

### "ECONOMY—MR. CALHOUN"

"Great savings in the War Department."

Whatever may be said of the conduct of Mr. Calhoun's friends, their courage will not be called in question.

To pass off upon the American people the most magnificent, the most visionary, and the most extravagant Secretary of War we have ever had, as a model of prudence and economy, required a bold defiance of public opinion, of which our history happily affords but few examples.

As the Secretary's economy is the weakest part of his character, his friends, with military skill, have turned the whole of their artillery to the defence of this point.

Every thing that has had a tendency to reduce the expenses of the Army, has been ascribed to the superior management of Mr. Calhoun. All the retrenchments introduced by the Radical Members of Congress, have been attributed to his economy. The money saved by the reduction of the Army, which he obstinately opposed, is carried to his credit.

Whatever we have gained by favorable seasons, abundant crops, and the reduced price of provisions, is claimed as the work of this economical Secretary; and should it rain manna in the wilderness, which may be wanted for the support of our forces there, it will be considered as so much gained by him on account of subsistence, and recorded among his "great savings in the War Department."

No small part of the Secretary's great savings has been attributed to the establishment of the Commissariat system in 1818. Whatever merit there may be in the establishment of that system, it is due almost exclusively to Col. Williams, late a very able and patriotic Senator from Tennessee; and certainly affords no strong reason for exalting Mr. Calhoun.

If there has been any great saving under this system, the credit is due to the management of the Commissary General, Mr. Gibson, who is truly a man of business and economy. But surely Mr. Calhoun is not to be made President of the United States, because George Gibson is a very good Commissary General.

The rapidity with which the old Army accounts have been brought to a close, is owing chiefly to the diligence of the Third Auditor, Peter Hagner, an intelligent, industrious, and vigilant officer, and who was so before Mr. Calhoun was known in the War Department.

All the credit due to these officers, and all others attached to the War Department, is carefully collected, to form a stock of merit for the Army Candidate, in this his time of need; but to be restored, with interest, as soon as he shall become President of the United States.

These great savings, which are attributed to the Secretary of War, sound well in debate, and look well upon paper,—but will not bear the test of examination.

In the Columbia Telescope, of S. Carolina, of 16th April, 1822, by way of shewing what immense savings Mr. Calhoun has made for the nation, we have the following statement of the expenditures of the Army for five years—

For the year 1818	\$3,702,495.04
1819	3,384,731.95
1820	2,816,414.11
1821	1,180,093.53
Estimate for 1822	1,800,424.85

The good People of South Carolina, who verily believe, that they have given to the nation the ablest man who ever filled the War Department, also believe that this great man by his superior economy, has made all the reduction in the expenditures of the army, that would appear, by the above statement; and that in 1822 for instance, he saved to the nation nearly two millions of dollars.

The sum of expenditures for 1822, is stated by *st. mat.*, that is by guess work, and is too low, by nearly 129,000 Dollars; and the sums stated for 1820 and 21, are still more remote from the truth, as will appear from more authentic statements, made by Mr. Calhoun's friends at Washington.

The day before this great display of Mr. Calhoun's savings was made in South Carolina, a similar display was made at the Seat of Government. Mr. Sterling, of New York, Mr. Calhoun's confidential friend, in a speech in the House of Representatives, by way of shewing "that the expenses of the army had been reduced to an extent, and with a rapidity very surprising," gives the following statements:

Cost per man.	Reduction.	
\$41.00 for the year 1818		
44.79	1819	\$16.87
315.88	1820	135.69
287.02	1821	164.55
299.46	1822	153.11

The proportion of the officers to the men in 1822, being greater than before, prevents the result of that year from being as favorable as prior to that time.

Again, the whole expenses of the army since 1818, have decreased as follows, viz—

1818	\$3,702,495.04	No. of Army 8,199
1819	3,663,736.16	8,428
1820	3,061,864.00	9,693
1821	2,327,552.13	8,109
1822	1,929,179.91	6,441

\*See National Intelligencer, 26d April, 1822.

This statement, although very erroneous, particularly in the last item, is a much nearer approach to the truth than that of South Carolina. Mr. Sterling was at the seat of government, and had the best opportunities of acquiring information. His statements have more imposing appearance, and have had more weight than any others upon this subject, and therefore are more worthy of examination.

