THE IREDELL EXPRESS,
PUBLISHED WEEKLY,
E. B. DRAKE. BY W. F. DRAKE.
EUGENE B. DRAKE & SON,
Editors and Proprietors.
TERMS OF THE PAPER,
$2 a Year, in Advance.

THE IREDELL EXPRESS.

A Family Newspaper---Devoted to Politics, Agriculture, Manufactures, Commerce, and Miscellaneous Reading.

Vol. II. Statesville, N. C., Friday, July 22, 1859. No. 3[illegible].

TERMS OF ADVERTISING.

One Dollar a square for the first week, and Twenty-five Cents for every week thereafter. Sixteen lines on less will make a square. Deductions made in favor of standing matter as follows:

	3 MOS.	6 MOS.	1 YEAR.
One square,	$3.50	$5.50	$8.00
Two squares,	7.00	10.00	14.00
Three squares,	10.00	15.00	20.00

When directions are not given how often to insert an Advertisement, it will be published until ordered out.

Read and Reflect!

1860.

The Squandering of $82,000,000 More Contemplated.

That reliable journal, the Baltimore *Patriot*, very justly remarks that the following statement of appropriations for the quarter ending 30th June, 1860, is equally significant as well by its contents as its omissions:

Amount actually appropriated for the use of Government for 1860	$41,130,194 53
Add balance of existing appropriations	12,478,907 28
That does not include the Post Office bill which the friends of the Administration defeated in the Senate, and which will have to be passed next Congress	20,475,788 00
The Secretary asked, besides, of sums stricken out by Congress	7,599,014 32
	$81,683,904 13

Doubtless all these items, besides other deficiency bills, will have to be passed next winter; and they at least show the *scale* on which the Administration contemplated spending money while the Treasury is empty, viz: at $81,683,904 13.

THE UNTOLD DEFICIENCIES ARE YET TO COME.

The disgust of the House at the revelations of the Naval Investigating Committee, the necessity of a loan, the approach of the Southern elections, occasioned the cutting off the *appropriations*, but there was no *reform* attempted; the only effect of the diminished appropriations is—*that the public service is not provided for!*

There is not an economical administration, for instance, at the Navy Yards provided for: but all useful buildings are *suspended;* yet they must be carried on; but it cannot be *honestly* done till other men are in power.

Deficiency bills for the Utah War, the Indian Wars, the Paraguay Expedition, the Damages for Post Office Contractors, are all to be provided for in the next Congress, for 1860.

The *diminished* appropriations of this last Congress are the result of *genuine Democratic statesmanship*—that is, the abandonment of the necessary public works, the arrest, in great part, of the progress of fortifications, the leaving the Post Office to fall to the ground, or be sustained by violation of law, (grounds of impeachment) the neglecting to provide any foreign mail steamer facilities, the allowing the American steam marine to be driven from the ocean, the leaving all the Western waters without a cent for the security of their commerce.

In a word, their economy is—an abandonment of the public interests—a failure to supply the public necessities, to make a show before the people in the Southern canvass.

MR. SCALES ASSISTED IN PRODUCING THIS STATE OF THINGS, NEITHER SPEAKING OR VOTING TO PREVENT IT! Will not his constituents hold him to a rigid accountability for thus conniving at and aiding in the prostration of all the great interests of the country? If either of them had an employee on his farm, in his shop, office, or counting-room, who so entirely neglected the duties assigned him as Mr. Scales has neglected the great and vital public interests entrusted to him, would he not, in justice to himself, instantly set that employee adrift? How vastly greater is the culpability of Mr. Scales than that of the mere private clerk or farm hand! The interests abused by him are alike individual and general. While the resulting evils affect immediately each individual, they necessarily oppress this wide-spread Union as a whole. Will not the sensible, practical men of this District think of these things with minds unbiassed by party feeling?

1859.

$83,000,000 More of Money Gone!

