

COLLOSSAL EXPENDITURE OF THE UNITED STATES.

OUR COLLOSSAL EXPENDITURES—WHAT DO WE GET FOR THEM?

(From the New York World.)

Last Saturday we printed a comparison of the expenditures as furnished by the Secretary of the Treasury, of the two financial years of 1860-61 and 1859-70, showing that making all allowances for the debt, interest, pensions, and an additional fifth for the increased expenditure to govern 38 millions of people in 1869-70, instead of 30 millions in 1860-61, we are now expending \$2.27 per capital to every one dollar we expended ten years ago.

This statement acted like a sort of loaded bombshell on some of our ardent advocates of revenue reform. Our figures and facts were not denied; but it was stated that no comparison could pertinently be made between the two periods. "As well might a comparison of expenditure between the great business of Messrs. A. T. Stewart & Co., and the corner grocery store kept by John Smith, as between the two periods."

We will now show that such assertions are rash. We will boldly compare the present expenditure of Great Britain with our own. Here is the estimate made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his budget of 1870-71.

Interest of debt.....	£26,840,000
Other charges on consolidated fund.....	1,820,000
Supply service voted by Parliament.....	38,283,000
Telegraph service.....	360,000
Expenditure.....	£67,303,000

It will be seen that the whole amounts to 67,303,000 pounds sterling. If we deduct from this the interest on the British national debt, £26,840,000 and £300,000 for the telegraph service—together £27,140,000—there remains a sum of £40,163,000; or in dollars, \$200,815,000. From this sum must be deducted 800,000 pounds sterling, or \$4,000,000, for ocean packet service, which by no means exists here. This leaves \$196,815,000.

Our expenditure for the fiscal year just ended was \$292,113,000; from this, if we deduct the interest paid on the debt, say a round sum of \$120,000,000, the balance left for carrying on the government was \$172,113,000, or within \$26,000,000 less than the English carried on their government for, exclusive of the interest on their debt, telegraph and packet service.

And now we will show what England has got for her expenditure of \$196,815,000, and what we have "not" got for our expenditure of \$172,113,000.

England has a royal family, consisting of a queen, and some twenty-two princes and princesses, young and old, a Duchess Dowager of Cambridge, a Duke of Cambridge, Princess Mary of Cambridge and her husband and two or three children; Windsor Castle, Buckingham Palace, Osborne House, Balmoral, and numerous other royal residences to keep up in repairs, furniture, servants, horses, &c., &c.

Thanks to the wisdom and republican simplicity of our forefathers, we have no vestige of the above to provide for.

England has to pay her judges and courts, for the administration of justice expenses, which amount to £672,000, or \$3,362,500.

The United States government only pay for the Federal courts; all the rest of the

judiciary expenses, comprising the great bulk of judicial administration, being borne by the several States.

England has to keep and pay for the maintenance of her criminal prisoners, officials, penitentiaries, and prisons.

The United States Federal government do not pay a dollar for similar expenses, as the several States bear this burden.

England has to provide for the keeping up of Gibraltar, Malta, and Aken; she has to supply, in her numerous colonies and dependencies which have not an independent colonial government, deficiencies which are certain to be made every year.

The United States have no colonies or foreign fortifications to keep up.

England has and maintains the finest navy in the world—a navy which is the wonder, admiration and terror of nations who see only a portion of it.

The United States have the most crazy dilapidated, inefficient navy of any great power in the world—a navy which our best naval officers declare a disgrace to us.

England has and pays for a standing army of at least 100,000 men, 60,000 of which are now in England, the rest serving for her all over the world (besides those in India for which she does not pay.)

The United States have less than forty-thousand men as a standing army.

England has the most efficient, best paid, and expensive diplomatic service in the world.

The United States have an efficient (?) diplomatic service but it is certainly not an expensive one, inasmuch as the four English missions of Paris, St. Petersburg Vienna and Constantinople cost more than our whole diplomatic service put together.

England has a splendid coast-guard service.

Where is ours?

England we all know, or at least we believe we all know, has an aristocratic oligarchy living on the above \$196,815,000.

The United States have no aristocratic oligarchy who live directly on the public purse. Ours is a monopolist oligarchy, who live on the people's substance, and rob and plunder them by act of Congress. But they certainly cannot get a dollar from the Treasury

As the above facts cannot be denied, and inasmuch as comparing ourselves with the most expensive, aristocratic, and largest empire in the world will certainly dismiss the pleasant comparison of A. T. Stewart's expenses and those of John Smith's corner grocery store, we would ask our Radical friends *what we can show* for an expenditure which falls less than \$25,000,000 short of the British.

Let it be understood, and well pondered, that the above comparison is exclusive in both countries of interest or reduction of debt. It simply embraces ordinary current expenditures.

The lively writer of the above, moreover, is under a small mistake; the English Oligarchy (query: did't he mean aristocracy?) does not live on the national revenue. His information on these points are on a par with those of Mr. Lafayette Kettle, about the average knowledge of intelligent Yankees on British affairs generally. The British aristocracy receive princely revenues from their splendid ancestral estates, some of them having as large incomes as the smaller states of the Union; there is not the

temptation or the desire, therefore, to plunder the people which exists in the free and independent republic, and this is one of the many uses of an aristocracy, it prevents the pure democrat from following out his propensities of bloodshed and rapine.

The study of this very interesting document is recommended to the would-be Independent annexationists of Canada, whose efforts to lead their countrymen blindfolded into political communion with the United States have been so praiseworthy and unsuccessful. The people of the United States have to thank the Republican wisdom and simplicity of their forefathers for the exuberant crop of scoundrelism which this generation and succeeding ones are destined to reap. The sins of the father will be visited on the children to the third and fourth generations, and they will find that political sins carry with them sure retribution.

SOUR GRAPES.

The N. Y. Tribune makes the following remarks on the Canadian Fortification scheme:—

Let us hope that the Canadians will not attempt to replace the troops which England is withdrawing, or maintain the forts along the southern boundary which England is dismantling. In peace they are needless, in war they would be powerless, and the moral effect of their army is absolutely and utterly lost upon us. Let her save the three or four millions a year which she contemplates expending for a standing army, and rest secure in the knowledge that we have no idea of invading her dominion, and would not take it as a gift or in payment of the Alabama claims. Above all spare us this occasional outpouring of newspaper wrath.

The philosophic N. Y. Tribune had better mind its own business and remember the old proverb of "the evil conscience being its own accuser." The States have no idea of invading our dominion for very good reasons, because the job would not pay, and we are merely arming to make sure of paying ourselves should the attempt be made. About all the rest of the nonsense the Tribune is welcome to it, but we promise Great Britain if she hands over to us the question of the Alabama claims, to settle it in a month, so that she will never hear a word from Brother Jonathan about it again, the people of Canada will shut him up for once and for aye on that subject.

The St. John Crew are in excellent spirits and health, and express confidence in the coming boat race at Lachine. Their new boat was launched last week, and the crew took a first pull in her. They rowed up and down the river past the spectators several times, and the boat was pronounced on all hands a "beauty." She sits prettily on the water, and moves easily, without any of that bobbing or jumping too common in boats of her class. It is considered that she will turn in eight or ten seconds less time than the old boat. Competent judges pronounce her the handsomest and best racing boat on the continent.