The first thing that strikes us, in looking at these statements, is, that the whole come within the period of Mr. Calhoun's administration of the War Department, and afford us the opportunity of comparing Mr. Calhoun of 1818 with Mr. Calhoun of 1822, by which it would appear that between those two periods, he had altered his practical economy much more for the better.

If the affairs of his Department, however, were not managed in 1822 with more economy than they should have been, which will not be pretended, then they must have been managed with the utmost profusion and extravagance in 1818 and '19.

If the army was not supported in 1818 more economically than at the rate of 451 dollars per man, under a contract system, in time of profound peace, it must have been because that system was badly administered.

The Commissariat system began to go into operation in that year. The Commissary General, and other officers subordinate to him, were appointed and under pay, and no doubt performed some services. It must be allowed, however, that the beneficial effects of the system could not be immediately realized. But in 1819 the system was in full operation, and yet very little improvement then took place in the expenditures of the War Department; not more than should have resulted from the reduced price of all articles necessary for the support of an Army at that time.

Under a well regulated contract system, in time of peace, the Army may be as cheaply, but perhaps not as well, supplied as under a Commissariat system. In fact, the present Commissariat system, so far as it respects the purchase of supplies for the army, is essentially a contract system, as will appear by the 7th section of the act of the 14th April, 1818, regulating the Staff of the Army, viz: "That the supplies for the Army, unless in particular and urgent cases, the Secretary of War should otherwise direct, shall be purchased by contract to be made by the Commissary General, on public notice, to be delivered, on inspection, in bulk, and at such places as shall be stipulated; which contract shall be made under such regulations as the Secretary of War shall direct."

The most important difference between the two systems is this: that under the one, the contracts for supplies were made by the immediate direction of the Secretary of War—under the other, by the immediate direction of the Commissary General; which, for the time being, is certainly a great improvement.

In 1819 the expense of supporting the Army, under the commissariat system, was at the rate of \$434 70 per man. In 1822, under the same system, it was at the rate of \$399 46 per man. And Mr. Sterling was truly surprised that it cost us so little in the latter, but forgot to be surprised that it cost us so much the former.

The pay of a private is \$5 per month for the year \$60 00  
In 1822 the rations might have been  
ho. at 12 cents each . . . 43 80  
Clothing at \$1 75 per month . . . 21 00  
Other expenses, estimated at . . . 5 20  
\$130 00

The privates ought to cost us annually about \$130 each.

In 1822 the average expense of the Army, officers included, was at the rate of \$299 46 (say \$300) per man. But this, Mr. Sterling's opinion to the contrary notwithstanding, was much more than it ought to have been.

Will our farmers and planters whose hard earnings are taken to support an Army of 6000 men at the annual rate of \$300 each, be persuaded that their money, in this case is expended with degree of economy *truly surprising*.

The country labors under great pecuniary distress, from which we cannot anticipate any speedy relief—the produce of agriculture sells at a price that will scarcely defray the expense of transporting it to market—and at no period of our history could the articles necessary for clothing our troops be had a so cheap a rate. And is our Army still to cost us at the rate of \$300 per man? Unless the articles necessary for the support of an Army shall command a better price than they have for two or three years past, the Army can & must be supported at a cheaper rate than it has been.

But, if \$300 per man be considered as a reasonable rate of expenditure for 1822, how is the Secretary to account for his extravagance in 1819? Why should our troops cost us \$135 24 more per man, in that year than in the year 1822? Why this waste of public money? Had it been the object of Mr. Sterling to shew to the people whose money must support our standing army,

the profusion and extravagance of the Secretary in 1818, '19, and '20, he could not have done it more effectually than by the statements he has exhibited.

Well may Mr. Calhoun exclaim, "Save me from my friends."

For once I will endeavor to do it, by removing some of the unfavorable impressions which these statements are calculated to make.

The army, according to Mr. Sterling's statement, in 1818, cost us per man, \$451 00—in the year 1822, \$299 46—making a difference of \$151 54.—But the whole of this difference ought not to be charged to the extravagance of the Secretary of War.

In the first place, Mr. Sterling has swelled up the aggregate of the army for 1822 beyond the limit of its organization, which, under the law of the 2d March, 1821, is fixed at 6,183 men, officers included, as appears by the return of the acting Adjutant General of the 9th November, 1822.

