

THE PUBLIC PRINTING.

How the Public Money is Used to Carry Elections and Support Party Newspapers.

THE EXECUTIVE ORGAN.

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE PRINTING COMMITTEE.

We have received a copy of the testimony taken by the Printing Committee in the House of Representatives...

TESTIMONY OF CORNELIUS WENDLAND.

Cornelius Wendland. Q.—What is your profession or business? A.—Printer.

Q.—Were you the printer of fact of the last Congress? A.—Yes.

Q.—Who was elected printer of that House? A.—James B. Stedman.

Q.—You are the printer of the House until you are superseded? A.—That is the custom.

Q.—Did he ever perform the duties of that office? A.—No.

Q.—When did you commence performing the duties of printer to the House? A.—Immediately on his election.

Q.—Will you be kind enough to state in as concise a manner as you can, the terms of the contract made with Mr. Stedman, as between you and Mr. Stedman, the printer of the House of Representatives? A.—I stipulated with him to do the work for sixty-four cents on the dollar.

Q.—Sixty-four cents on the dollar? A.—Yes.

Q.—That is, where he received one dollar for printing you got sixty-four cents out of it for doing the work? A.—Yes.

Q.—You stipulated that you should get six cents out of the dollar and you balance? A.—Yes.

Q.—And you stipulated that you should get six cents out of the dollar and you balance? A.—Yes.

Q.—And subsequently, be kind enough to state about what time you bought him out entirely for a stipulated sum? A.—He was elected in December, and in May following, I think, I gave him a stipulated sum.

Q.—How much was that? A.—Thirty-four thousand dollars.

Q.—That was the whole bonus you paid him for selling out to you the right of printer to the House? A.—No.

Q.—You stipulated that you should get six cents out of the dollar and you balance? A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you know what their several interests were? A.—I understand that Mr. Banker's interest was one-half, Mr. McLean's one-third, and Judge Walker, I think, informed me that he had quarter interest.

Q.—Had Mr. Stedman, at the time of his election, any facilities here in Washington for the work which the public printer would be compelled to do? A.—None whatever.

Q.—Were you the printer of the Thirty-fourth Congress? A.—I was elected printer of the thirty-fourth Congress.

Q.—Can you state from recollection the amount of money paid during the thirty-fourth Congress for the printing done for the House of Representatives? A.—I think it was about \$250,000; I am not sure; it was some considerable sum.

Q.—Can you state from recollection the profit? A.—Well, I could not come very near it, from the fact I was doing the Senate and Executive work, and I had to do the printing of the House.

Q.—Sixty-four cents on the dollar? A.—Yes.

Q.—Can you state the aggregate amount paid for the printing of the House during the thirty-fourth Congress? A.—It was a trifle over \$200,000; I think about \$212,000, if my memory serves me; I have all these figures to a cent.

Q.—Can you state the profit on that work? A.—I think it ran in the neighborhood of forty cents; some of the work is not so heavy as other, and it is not the same style. The price depends upon the style, and I think I made 40,000 worth of a particular kind of work and the forty cents profit on the dollar, and we may another kind and make sixty or seventy cents profit on the dollar. The prices are fixed by law, and the established scale is varying.

Q.—Who does the Post-office blank printing? A.—Mr. Crowell did it up to the time of the election of Mr. Bowman; now Mr. Jewett, of Ohio, does it for Mr. Bowman.

Q.—Who has the contract for doing that work? A.—It is not done by the printer, but by a law which gives it to the printer elected by the House.

Q.—Do you recollect the aggregate amount paid for printing Post-office blanks during the thirty-fourth Congress? A.—I think it averaged about \$40,000 per year.

Q.—Do you know the profit on that to the person who was paid by the Government for doing that work? A.—One-half, Sir.

Q.—Where does the contract lie? A.—In New York.

Q.—Was the work done there? A.—It was done in New York; I would state that, Crowell was the contractor for the work for I think five years, and under the law of 1852, the contract was then held ran out, and the work reverted to the printer of Congress.

Q.—Who was the printer of Congress? A.—The printer of either House or the Superintendent of the Printing might give it; he did it to the printer most generally connected with the organ of the President; Judge Nicholson edited the Union, and he got it; I was a business man of Nicholson at that time; it was a sub-contract with Crowell, under which he did the work for Nicholson.

Q.—Who was the printer of Congress? A.—The printer of either House or the Superintendent of the Printing might give it; he did it to the printer most generally connected with the organ of the President; Judge Nicholson edited the Union, and he got it; I was a business man of Nicholson at that time; it was a sub-contract with Crowell, under which he did the work for Nicholson.

Q.—Who was the printer of Congress? A.—The printer of either House or the Superintendent of the Printing might give it; he did it to the printer most generally connected with the organ of the President; Judge Nicholson edited the Union, and he got it; I was a business man of Nicholson at that time; it was a sub-contract with Crowell, under which he did the work for Nicholson.

