

1828 by \$12,682 13, notwithstanding the clamor which has been raised about the extraordinary number of outfits paid the last year.

The result would still be more unfavorable to the economy of Mr. Chilton's now favorite administration, and if he had made the comparison between the first year of Mr. Adams' administration and the first of Gen. Jackson's:

Foreign intercourse in 1825 \$297,790 11  
Do do in 1829 193,442 13

Greater in 1825 than in 1829 by \$99,347 98

If my memory does not deceive me, the late Administration paid to Ministers, Secretaries, and Charges for returning "a non est inventus" against the Congress of Panama \$40,000. The diplomatic intercourse with a single power, Great Britain, in the rapid succession of Ministers, Charges, salaries, outfit, cost the U. States about the sum of \$100,000 in four years.

As the diplomatic expenditures, including the incidental expenses of foreign intercourse, &c. depend more than any other public expenditures upon Executive discretion, and as the commencement of a new Administration is necessarily calculated to increase the amount expended in the immediate previous year, I have selected the two first years of Mr. Monroe, the two first years of Mr. Adams, and the two first of Gen. Jackson, and compared them with each other, in order to test the economy of each.

Mr. Monroe, in 1817 and 1818 \$715,024 56  
Mr. Adams in 1825 and 1826 517,858 27  
Gen. Jackson, in 1829 and 1830 412,942 13

Thus it will be seen the expenditures (if the whole sum appropriated for 1830 should be expended, which in all probability, will not be the case) of the first two years of General Jackson's Administration, on account of our foreign intercourse, will be \$292,092 43 less than the amount expended in the two first years of Mr. Monroe's administration. It is \$194,916 14 less than the amount expended in the two first years of Mr. Adams' administration. With these facts spread upon the records of the country, so that "he who runs may read," before time is given for the legislation necessary to reform many of the abuses, which have existed so long, that, by the force of precedent the administration is almost compelled to regard them as a part of the law of the land, the honorable Mr. Chilton, under the influence of some extraordinary cause of momentary excitement, proclaims to the public that his "mind was perfectly satisfied that, instead of retrenching the expenditures of the government they were increased," by the present administration.

In the other departments of the public service, and especially in the naval service, I am pleased to find in its administration not only a professed disposition, but the effects of an efficient reform, already manifested in the reduction of the aggregate amount of the expenditures, and in the detailed expenditures depending mainly upon Executive allowances. Less expense, more efficiency, greater economy and stricter accountability, are manifested throughout its whole operations. Much yet remains to be done, by legislation, to effect all that is required. In the administration of this department of the public service has existed, and still exists a greater latitude for the exercise of Executive discretion than in any other, except that of the State Department. And what is the result when the aggregate expenditures of the last twelve months of Mr. Adams' administration are compared with the first twelve months of General Jackson's over this Department?

From 1st March, 1828, to 1st March, 1829, the expenditures of the naval establishment were \$4,082,439 47  
From 1st March, 1829, to 1st March, 1830, they were \$2,076,328 55

Thus it is seen that the expenditures in the naval establishment are less in 1829 than 1828 by \$1,006,111 12

Still the gentleman says, his "mind was perfectly satisfied that instead of retrenching the expenditures of the Government, they have been increased," by this administration.

It is however further insisted, that a difference in the expenses of a long and short session of Congress should be deducted. If that were done, it would still leave the gentleman far removed from the fact.

Why not by the same rule, or for the same reason, deduct from the expenditures of 1829, the excess expended over 1828, for surveys, roads and canals, and the improvement of harbors, &c. contracts, for the construction of which, and obligations in many instances were made and incurred by the late administration; to meet which, much of the money charged in the expenditures of 1829, was drawn from the public Treasury.

I further said that if the aggregate of expenditure in any given year was any evidence of the economy or fidelity of an administration, then the expenditures of the months of January and February, 1829, made by Mr. Adams, ought not to be charged to the expenditures of the present administration.