The ranks of the army, however, will rarely be full agreeably to this organization. In 1822 the aggregate of the army amounted to 5,211 men, officers included. This appears by the return of the acting adjutant General of the 12th of November, 1822. And this return signed by the acting adjutant General to make it very strong, is also signed by the Major General, but in what capacity, whether as Commander in Chief, or as assistant acting Adjutant General does not appear by the record. It goes however, to shew that the Major General has something to do at Washington, notwithstanding all the Radicals have said to the contrary.

Mr. Sterling's rate of expense per man for 1822 should be increased more than 20 per cent: that is, he should have divided the whole expense of the Army for that year by 5,211, the actual number of men in service, instead of 6,442 his estimated number. This would give the sum of \$370 21 and reduce the difference from \$151 54 to \$80 79 cts. per man.

There are other circumstances to be taken into the calculation. To make up the annual amounts of the expenditures of the Army, from which Mr. Sterling has taken his rates of expense, he includes the charges for the pay, subsistence, forage, bounties, and premiums, and other expenses of recruiting—Hospital department contingencies and quarter muster's department, but excludes the expense of the Military Academy.

In the year 1818, the transportation account of the officers alone, amounted to \$43,341. In 1822, to a comparatively small sum.

In the year 1818, the recruiting service cost \$155,873. In 1822, no more than \$23,579—Most of the contingent expenses of the army were greater in 1818, than in 1822.

It is not doubted, but that the Commissary General, has made considerable savings in his Department, by his care and diligence in forming contracts for supplies. If to all this, we add, what has been gained by the reduction in the prices of all articles necessary for the supply of an army since 1818, about 33 1/2 per cent. on an average, we shall find that Mr. Sterling's great difference in the rate of the expense of the army in 1818 and 1822, can be accounted for, without considering Mr. Calhoun more extravagant in the former year than in the latter, or more economical in the latter year than in the former.

In fact, so far as regards his particular agency, there seems to be but little change in his system of economy, either for the better or the worse, since he came into office.

But there are certain supposed great savings upon a variety of contracts, the merit of which more exclusively belongs to the Secretary.

In a debate on the contract for delivering stone at the Rip Raps, one of his friends declared "that he was authorized to say, that if Mr. Mix had not taken this contract, a loss would have been occasioned to the United States of 75,000 dollars—the contract having been taken by Mr. Mix at half a dollar per perch less than was just about to be contracted for by another person."

That this circumstance has not been published among the strong reasons for raising Mr. Calhoun to the Presidency, may possibly be owing to the great modesty of his friends. As, however they seem in a fair way to recover of that, we may still have these \$75,000 exhibited among the great savings in the War Department. After which we may also have an account of great savings on other contracts for fortifications. On the contract for advancing the public money to build a Powder Mill for Mr. Buzzard. On the contracts for cannon, howitzers, shot shells &c. for the last 5 years; and more especially on the contracts with the Messrs. Johnsons, for transporting our army from St. Louis to Council Bluffs; all which will require an impartial and careful examination.

### Raleigh Paper-mill.

J. GALES gives notice to those Country Merchants who have been in the habit of collecting Rags for his mill, that he has at present a sufficient Stock on hand, and what they receive in future, must be of the best quality only.

### Eighteenth Congress.

#### SENATE.

MONDAY, JAN. 19.

Mr. Ware, a Senator from the State of Georgia, appeared and took his seat.

Mr. Holmes, of Maine, said, that, by an act of Congress, the sum of \$10,000 per annum, was appropriated for the purpose of civilizing the Indian tribes in the vicinity of the U. States; that it had been apprehended, by the wording of that act, that the sum, thus appropriated, could be applied to the civilization only of such tribes of Indians as are located on the frontiers of the country; that several of the states had Indian tribes within their limits, who were as fit subjects for the provisions of the act as any others, and whose situation promises as much success in any attempt at improving their condition; that, in the State of Maine, there were two of this kind, the Penobscot and the Passamaquoddy tribes. Mr. H. remarked, that the law required an annual exhibition to Congress, of the expenditure of the sum appropriated; but that he had not seen such a statement. His present object, however, was to inquire whether the act might not be so modified as to extend the benefits of its provisions to other Indians than those situated on the frontiers. He, therefore, submitted the following resolution, which was read, and laid over for consideration:

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs be instructed to inquire whether any alterations are necessary, in the act "making provision for the civilization of the Indian tribes adjoining the frontier settlements," so as to authorize a part of the fund, provided by the act, to be applied to the instruction and civilization of the Indians in the State of Maine, or any other State where such Indians are not adjoining "frontier settlements."