Q.—Who was the printer of Congress? A.—The printer of either House or the Superintendent of the Printing might give it; he did it to the printer most generally connected with the organ of the President; Judge Nicholson edited the Union, and he got it; I was a business man of Nicholson at that time; it was a sub-contract with Crowell, under which he did the work for Nicholson.

Q.—Who was the printer of Congress? A.—The printer of either House or the Superintendent of the Printing might give it; he did it to the printer most generally connected with the organ of the President; Judge Nicholson edited the Union, and he got it; I was a business man of Nicholson at that time; it was a sub-contract with Crowell, under which he did the work for Nicholson.

Q.—Who was the printer of Congress? A.—The printer of either House or the Superintendent of the Printing might give it; he did it to the printer most generally connected with the organ of the President; Judge Nicholson edited the Union, and he got it; I was a business man of Nicholson at that time; it was a sub-contract with Crowell, under which he did the work for Nicholson.

Q.—Who was the printer of Congress? A.—The printer of either House or the Superintendent of the Printing might give it; he did it to the printer most generally connected with the organ of the President; Judge Nicholson edited the Union, and he got it; I was a business man of Nicholson at that time; it was a sub-contract with Crowell, under which he did the work for Nicholson.

Q.—Who was the printer of Congress? A.—The printer of either House or the Superintendent of the Printing might give it; he did it to the printer most generally connected with the organ of the President; Judge Nicholson edited the Union, and he got it; I was a business man of Nicholson at that time; it was a sub-contract with Crowell, under which he did the work for Nicholson.

Q.—Who was the printer of Congress? A.—The printer of either House or the Superintendent of the Printing might give it; he did it to the printer most generally connected with the organ of the President; Judge Nicholson edited the Union, and he got it; I was a business man of Nicholson at that time; it was a sub-contract with Crowell, under which he did the work for Nicholson.

Q.—Who was the printer of Congress? A.—The printer of either House or the Superintendent of the Printing might give it; he did it to the printer most generally connected with the organ of the President; Judge Nicholson edited the Union, and he got it; I was a business man of Nicholson at that time; it was a sub-contract with Crowell, under which he did the work for Nicholson.

Q.—Who was the printer of Congress? A.—The printer of either House or the Superintendent of the Printing might give it; he did it to the printer most generally connected with the organ of the President; Judge Nicholson edited the Union, and he got it; I was a business man of Nicholson at that time; it was a sub-contract with Crowell, under which he did the work for Nicholson.

Q.—Who was the printer of Congress? A.—The printer of either House or the Superintendent of the Printing might give it; he did it to the printer most generally connected with the organ of the President; Judge Nicholson edited the Union, and he got it; I was a business man of Nicholson at that time; it was a sub-contract with Crowell, under which he did the work for Nicholson.

Q.—Who was the printer of Congress? A.—The printer of either House or the Superintendent of the Printing might give it; he did it to the printer most generally connected with the organ of the President; Judge Nicholson edited the Union, and he got it; I was a business man of Nicholson at that time; it was a sub-contract with Crowell, under which he did the work for Nicholson.

Q.—Who was the printer of Congress? A.—The printer of either House or the Superintendent of the Printing might give it; he did it to the printer most generally connected with the organ of the President; Judge Nicholson edited the Union, and he got it; I was a business man of Nicholson at that time; it was a sub-contract with Crowell, under which he did the work for Nicholson.

Q.—Who was the printer of Congress? A.—The printer of either House or the Superintendent of the Printing might give it; he did it to the printer most generally connected with the organ of the President; Judge Nicholson edited the Union, and he got it; I was a business man of Nicholson at that time; it was a sub-contract with Crowell, under which he did the work for Nicholson.

Q.—Who was the printer of Congress? A.—The printer of either House or the Superintendent of the Printing might give it; he did it to the printer most generally connected with the organ of the President; Judge Nicholson edited the Union, and he got it; I was a business man of Nicholson at that time; it was a sub-contract with Crowell, under which he did the work for Nicholson.

Q.—Who was the printer of Congress? A.—The printer of either House or the Superintendent of the Printing might give it; he did it to the printer most generally connected with the organ of the President; Judge Nicholson edited the Union, and he got it; I was a business man of Nicholson at that time; it was a sub-contract with Crowell, under which he did the work for Nicholson.

Q.—Who was the printer of Congress? A.—The printer of either House or the Superintendent of the Printing might give it; he did it to the printer most generally connected with the organ of the President; Judge Nicholson edited the Union, and he got it; I was a business man of Nicholson at that time; it was a sub-contract with Crowell, under which he did the work for Nicholson.

Q.—Who was the printer of Congress? A.—The printer of either House or the Superintendent of the Printing might give it; he did it to the printer most generally connected with the organ of the President; Judge Nicholson edited the Union, and he got it; I was a business man of Nicholson at that time; it was a sub-contract with Crowell, under which he did the work for Nicholson.