An official statement just published in Mr. Buchanan's special organ, the Washington *Constitution*, furnishes us with an account of the expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1859, *exclusive* (mind, EXCLUSIVE) *of trust funds and payments on the public debt.* It is as follows:

Civil foreign intercourse and miscellaneous,	$23,086,181 67
Interior,	4,753,972 60
War,	23,243,822 38
Navy,	14,712,610 21
	$66,396,586 86

But that is not all. A part of the annual appropriations for each fiscal year is never expended until after its expiration, but all is spent in the end. The Congressional appropriations for the past year were $83,000,000, while the receipts have been considerably less than $60,000,000, or about $23,000,000 less than the expenses of the government. Where is this enormous deficiency to come from? Do the people not see that, if not put a stop to by them, such management of the financial affairs of the country will inevitably lead to DIRECT TAXATION, and that, too, at no very distant day? Let them reflect—with what degree of satisfaction would they behold the Federal Assessor of Taxes alight at their doors, and proceed to take an inventory of their effects, preparatory to collecting a hundred millions for the support of the General Government? Do they not think they are already sufficiently taxed?

The above statement shows a beautifully economical state of things, truly—practice against professions with a vengeance! While Messrs. Buchanan, Stephens, and other Locofocos high in place, were heard a few months ago loudly protesting that $40,000,000 was ample for the public expenses, we now find these very men officially confessing that they have, within the last brief year wickedly scattered to the winds $3,000,000 *more than twice that amount of the people's money, and* $23,000,000 *more than the income of the Government for the same period!* What management! What shameful abuse of the popular confidence! At such a rate, how much longer can we keep the ship of State afloat? Verily it is rapidly drifting to destruction. Nothing can save it but a thorough reform—a complete cleansing of the National councils and all departments of the Government from the corrupting and blighting presence and influences of Locofocoism. Let the voters, without respect to party affinities, of the Sixth District reflect soberly and as patriots upon the monstrous facts and probabilities that stare them in the face, and act promptly and to the purpose on the first Thursday in August next. Let the voters of the State give that day to their country. It will repay them a thousand fold in averting calamities which are inevitable if they do not exert themselves. To action, then—to action!

1858.

$92,330,461!

Few persons will conceive how immense the above amount really is, by merely glancing at the figures. For the year ending June 30, 1858, (according to the report of the Secretary of the Treasury,) the present Administration expended—squanded—in divers unnecessary and dishonest ways, this stupendous sum of money. And yet Mr. Buchanan himself had declared just previous to his accession to power, that forty or fifty millions would be ample for all the legitimate demands of Government upon the people's Treasury. But, right upon the heels of this declaration and in opposition to all precedent, Mr. Buchanan, in time of profound peace, expended in a single year **$92,330,461!!**

To convey a clearer idea of the magnitude of this sum, we ask the attention of our farmer friends to the following calculation: Take the average market value of North Carolina land to be $8 per acre, ordinary improvements included, and a convenient, profitable farm to consist of 200 acres, the value of the farm would be $1,600. Now, how many farms like this one did the present "Democratic" Administration prodigally run through with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1858? A simple sum in division will answer the question. Here it is:

Price per Farm. $1600) Gov. Disbursed. $92330461 (No. Farms Squandered. 57,706
8000
12330
11200
11304
11200
10461
9600
861

Fifty-seven thousand seven hundred and six farms!—*Good North Carolina Farms!*—expended—squandered—wasted—in one brief year by "Democratic" economy in the management of the Government! and more than enough beside to buy half of another farm! Comment is useless.

Voters of the Sixth District, you can and ought to appreciate the enormity which the above facts demonstrate. At the same rate of disbursement, how long would it take to consume the whole landed value of our glorious good "Old North State?"

☞ Let every man, whether he be Whig, Democrat, or American, who is an advocate of honesty and good government, make free and efficient use of the following statements. They are true—strictly true—and may therefore be implicitly relied on. Just for a moment seriously contemplate the startling fact that the present pseudo-Democratic Administration is prodigally disbursing the government finances to party favorites and speculators at the frightful and ruinous rate of

$92,330,461 per year!
$7,694,205 per month!
$1,795,311 per week!
$256,473 per day!
$10,686 per hour!
$178.10 per minute!
$2.96 per second!!!

Yet, such is incontestibly the truth, the proof of which we furnish by the re-publication of the subjoined Exhibit, all payments on the public debt being deducted:

From the Lynchburg Virginian.

An Exhibit of the Expenditures.