Mr. Ruggles, from the Committee on Claims, reported unfavorably to the petition of Hanson Kelly.

Mr. Smith presented the memorial of certain manufacturers, and others of the City of Baltimore, praying Congress to lay a tax on Sales at Auction. Referred to the Committee on Commerce and Manufactures.

TUESDAY, JAN. 20.

Mr. Van Buren gave notice that he should ask leave, on Thursday next, to introduce a joint resolution, proposing an amendment to the constitution of the United States, on the subject of the power of Congress to make roads and canals.

The report of the Committee on Claims, unfavorable to the petition of Hanson Kelly, of North Carolina, was taken up for consideration. This petitioner claims an additional sum of money, which he states to be due him, under a contract with the Marshal of North Carolina, for supplying rations to prisoners, during the late war. Mr. Ruggles stated the views of the Committee on the subject. Messrs. Branch, Macon, Bell, Edwards of Illinois, Kelly, Chandler, Smith, Van Dyke, and Lanman, spoke upon the allowance of the claim. A motion of Mr. Macon, to reverse the report of the committee, prevailed; and the report was re-committed, with instructions to prepare a bill for the relief of the petitioner.

The Senate adjourned till to-morrow.

### House of Representatives.

MONDAY, JAN. 19.

After the presentation of numerous petitions and memorials.

The Speaker laid before the House a communication from the Treasury Department, containing the annual statement of the amount received by the several clerks in that department, during the year 1823.

Mr. Tod, from the Committee on Manufactures, gave notice that, this day two weeks, he should call up the tariff bill, and he presented a statement of the comparative duties as now existing by law, and as proposed by that bill; which was ordered to be printed.

#### THE GREEK QUESTION.

The House then went into committee of the whole, on the resolution some time since offered by Mr. Webster, which is in the words following:

Resolved, That provision ought to be made by law for defraying the expense incident to the appointment of an Agent, or Commissioner, to Greece, whenever the President shall deem it expedient to make such appointment.

The resolution having been read—  
Mr. Webster rose and delivered his sentiments on the subject, in a long though eloquent speech. His remarks fill five columns of the National Intelligencer, and consequently would occupy too great space in our paper. After Mr. Webster concluded the committee rose, reported progress, and having leave to sit again, the House adjourned.

THURSDAY, JAN. 20.

Mr. Crowninshield, from the Committee of Naval Affairs, reported a bill authorizing the building of ten sloops of war, which was twice read and committed.

Mr. Mitchell, from the committee to whom the subject was referred, reported an amendment to the resolution respecting the Marquis La Fayette, striking out the preamble, and all that follows the word "Resolved," & substituting the following:

"That the Marquis De La Fayette having expressed his intention to visit this country, the President be requested to communicate to him, the assurances of grateful and affectionate attachment still cherished towards him by the government and people of the United States."

"And be it further resolved, That, as a mark of national respect, the President cause to be held in readiness a ship of the line, and invite the Marquis to take passage therein, whenever his disposition to visit this country be signified."

Mr. Livingston of Louisiana, rose to express the hope, he might without impropriety say the conviction, that the resolution would be adopted unanimously by this house. Not only were the merits of the illustrious man, to whom it had reference universally known in these States, but they had been personally, repeatedly, and publicly acknowledged. The history of his connections with the U. States, was personally known to some of the members of this House—it was known to all who had read the story of our revolution. It was a connection which did honor to both—to the country that received, and to the individual who rendered them.

Messrs. Stevenson of Virginia, and Warfield followed Mr. Livingston in support of the amendment, in brief, though pertinent language:

The question being put on the adoption of the amendment, it passed unanimously in the affirmative; and the resolution as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading.

#### THE GREEK CAUSE.

On motion of Mr. Webster, the house then resolved itself into a committee of the whole on the state of the union.

Mr. Clay offered the following which he desired to lay on the table for consideration:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That the people of these United States would not see, without serious inquietude any forcible interposition, by the Allied Powers of Europe, in behalf of Spain, to reduce to their former subjection those parts of the continent of America, which have proclaimed and established for themselves, respectively, Independent Governments, and which have been solemnly recognized by the United States.

The committee of the whole having resumed the consideration of the resolution recommending an appropriation to defray the expense of a mission to Greece.

Mr. Poinsett of S. Carolina, then rose and addressed the house at considerable length & in conclusion offered the following as a substitute for the resolution offered by Mr. Webster.