Q.—Who was the printer of Congress? A.—The printer of either House or the Superintendent of the Printing might give it; he did it to the printer most generally connected with the organ of the President; Judge Nicholson edited the Union, and he got it; I was a business man of Nicholson at that time; it was a sub-contract with Crowell, under which he did the work for Nicholson.

Q.—Who was the printer of Congress? A.—The printer of either House or the Superintendent of the Printing might give it; he did it to the printer most generally connected with the organ of the President; Judge Nicholson edited the Union, and he got it; I was a business man of Nicholson at that time; it was a sub-contract with Crowell, under which he did the work for Nicholson.

Q.—Who was the printer of Congress? A.—The printer of either House or the Superintendent of the Printing might give it; he did it to the printer most generally connected with the organ of the President; Judge Nicholson edited the Union, and he got it; I was a business man of Nicholson at that time; it was a sub-contract with Crowell, under which he did the work for Nicholson.

Q.—Who was the printer of Congress? A.—The printer of either House or the Superintendent of the Printing might give it; he did it to the printer most generally connected with the organ of the President; Judge Nicholson edited the Union, and he got it; I was a business man of Nicholson at that time; it was a sub-contract with Crowell, under which he did the work for Nicholson.

Q.—Be kind enough to state what bonus you paid him for transferring the printing of the Senate to you? A.—I should explain that I took Harris as editor of the Union; I was then the owner of the organ; I took Mr. Harris as editor, with the understanding that I should pay him many thousands of dollars per annum for editing the paper; I found him rather slack in it, and was compelled to procure other editorial assistance, and on his election as printer, I stipulated to give him \$20,000 more than I had previously given him, which I think was some seven or eight thousand dollars for a period of nine or ten months.

Q.—I am not sure; but I know the district was called Landy's district at that time.

Q.—To whom was the money appropriated? A.—That I could not tell.

Q.—Was it appropriated for the election of the Democratic candidate or the people's candidate? A.—Always for the Democratic cause.

Q.—How much was spent in that district? A.—I think there were two drafts made of a thousand dollars; one perhaps for \$500, the other for \$500.

Q.—What other district was money spent in? A.—I think in Mr. Jones' district.

Q.—I think in the Jones' district—J. Glancy Jones or Owen Jones? A.—There was none sent into the district of Owen Jones that I know of.

Q.—In regard to the district represented by J. Glancy Jones in the last Congress, was any money sent into that district to secure his re-election? A.—That I cannot say.

Q.—How much? A.—I cannot state how much; I merely made a memorandum of the amount of money that went into Pennsylvania during that time; I have the amounts that were paid towards sustaining the Philadelphia Pennsylvania and Executive Organ.

Q.—Do you not know the amount of money that went into J. Glancy Jones' district? A.—I do not remember.

Q.—Can you approximate it? A.—If my memory serves there was \$500 sent there on one occasion; instead of speaking of the \$11,198 57 having been spent in the Fall election of 1858 in Pennsylvania, I should have said that that amount was contributed to the support of the Pennsylvania organ, the most sent into Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858 was about \$4,000 only.

Q.—Do you know of money having been spent in any other districts than those you have mentioned? A.—I think there was some sent into Philadelphia, but I cannot tell how much.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

Question by Mr. Fiske.—The \$4,000 you speak of as having been spent in Pennsylvania in the Fall election of 1858; is it a distinct sum from the \$11,000 mentioned in the report of the Pennsylvania Executive Organ? A.—Yes, Sir; entirely distinct.

COMPTROLLER'S REPORT.

REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS, FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPT. 30TH, 1859.

(CONTINUED—NO. 18.)

STATEMENT.

Exhibiting the valuations of real estate, and the Taxes derived from each subject of taxation in the several Counties of the State; also the Taxes levied by the Courts of Pleas and Quarter Sessions for County purposes, as follows:

No. 80.—WILKES COUNTY.

ESLEY STALEY, Sheriff.

Acres Land, \$19,831

Valuation Land, \$783,757

Town Property, \$16,190

STATE TAXES.

Land, \$1,577 76

Town Property, 32 82

Polis, 1,234 10

Interest, 418 14

Dividend and Profit, 18 60

Salaries and Fees, 42 81

Mortgages and Deeds, 23

Studs and Jacks, 8 50

Capital in Trade, 17

Marriage License, 47

Gold Watches, 16 25

Plains, 18 80

Plate and Jewelry, 2 60

Playing Cards, 2 10

Riding Vehicle, 52 75

Silver Headed Canes, 201 70

Merchants' Capital, 60

Retailers, 10

Privileged Voters, 6 40

Arrears for Insolvents, 42 82

Liquor Dealers, 42 82

Total amount, \$3,977 55