundred dollars a day, and her expenses and insurance.' 'She was not worth fifteen thousand dollars, and one hundred dollars a day would have been an extravagant hire for her.' 'For the entire period she was in service, the Government has paid eighty-two thousand five hundred and fifty-five dollars!!'

The following rates were allowed for the hire of steamboats at different periods, during the Florida service. Let it be submitted to a candid public to say whether the Whigs were justifiable in charging the late Administration with extravagance.

Forester—7 months, at \$3,500 per month—\$24,500

Charleston—10 months, at \$4,000 per month!!! \$40,000

Watchman—17 days, at \$450 per day!! 7,650

1 trip from Mobile to Tampa Bay, with one brig and four schooners—distance usually run in 4 days!! 22,000

Lion—1 trip from Fort Brooke to Mobile—usually made in 4 days—\$1500 per day!!! 6,000

Ocmulgee—1 trip from Savannah to St. Augustine—usually made in 5 days!! 2,300

Brilliant—1 trip from New Orleans to Waterloo, Ala.—usually made in four days—at \$1500 per day!!! 6,000

Cherokee—1 trip from Jacksonville to Gary's Ferry—usually made in 12 hours!!! 1,215!!!

The following is from The Independent, a paper published at Washington City, and exhibits a few of the items which went to make up the enormous sum expended on some of the Branch Mints. The whole amount drawn from the Treasury on account of the Branch Mint at New Orleans was five hundred and fifty-four thousand four hundred and seventy dollars and twenty cents!!!!!!

"Some of the items charged under the head of 'Building and Machinery,' the committee say are worthy of special notice, not only on account of the amount of money expended on them, but for the character of the items themselves; as for instance, we find the following charges:

U. S. Branch Mint at New Orleans, To Stiles & Miller, Dr. \$2,376 00

For 594 sq. yds. wood pavement, Do. To James M. Reid, \$2,376 00

For building—4 BATH HOUSES, and flagging yard and paving sidewalk, 8,099 00

Do. To Clay & Clark, For 7 BATHS and 1 water closet, 1,700 00

Do. To ———, For paving yard with flags, &c., 3,846 00

Do. To Clay & Clark, For finishing water closets, 818 38

\$16,839 28

Thus, it appears that for paving and flagging the yard, sidewalk, &c., and for BATHS, Water-Closets, &c., there was paid the sum of SIXTEEN THOUSAND EIGHT HUNDRED AND THIRTY-NINE DOLLARS AND TWENTY-EIGHT CENTS!!!

Upon an examination of the accounts of the Treasurer of this Branch Mint, the conclusion is forced upon the minds of the committee that the officers of this establishment from the Superintendent down to the lowest Clerk, not only supposed their business was to "coin money," but to spend it as fast as coined, and that they were sent there to live in a palace and indulge in the most unbounded luxury.

The committee have appended to this report (see appendix B) copies of some of the vouchers accompanying the accounts of the Treasurer, as settled at the Treasury Department, which will give some idea of the luxurious tastes, and their disregard of that homely virtue, economy, on the part of the officers of the Mint. Indeed, the committee can hardly suppose any further proof of their unbounded extravagance is wanting than the fact they have already shown—namely: that some TEN THOUSAND DOLLARS were expended by them in the erection of those palaces of Eastern luxury, BATHS and their appurtenances.—The Committee are fully aware that these gentlemen did but "follow in the footsteps of illustrious predecessors;" that some of the Emperors of Rome expended immense sums in the erection of baths in the "eternal city." But, if they do not greatly err in their historic recollections, these luxurious buildings were the growth of the Empire, and not of the Republic of Rome; and were erected by the masters, and not by the servants of the people.

Among the items of amounts which will be found in the appendix, are the following:—

5 mahogany arm chairs \$10.25 each, \$51.25

30 mahogany arm chairs \$5 each, 150 00

6 Grecian arm chairs \$3.50

Desks and tables, 40 00

One pair porcelain spit boxes, 40 00

2 inkstands \$10 each, 20 00

One mahogany bureau, 200 00

One cream foolscap paper, 20 00

One do do, 20 00

One ivory pen holder, 5 00

Penknives each, \$3.50 to 4 00

Trees and shrubs, 4 00

One desk curtain, 25 00

Ice furnished the Mint, 14 00

Mahogany boards for a counter, 60 00

3 bronze paper weights, 90 00

1 Eagle do do, 75 00

1 stuffed mahogany chair, 12 00

1 large lamp for lobby, 75 00

Bookcase and desk, 75 00

A bust of Livingston, 250 00

Making, painting, gilding, &c., a pipe for a Sextant Box, 150 00

The committee have only selected a very few items out of the great mass of a similar character to be found in the accounts of the Treasurer on file in the proper Department, which show the most criminal waste of the public money by those whose duty it was to guard and protect the interests of the Government. They cannot forbear to express their astonishment that such accounts should have been allowed by the Second Auditor and First Comptroller.

And truly it would seem a matter of astonishment to any one, particularly if they had not been accustomed to hear of the unprecedented and unheard-of extravagancies of the late administration. But the accounts were allowed. Why? Because it would not do to offend influential individuals, to whom the administration looked for support.

The Lynchburg Virginian compiles the following from the report of the committee. It refers to still another case, and serves further to illustrate the truth of the charge of corruption and extravagance which was made against the Van Buren administration:

"It appears that Capt. R. D. Collins, a disbursing agent of the Government, at Little Rock, Arkansas, failed to make his quarterly returns to the accounting officer at Washington, for the second quarter of the year 1838, and did not do so until the first of January, 1839! and at the latter date his accounts for the third quarter of 1838, ending on the first of September, were not rendered. Yet under these circumstances, and with a balance in his hands exceeding \$200,000 still in his possession, the sum of \$400,000 was advanced to him between the 3d of October and the 23d of December of that year! The total amount advanced to Capt. Collins after it was known that he had become a defaulter to the Government!! was \$582,290!!! The consequence was precisely such as might have been anticipated. He was continued in office until the 7th of June, 1839, when a balance was found to exist against him of \$215,369 15, the whole of which amount, it is believed, will be lost by the Government.

These are a few cases among many—the most reckless among the Loofcoo party do not, as we have learned, pretend to deny their truth, or even attempt to explain them away. The proper vouchers are regularly on file in the several Departments where the business was transacted. Profligacy like that which has been brought to light by the committee referred to, is without a parallel in the history of this, or any other civilized country. And this is the same party now making such desperate efforts to reinstate themselves in that power from which they were hurled so recently by an injured people.

It is no matter of surprise that the Government has become bankrupt. No wonder that with an overflowing Treasury when Mr. Van Buren came into office, in four short years it was all expended, and a heavy debt to be left as a legacy to his successors. But more of it hereafter.

☞ The Lincoln Republican will please copy.

To certain Loaf