Resolved, That this house views with deep interest the heroic struggle of the Greeks to elevate themselves to the rank of a free and independent People, and unite with the President in the sentiments he has expressed in their favor; in sympathy for their sufferings, in interest for their welfare, and in ardent wishes for their success.

Mr. Randolph moved the committee rise. Let us sleep upon them before we pass resolutions which I will not say are mere hooks to hang speeches on, and thereby commit the nation to a war, the issues of which is not given to human sagacity to calculate.

Mr. Cuthbert, of Geo. hoped that the motion to rise would prevail. The resolutions of the Gentlemen on the Greek question covered, of themselves very important and very delicate ground, but that which the Honourable Speaker had since offered, added to the others, threw open for discussion the entire field of our foreign relations; and it was certainly proper, that they should all be printed, and submitted to the most deliberate reflection.

Mr. Clay then rose, and said he hoped the Committee would not rise. He trusted that gentlemen were now prepared to act on the resolutions, with respect to Greece, and as to that which he had himself submitted, and which the gentlemen from Virginia had, he must say, gratuitously, and without just reason, alluded to in his observations, it was by no means his wish that it should be now considered. He had distinctly stated, at the time he offered it, that he wished merely to lay it on the table that it might be reflected on. At a proper time he should call it up for discussion. He would, however, incidentally remark, since it had been made the subject of animadversion, what he hoped, incontrovertibly to prove, that that resolution, or something like it, must be adopted, or we might prepare to surrender our liberty. If the gentleman wished time to consider it, he should be accommodated: he might take days, or weeks, if he pleased, for more mature reflection; but if the liberty of the country was worth preserving, we must rouse ourselves; we must take decided ground, or we are gone. At least in prospect. He trusted that the committee would now proceed; he pledged himself to shew to that tin tocsin of war which had been sounded with so much effect from one side of the house to the other, was, when examined, a mere creature of the imagination. He hoped that the resolution of the gentleman from Massachusetts would be adopted. The measure for which it prepared was in strict accordance with the policy of the country, with the practice of all our Presidents, from the days of our immortal Washington to this hour. He was disposed to accord to the gentleman from Virginia, every reasonable accommodation; but asked Mr. C. has it come to this? Have we yet to make up our minds on the question of the Greek cause? Has there, then, been no pilow reflections on such a subject? Is it now that we are for the first time to "sleep upon it?" He trusted not. He did hope that, ere this time, every gentleman had made up his mind on such a question. The proposition is before us. It asks us to speak a cheering word to the Greeks. Gentlemen had only to say yes or no. That monosyllable was all that was asked of them. Let them say, distinctly, whether they could give so much encouragement as this to a nation of oppressed, and struggling patriots in arms, or whether they would shut themselves up in a cold, shivering, contracted, but mistaken policy, which must in the end re-act upon ourselves. If, in a proposition so simple, so plain, so harmless, so free from all real danger as this, we were to shut our hearts from the influence of every generous, every manly feeling, let gentlemen say so at once. But he could tell the gentleman from Virginia, that he who follows the dictates of a heart warmed with humanity, and with the love of freedom, has a better guide than that cold, unfeeling, pen-calculating policy, which shrinks before it is menaced, and will never do a noble deed, for fear of some remote, possible consequences of conceivable danger.

Mr. Randolph, in reply, explained the object of his motion, which was simply to have the several resolutions printed, that they might be better compared and considered—he did not mean to interfere with his resolution.

Mr. Foot, of Con. hoped, the committee would rise. The amendment, he said, enlarged the ground of discussion, and the resolution of the Speaker widened the field still more. He hoped, for his own part, that the resolutions would all be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The question was then taken on rising and reported, and it was decided in the negative—aye 84, noes 88.

Mr. Dwight, of Massachusetts, rose and addressed the committee at great length, decidedly in favor of the resolution submitted by Mr. Webster. When he had concluded, Mr. Mangum renewed the motion to rise. He hoped the gentleman from Massachusetts would indulge him in the motion. He could assure that gentleman he had come to this house yesterday with his mind, as he thought, fully made up to oppose the resolution; but by the luminous and able reasoning of that gentleman, his determination had at least been shaken, and he asked for further time for reflection. Whereupon,

The question was put, and the committee rose, reported progress, and had leave to sit again, and on motion of Mr. Taylor, the resolutions were ordered to be printed.