To make the comparison a fair and just one, the expenditures of the first twelve months of General Jackson's adminis-

tration should be compared with the last twelve months of Mr. Adams's

I then stated the fact, that the expenditures from the first day of March, 1828, to the 1st of March 1829, amounted to \$26,513,788 13

And those from 1st March 1829, to 18.9 to 1st March, 1830, to 24,520,580 04

Making those of Mr. Adams's last 12 months greater than those of General Jackson's first 12 months, by 1,093,268 09

And here follows the proof of the facts stated:

STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURES of the United States, from the 1st of March, 1828, to the 28th February, 1829, and from the 1st March, 1829, to the 28th February, 1830.

From 1st Mar 1828 From 1st Mar 1829 to Feb. 28, 1829. to Feb. 29, 1830

Civil, Miscellaneous and Foreign Inter-

course 3,853,614 06 2,860,359 63

Military Establish-

ment 6,414,106 86 6,200,296 83

Naval establish-

ment 4,082,439 47 3,076,328 35

Public Debt 12,163,627 74 12,383,595 23

\$26,513,788 13 \$24,520,580 04

EXPENDITURES of the United States from the 1st of January to the 3d of March, 1829, inclusive

Civil, Miscellaneous, and Foreign Inter-

course \$715,266 62

Military 1,124,281 51

Naval 659,150 20

Public Debt 205 54

Treasury Department, \$2,498,903 87

Register's Office, April 3, 1830.

T. L. SMITH, Register.

But it is insisted that the amount paid under the Ghent Treaty, by both administrations, should be deducted from the amount expended in each year. If that be done, the result will still prove the honorable gentleman's statement incorrect, by at least \$507,317 41, as will be manifest from the following table:

Total Expen. of 1828. 1829.

\$25,459,479 62 25,071,017 59

Deduct public debt 12,163,538 07 12,383,800 77

13,296,041 45 12,987,216 82

Deduct am't pd. under 1st art. T'y of Ghent 790,709 40 8,280 22

\$12,505,972 05 \$12,676,936 50

This exhibits an aggregate of difference of only \$171,964 45, instead of \$279,282, according to Mr. Chilton's calculation. Apply the same principle to expenditures of the last twelve months of Mr. Adams' administration, and the first twelve months of General Jackson's and the result will be more unfavorable to the gentleman.

From 1st Mar 1828 From 1st Mar 1829 to 1st Mar. 1829 to 1st Mar. 1830.

Total expenditures, exclusive of paym'ts of public debt, and for claims under 1st art. T'y of Ghent \$13,560,090 79 \$12,128,794 59

The expenditures of 1829, under General Jackson's administration, after these deductions, are still less by \$1,431,386 30; yet Mr. Chilton's calculation, by charging the present Administration with the expenditures in January and February, 1829, made them \$1,093,577 more; and in this the honorable gentleman only made a small mistake of \$2,524,963 30. The effect of which mistake has been to satisfy his mind perfectly, "that instead of retrenching the expenditures of Government, they have been increased," by the present administration.

Mr. Chilton's statement was, that the expenditures of the first year of General Jackson's administration were greater by \$679,282, than the expenditures of 1828, the last of Mr. Adams' administration.

Mine was, that the aggregate amount of expenditures, including the amount of public debt paid in both years, was less by \$313,396 31. The statement of the Register of the Treasury above will settle the point at issue.

I further said that if the aggregate of expenditure in any given year was any

evidence of the economy or fidelity of an administration, then the expenditures of the months of January and

February, 1829, made by Mr. Adams, ought not to be charged to the expenditures of the present administration.

To make the comparison a fair and just one, the expenditures of the first twelve months of General Jackson's adminis-

tration should be compared with the last twelve months of Mr. Adams's

I then stated the fact, that the expenditures from the first day of March, 1828, to the 1st of March 1829, amounted to

\$26,513,788 13

And those from 1st March 1829, to 18.9 to 1st March, 1830, to 24,520,580 04

Making those of Mr. Adams's last 12 months greater than those of General Jackson's first 12 months, by 1,093,268 09

And here follows the proof of the facts stated:

STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURES of the United States, from the 1st of March, 1828, to the 28th February, 1829, and from the 1st March, 1829, to the 28th February, 1830.