Exclusive—[mark it, *exclusive*]—of the payments on account of the public debt, the expenditures of the Government for the last ten years, ending the 30th of June in each year, have been as follows:

1849	$41,178,395	1854	$51,018,250
1850	38,425,052	1855	56,365,304
1851	43,787,892	1856	60,172,502
1852	39,732,081	1857	64,878,828
1853	43,544,262	1858	71,901,130

The expenditures of the Government from 1789 to 1822, a period of thirty-three years, were as follows:

1789 to 1792	$3,797,493	1808 to 1812	36,147,837
1792 to 1796	12,083,295	1812 to 1816 war	108,537,996
1796 to 1800	21,338,351	1816 to 1820	58,698,087
1800 to 1804	17,174,433	1821	16,723,470
1804 to 1808	23,927,244	1822	9,827,642
Total aggregate			$302,254,868
Total aggregate for 1854 to 1858			304,426,004

Showing an excess of expenditure during the last *five* years, exclusive of payments on account of the public debt, of $2,171,135, over the *entire* expenditures of the Government from 1789 to 1822, a period of thirty-three years, and during which a most expensive war was carried on with Great Britain!

The expenditures during the administration of John Quincy Adams, were as follows:

1825	$11,490,459	1827	12,964,397
1826	13,962,516	1828	12,500,041
Total aggregate			$49,813,213
Annual average expenditure from 1825 to 1859—four years			$63,329,438

Showing an average expenditure for *each and every year* of the last four years, of $14,017,325—*more* than the *entire* expenditure of the whole four years of the much abused administration of John Quincy Adams!

These figures are *facts*. We challenge the closest scrutiny into their accuracy. They fasten upon the Democratic rule, which has cursed the country for the last six years, an enormity of increased expenditure and waste of the public money unparalleled in its previous history!

While the above article shows how much of the public funds is annually squandered by the Buchanan dynasty, the following paragraph may serve to give some idea of

How the Money Goes.

"At Niagara 19 men are employed at an expense of $12,000 to collect $8,000—at Oswego 29 at $18,000 to collect $9,005—at Buffalo 20 men at $17,000 to collect $10,000—at Plattsburg 26 men at $14,000 to collect $18,000—at Burlington 33 men at $16,000 to collect $8,500—at Wiscasset 3 men at $7,000 to collect $130—at Portsmouth 21 men at $11,000 to collect $5,500—at Newberryport 13 men at $16,200 to collect $9,900—at Marblehead 9 men $2,200 to collect $250—at New Bedford 14 men at $6,500 to collect $4,800—at Perth-Amboy 13 men at $4,500 to collect $1,500—at Norfolk 23 men at $19,000 to collect 91,000—at Genesee 7 men at $2,000 to collect 82—at Toledo 7 men at $4,400 to collect 567—at Detroit 19 men at 19,600 dollars to collect 13,000—at San Francisco 134 men at 102,000 dollars to collect 158,000—at Benicia 8 men at 4,400 dollars to collect 2,300—at Stockton 1 man at 3,100 dollars to collect 145—at Sacramento 1 man at 3,500 dollars to collect 36—at Monterey 3 men at 7,050 dollars to collect 45—at San Pedro 6 men at 4,200 dollars to collect 304."

Mr. Scales and the Utah Mission.

Mr. Scales in all of his speeches upon the stump declares without qualification, that the war which the President has waged upon the Mormons, meets with his unqualified approbation, and of course the manner of conducting it, also; which war, it would appear, is to have no ending, and costing to conduct it the sum of untold millions of dollars!! Mr. Scales and Buchanan could not have devised a more ruinous drain upon the revenues of the country than this same Mormon war, the design of which seems to be to squander upon favorites vast sums of the people's hard-earned cash. The following which we copy from the New York *Express* will not only show the enormous cost of this war, in a few items, but the enormous swindling allowed to be practiced upon the government by men having the control of this business.

How the Administration "Retrenches and Reforms"—A $400,000 Flour Speculation.

A Correspondent of the Missouri *Democrat* writing from Camp Floyd, Utah Territory, under date June 3d, furnishes some startling facts respecting the contract for furnishing the army in Utah with Flour for the ensuing year.

The lucky contractors, it seems, are John Holliday and Col. Martin, who receive $28 60 cents for every 100 pounds of flour they furnish. The average daily consumption by the Camp, is not less than 5,000 pounds, making the annual consumption about 2,000,000 pounds.

Now, when it is remembered that Messrs. Wm. Martin and E. P. Stanton offered to furnish the supply of flour at $10 per 100 lbs., and that Mr. J. C. Little agreed to take the same contract for $7 50 per 100 pounds, is it not strange that Messrs. Holliday and Martin have been awarded this contract at $28 60 per 100 pounds? Does it not look like collusion on the part of those in Authority?

And this is by no means the worst feature in the case. For, says the Democrat Correspondent, "the quality of flour manufactured in this Territory is of the poorest description, and would pass for "sweepings" at any market in the States."

It appears that since the arrival of the contractors (Holliday and Martin,) they have been contracting for this sort of flour, at from $5 to $8 per 100 pounds. Were they to pay $8 for all they buy, it would only require an outlay of $160,000 to complete their contract with the Government, leaving them the snug little sum of *four hundred and twelve thousand dollars.* Now if, as this correspondent thinks to be correct, there are *four* partners in the arrangement, they will realize *one hundred thousand dollars each* and be at no trouble or risk. The entire wages of the men employed in the Quarter Masters Department for a whole year, would not amount to one-half the sum squandered on this flour contract alone.

To what purpose do we hear this cry about retrenchment in the expenditures of the government, while the heads of departments are permitted thus to lavish upon contractors hundreds of thousands of the people's money? We shall not be surprised to learn, when the expenses of sending out the army to Utah to make peace with Brigham Young are footed up, that the profits of speculators connected with the expedition exceed by thousands of dollars all the other expenditures.

Now we would like for Mr. Scales to be able to show that *he* is not concerned in this Utah flour speculation. The statement says there are four partners, and the rational inference is that Mr. Scales is one of them, hence his approval of the Mormon war, and no other leading measure of Mr. Buchanan's administrtion—so he *says*. Will Scales enlighten the public mind upon this subject?

Letter from Judge Douglas.

WASHINGTON, June 23.

The friends of Judge Douglas are in possession of the following letter explaining his position in regard to the Presidency:

WASHINGTON, June 22, 1859.

My dear sir:—I have received your letter inquiring whether my friends are at liberty to present my name to the Charleston Convention for the Presidential nomination. Before this question can be finally determined, it will be necessary to understand distinctly upon what issues the canvass is to be conducted. If, as I have full faith they will, the Democratic party shall determine in the Presidential election of 1860 to adhere to the principles embodied in the compromise of 1850, and ratified by the people in the Presidential election of 1852, and re-affirmed in the Kansas Nebraska act of 1854, and incorporated into the Cincinnati Platform of 1856, as expounded by Mr. Buchanan in his letter accepting the nomination, and approved by the people in his election—in that event my friends will be at liberty to present my name to the Convention, if they see proper to do so. If, on the contrary, it shall become the policy of the Democratic party, which I cannot anticipate, to repudiate these their time honored principles, on which we have achieved so many patriotic triumphs, and, in lieu of them the Convention shall interpolate into the creed of the party such new issues as the revival of the African slave trade, or a Congressional slave code for the Territories, or the doctrine that the Constitution of the United States either establishes or prohibits slavery in Territories, beyond the power of the people legally to control it, as other property, it is due to candor to say that in such an event, I could not accept the nomination if tendered to me.

Trusting that this answer will be deemed sufficiently explicit,

I am very respectfully your friend,
(Signed) S. A. DOUGLAS.
J. B. Dorr, Esq., Dubuque, Iowa.

Documentary.

Facts for the People!—How the Money Goes!—Being a Supplement to the Pamphlet Entitled "What it Costs to be Governed."

[PUBLISHED BY ORDER OF THE CHARLOTTSVILLE COMMITTEE.]