From 1st Mar 1828 From 1st Mar 1829 to Feb. 28, 1829. to Feb. 29, 1830

Civil, Miscellaneous and Foreign Inter-

course 3,853,614 06 2,860,359 63

Military Establish-

ment 6,414,106 86 6,200,296 83

Naval establish-

ment 4,082,439 47 3,076,328 35

Public Debt 12,163,627 74 12,383,595 23

\$26,513,788 13 \$24,520,580 04

EXPENDITURES of the United States from the 1st of January to the 3d of March, 1829, inclusive

Civil, Miscellaneous, and Foreign Inter-

course \$715,266 62

Military 1,124,281 51

Naval 659,150 20

Public Debt 205 54

Treasury Department, \$2,498,903 87

Register's Office, April 3, 1830.

T. L. SMITH, Register.

But it is insisted that the amount paid under the Ghent Treaty, by both administrations, should be deducted from the amount expended in each year. If that be done, the result will still prove the honorable gentleman's statement incorrect, by at least \$507,317 41, as will be manifest from the following table:

Total Expen. of 1828. 1829.

\$25,459,479 62 25,071,017 59

Deduct public debt 12,163,538 07 12,383,800 77

13,296,041 45 12,987,216 82

Deduct am't pd. under 1st art. T'y of Ghent 790,709 40 8,280 22

\$12,505,972 05 \$12,676,936 50

This exhibits an aggregate of difference of only \$171,964 45, instead of \$279,282, according to Mr. Chilton's calculation. Apply the same principle to expenditures of the last twelve months of Mr. Adams' administration, and the first twelve months of General Jackson's and the result will be more unfavorable to the gentleman.

It is when the executive surpasses the limits of its power, and usurps the authority of the approaching department of Government, that we may look for abuses, and expect extravagance in an administration.

It is not so much by the aggregate expenditures for the service of any one year, as by the manner of its applications, that the economy of an administration is to be tested. The aggregate amount of expenditure in any given year must depend upon the appropriations by Congress, and the exigencies of the country.

While the public look to this administration for the retrenchment of useless expenses, and the abolition of unnecessary officers, they do not desire to curtail the just and necessary, nay, liberal expenditures for the support of Government, for the defence of the country, the support of the army and navy, the extension of commerce at home and abroad, for the preservation of friendship and peace with other nations, by keeping up and sustaining the necessary diplomatic relations with them. They do expect, however, that the money appropriated for this purpose shall be faithfully and honestly applied by the Executive, and in that just expectation, as yet, they have not been disappointed.

It is not so much by the aggregate expenditures for the service of any one year, as by the manner of its applications, that the economy of an administration is to be tested. The aggregate amount of expenditure in any given year must depend upon the appropriations by Congress, and the exigencies of the country.

It is when the executive surpasses the limits of its power, and usurps the authority of the approaching department of Government, that we may look for abuses, and expect extravagance in an administration.

If money appropriated for the Indian service is taken to pay a stale demand for services said to have been rendered twenty years ago, for the department of State--this is an abuse.

If money be paid to a man as Charge d'Affairs, who was never appointed as such, in the shape of an outfit for coming home--it is an abuse.

If money be taken from the public treasury, and paid to a political partisan, as bearer of despatches to South America, and he does not go, but seeks his pleasure and takes recreation in Europe at public expense--this I would call an abuse.

If an officer of the Government draws money from the treasury under pretence that it is drawn for the public service, but in fact for his own use, this is worse than abuse.

If an accounting officer of the Treasury pass an adjust and illegal claim against the Government, and under pretence of a loan, pockets one thousand dollars, this should be denominated an abuse.

If a navy agent be allowed by an accounting officer of the Treasury, under

sanction of the head of a department, in

the shape of extra commissions, &c. &c.

ten thousand dollars per annum for ten

years, when the law declares that his

compensation shall not exceed two

thousand dollars per annum, all will

admit this to be an abuse.

I could swell this list if it were neces-

sary, and then say to Mr. Chilton, there

are some of the abuses which have ex-

isted heretofore, and that I believe that

they do not exist now; they have been