This document is a sequel to the pamphlet entitled "What it costs to be governed." This will explain some of the leading facts bearing on the corruption of the government, are either not mentioned, or hastily alluded to. That pamphlet has given in full the celebrated transactions, touching the Merrick contract whereby with Mr. Buchanan's own endorsation Merrick and Sons, for 450 votes, received a naval contract without being the lowest bidders. It, detailed, also, the shameful swindling practiced by Wendell and Seaman, in connection with the public printing, whereby according to the Washington States, (edited by Mr. Pryor,) "the committee convict them of receiving bribes and bounties—one to the amount of $30,000, the other to the amount of $39,000.

That pamphlet detailed also the charge—so far uncontradicted—and alleged to be a matter of notoriety in Washington—to the effect that a certain Mr. Rice editor of the Pennsylvanian, had a contract for printing blanks for $40,000, which cost him just $5000, the profit being divided 50 per cent. to the Washington Union, 5 per cent. to the Assistant Secretary of State, and 3 per cent. to a paper published in the interest of a member of Congress.

That document in addition to the affair of Merrick & Sons, details, also, the other frauds exposed in the Philadelphia Navy Yard, by the majority and minority Reports of the House of Representatives.

It gives also the case of the Hon. J. Glancy Jones a leading member of Congress from Pennsylvania, and particular friend of Mr. Buchanan who received 5 per cent. whilst a member of Congress, to obtain contracts for the government of the Reading Forge company—although there is a law of Congress expressly forbidding all such transactions. The document also gives in detail the expenditures for the committee rooms of the new capitol, involving $1350 for a looking glass, $900 for a set of curtains, $75 a piece for chairs, &c.

These points we shall therefore but hastily, if at all, refer to in the present paper. We propose to take up the subject, where that pamphlet left off, and to present the North Carolina people some more interesting studies on the subject of the public plunder and the damning corruption of the Federal Government.

"Much yet remains unsung." And we proceed calmly—and we defy contradictions—to bring under the knife the administration of the government; and we shall lay open its putrid sores until Democracy shall stink in the nostrils of the people. We do not mean to impugn the rank and file of the Democratic party; by Democracy we mean the policy and the acts of those who have guided and controlled public affairs.

Well may a Democrat exclaim:—"Why are the people so patient? Why slumbers the indignation of the party?"

Surely it is a time for all parties to rise up and sweep from their foul roosts the vultures at Washington—to fright the unclean birds that swarm upon the capitol.

But let us proceed with our task.

And, first, in this letter of Feb. 23d, 1852, Mr. Buchanan speaks with horror of the "enormous" expenditures of the Government, which had reached (he said though it was not true,) the sum of fifty millions of dollars per annum, and, "unless arrested by the strong arm of Democracy, might in a few years, reach one hundred millions." He was convinced, he saw that the expenses could be, considerably reduced below the present standard.

That's the promise. Now let's read the practice.

In the first year, Mr. Buchanan spent $81,000,000 and had to borrow some twenty millions to carry on the Government. Actually, when he was straightened for money, spending $81,000,000.

What would he have done in the flush days of Fillmore, when the Treasury was then overflowing?

But we do not design to declaim: we come forward with facts, we give dates, and authorities, and we shall examine chiefly Democratic witnesses. It is our object to show how the money is spent; and to begin, let us see how Congress—that precious protector and guardian of the people, manages, in the course of one session, to feather its own nest with the people's money:

HOW MUCH MEMBERS OF CONGRESS GET.

We take the following exhibit of the pay, mileage and pickings of Congress, from the great central organ of the Democratic party, the Washington Union, (of Feb. 9, 1859.)

Pay mileage and contingences of 300 members	$3,583,523
Cost of Franking Privilege to the Post Office Department	1,500,000
Expended on capitol	1,000,000
Total	$6,083,523

The Virginia Legislature, argues the Union consists of 200 members, spends in one session including everything $150,000. If it had 300 members, as Congress, at the same rate, its total expenses would be $275,000.

The Virginia Legislature, for three months, get $106,000 pay and mileage. Double the session, and suppose the average distance travel to be ten times as great, and it would be $466,000 supposing the body to have 300 members. But the actual pay and mileage of Congress a long session is $1,559,018

Let us deduct (this is our own calculation) the $1,000,000 expended on the capitol, and see how much our patriotic friends get per head. The amount left is $3,583,523 for pay, mileage and contingencies. Divided by 300 we have as the annual cost of a member of Congress the snug little sum of $19,954,05, which is tolerably comfortable.

But how does it go? They receive one million and a half it seems, in pay and mileage; what becomes of the other three and a half millions.

Well, carrying on as they do, an extensive correspondence with their constituents they require two post offices. The Senate has a post-office for its sixty-four Senators, and the House of Representatives, being equal in dignity, has also its post-office. The Senate's post-office takes four men to keep it—first master at $1850; secondly, and assistant post master at $1440; and thirdly, and two mail boys at $900 each. The House post office takes also four persons, a post master at $2190, one messenger at $1740 and two small boys at $1100 a piece, (pretty good pay for a boy.)

Then, the gentlemen of the Senate require to be waited upon, and niggers being scarce, they require for 64 messengers, at the remunerative wages of $1200 a messenger to every three Senators. The House of Representatives has only 35 messengers, generally getting smaller wages than their friends in the Senate, but the head one receiving $1,756.80. The others get $1400, $1200, $1000, and as low as $600. The number of messengers in the House it is necessary, to employ also $1,500 of pages and mail boys—how many pages and mail boys now we do not know.

Well, then, as the people pay these gentlemen's postage, of course they ought to pay also for the paper they write on. Congress, accordingly, appreciates this; and we have among the "contingent" expenses of the Senators:

For Stationery $17,000 for 1858-59.

Supposing each Senator to write up each session, to his wife and constituents, one ream of paper, it would take $650; but if each member wrote up forty reams, it would take about $360 for each gentleman's writing paper, as it does.

Of course, also, gentlemen must have news, accordingly we find:

Newspapers for Senators	$3,200
House of Representatives	12,500
Total	$15,700

Which at $4 a piece for six months, would give our precious Congress 3925 instructive daily newspapers.

Then the two Houses must have their clerks. The Senate has one chief clerk to the President of Senate $1752 committee clerks at $850 each. And also clerks to committee, pages, police, horses and carryall at $34,509.50.—Why the committees and carryalls are brought into the same item, we do not know—but suppose they get tired writing down all they did have.

The other House has some thirty clerks, with salaries ranging at $1500, 1800, 2100, the clerk of the House 3600.

But let us make out our bill in form:

Total pay of 308 members of the House and Senate, including expenditures on Capitol	$6,083,523
Total cost of a Congressman, including capitol	20,269.11
Total cost of ditto, deducting capitol	16,954.05

According to our inquiries, as far as prosecuted, the following, with regard to a few items, is

"THE WAY THE MONEY GOES."

Post office for Senate, (4 persons,)	$499 00
do for House, (2 persons,)	6,100 00
18 messengers, for 64 Senators	21,600 00
36 do for House, at $1,200	43,200 00
"Pages and Mail boys" for House,	8,500 00
Writing paper for Senate	17,000 00
do for House	20,000 00
Newspapers for Senate	3,200 00
do for House	12,500 00
Clerks to committees, pages, police, horses and carryalls for Senate	32,489 50
36 Clerks for House, at $1,500	45,000 00

We cull out also the following items. (We are taking all this from a public document, entitled "Estimates of Appropriations," sent to the House of Representatives by Howell Cobb, Secretary of the Treasury. He gives the amounts appropriated for 1858-9, and the estimates for 1859-60. Our figures are the appropriations actually made for 1858-9.)

Keeper of the Stationery	1,752 00
Draughtsman, Senate	1,850 00
Binding for Senate	60,000 00
Binding Documents, House	7,500 00
Lithographing and Engraving, for Senate	4,000 00
Lithographing and Engraving, for House	7,200 00
Folding Documents, House	3,000 00
Cartage, House	200 00
Fuel, oil, and candles	1,500 00
Miscellaneous—that's sweeping—for Senate	2,000 00
Miscellaneous, House	4,000 00
Horses, Carriages, and Saddle Horses, (don't they have a nice time?)	

These gentlemen also use tobacco. They take snuff. We see, (this is also from a public document, though a different one from the preceding,)

12 bottles Maccaboy Snuff.
6 bottles Martinique Snuff.
13 pounds American Snuff.
2 Walnut Snuff Boxes (all for House.)

A member of Congress of course takes snuff, and has a gold headed stick, and looks extremely nice, walking about the capitol.

"American gentlemen" also "part their back hair." We see the following convenient arrangements:

278 buffalo and other combs, for House	$71 00
380 (1½ to each member) English and other brushes, House	843 37

Whatever the corrupt public sentiment, they also wash.

489 bars toilet soap, and soap dishes, for House	206 49½

Is a member of Congress good looking? He has a perennial view of his magnificent person. There are—

30 magnificent French plate mirrors	9,565 00

Has he corns?

There are 3,457 yards velvet carpet	17,904 20

Perhaps our friend likes to look out on the beautiful fields, and "make verses to his mistress' eyebrow."

There are single windows costing apiece	17,00 00

Does he like to lounge under a magnificent arch, and whisper to his heart, "Oh, I am one of 'em?"

There is a door at	45,00 00

Is the air of Heaven too rude and plebian for his pampered nerves?

Their atmosphere is attuned with the luxurious ether of a mammoth steam pump, which yours vapors into their splendid Hall.

Oh, with what emotions of admiration and wonder must foreign ambassabors and secretaries look upon one of those magnificent beings—with his soap—and his snuff—and his papers—and his combs—and his cane—breathing that air!

Let us now pass from those delightful scenes, where a Congressman revels in realized dreams of oriental fable, to some other of the leading items in our public expenditures—mentioning, first, the gross sum total of $89,000,000, brought in by Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Fillmore's average expenses were about thirty-nine million per year, deducting amount paid towards the public debt, and indemnities on account of the Mexican War. Mr. Buchanan is also entitled to a reduction of nine thousand, in round numbers, on account of payments towards the public debt. The sum left is eighty millions as the expenditures of Mr. Buchanan for the year ending June, 1858. This excludes two millions deficit of last year, and estimated in the expenditures of this year, and includes ten millions deficit for 1857-8. We ask how Gen. Pierce and Mr. Buchanan have doubled the expenditures in a few years? Can it be explained? Do not the people demand an explanation?

Ten years ago the annual Legislative expenses, not estimating anything for franking privilege, was one million. It is now, as we have seen, 3,583,523—three times as great in ten years.

HOW THE SECRETARY OF WAR MAKES THE MONEY FLY.

Let us examine the war department. There were in 1857-8 about twelve thousand five hundred soldiers in the Army. The total cost of the war department was twenty-five thousand four hundred and eighty-five dollars. We will deduct—for we would mislead no one—two thousand three hundred charged upon this Department, but actually expended on the Capitol, the General Post Office, &c. It leaves twenty-three thousand one hundred and eighty-five. We have this statement:

Expenses of War Departm't under Mr. Fillmore, for year 1849-50,	$1,401,000
For year 1850-51,	11,400,000
For year 1851-52	8,225,000
For year 1852-53	9,946,000
Average, nearly	9,500,000
Under Gen. Pierce, 1853-4, excluding Rivers and Harbors	10,809,000
For year 1854-5, exclud'g Rivers, Harbors and Public Building,	13,100,000
For year 1855-6, excluding, &c.	15,400,000
For year 1856-7, excluding, &c.	17,250,000
Average	14,157,000
Mr. Buchanan, 1857-8, excl'dg. &c.	28,100,000

So the ordinary expenses of the War Department have been more than doubled in seven years. In that time there was an addition to the army of some three or four thousand men—say four thousand—it having amounted, in Fillmore's time, to some nine thousand five hundred men. The expenses of the officers and men, or the army proper, including pay, clothing, supplies of all sorts for men and horses, transportation, &c., &c., amounted to several millions per year.

The number of officers was about 1000, at an average pay of [say] $1200 the pay of a 2nd lieutenant.—This gives $1,200,000 which deducted from $7,000,000 leaves less than $6,000,000, as the sum expended in 1842-'53 for 9500 private soldiers. There having been an addition since then, to the rank and file of 3000 or 4 per ct., it is just to expect an increase in the expenses of the army of 42 per cent on $6,000,000. This is $2,500,000, that, allowing for the increase of the army, the expenses in 1857-8 Mr. Fillmore's rate of expenditure ought to have been 12,000,000. What has become of the other 11,000,000?

Who has got it? There has been also an increase in the pay of the army, amounting to 48 per year—amounting to that gross increase of 672,000.—Well allow that. There remains the enormous sum of 11,000,000 unaccounted for—an increase in five years of considerably over 100 per cent.

We have struck out $300,000 on account of the Washington Aqueduct, the Post Office, and the extravagant doing at the Capitol. We have struck out this—we have allowed the increase in the number and the pay of the Army—and now ask the Democratic candidate in this District, where is that $11,000,000? Who has got it? From nearly $9,000,000, and that more than it ought to have been, up to $20,000,000 in seven years.

"Why slumbers the indignation of the Democracy?" "Why are the people so patient?" It is a time for wailing and indignation in the Democratic party. They have been cheated, deceived, plundered, their leaders have proved faithless.

We do not know where this money has gone to, but a straw will show how the wind blows. On account of the recent Indian disturbances in Oregon, a debt, according to the Government agents, of $6,000,000 had been contracted by the War Department—this War Department whose extravagance we are now arraigning recommended it to be paid. And how much is it supposed they charge poor old Uncle Sam for a musket? $125. How much for oats? $5 per bushel. $55 for a pistol. $120 a ton for hay, &c., &c.

"Pop goes the weasel,
And that's the way the money goes."

The Committee on Military Affairs reduce this precious claim $1,500,000.

This one fact opens up the whole subject. The people are plundered. We pay for our army $1700 per man. A French soldier is handsomely dressed, well fed, and drinks his cheap wine at $120 a year.

FORT SNELLING.

We might refer also to the Fort Snelling sale in 1857, where some 8000 acres of public land for which there was an offer in the War Department at Washington of $15 per acre, was sold secretly—not by auction—and without advertising, at $11 per acre—to certain parties, one of them a particular friend of the Secretary who learned in Washington from the Secretary of War that the sale would take place, and who traveled from Washington to Fort Snelling [some of them] in company with the commissioners of the sale—and who, except said commissioners, as far as appears, were the only persons who knew of the intended sale—the people living on the spot, some of whom wanted to buy, not hearing of the matter for a month after the sale was made! The whole reservation brought ninety thousand. The partner of Mr. Steele, one of the purchasers, soon after the sale offered a detailed account of the value of the lands to Mathew Johnson, U. S. Marshal for the Northern District of Ohio, at the large figures of one million four thousand dollars. One section of six hundred and forty acres was actually sold for six hundred thousand. But we must pass on. Let us see

HOW THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY MAKES MONEY FLY.

The following is a statement of the expenditures of the Navy for the years given:

Under Mr. Buchanan, 1857-'58, including steam mail service	13,091,000
Under Mr. Fillmore, excluding steam mail service for 1846-'50	7,735,000
For 1850-'51	7,984,000
For 1851-'52	7,685,000
For 1852-'53	9,327,000
Average under Mr. Fillmore	8,182,000

In '50 there were 77 ships in the Navy with 2370 guns; in 1858, 78 ships with 2231 guns; so that the Navy is rather smaller now than it was then, and Buchanan in six years manages to swell the expenditures from eight million to thirteen million.

Do we make any misrepresentation? Look to the testimony of Mr. Senator Pugh, [Democrat,] on page 2758 of the Congressional Globe for 1857-'58, Said

"Senator Pugh. There must be a-'buse in the Navy; there must be shame-'ful profligacy at some place if $5,-'000,000 cannot give us a Navy that 'does not even rise above the dignity 'of a sham."

Hear another Democratic Senator, Clingman of North Carolina. See same reference:

Senator Clingman. "A Democra-'tic member of Congress from the State 'of New York in reply to a remark of 'mine about the large expenditures 'and small return, told me that, in his 'opinion, in one of the Navy Yards, I 'shall not specify which, two-thirds of 'the money was wasted.

Mr. Pugh. "I think that is very 'probable; for it is my experience that 'two-thirds of the money we vote for 'any purpose is wasted."

Said Senator Toombs, during the same debate:

Mr. Toombs. "The budget for the 'French Navy is 120,000,000 francs '[$24,000,000,] ours eighth [$16,000,-'000] two-thirds of what theirs is.—'The French Navy is represented to 'contain some 400 or 500 ships, ours '50 or 60."