## INVESTIGATION.

## COMMUNICATED TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, APRIL 29, 1822.

## Mr. Sanders made the following report:

The Select Committee, to whom was referred the investigation of the affairs of the Post Office Department, have had, according to order, the same under consideration, and beg leave to report:
That, as the attention of the committee was directed to no specific object, but to the fiscal affairs of the Post Office Department generally, they have endeavored to give to their examination such a direction as they considered most likely to elicit any improper transactions in the Department, if any such existed, and, at the same time, to exhibit its concerns in such a point of view as would best enable the House to judge of its management and condition.

The investigation, however, which the committee have been enabled to make, has been of too partial a character to prove satisfactory, even to themselves; the lateness of the period at which it was commenced, the preliminary calls which they found it necessary to make, added to their other duties on the House, forbid their going into that extensive inquiry into the different contracts, receipts, and expenditures of the Department, which would bave required their exclusive attention for weeks, but from which alone a full, fair, and correct report of its various transactions can ever be made. Partial abuses may be examined and exposed, and thus lead to the correction of others of more consequence, though more difficult to discover. The points of inquiry to which the attention of the committee has been especially directed, and the facts which they have been enabled to collect, may not prove without their use. These points are as follows, viz:

1. Whether duplicates of all contracts and proposals, made and entered into with the Department, have been lodged with the Comptroller of the Treasury?
II. Whether, in any instance, contracts have been improperly given to one person in preference to another?
III. Whether the puibic money has been improperly advanced to contractors, or other persons in the service of the Department, in anticipation of their services?
IV. Whether certain Deputy Postmasters have made due returns of the expenses incident to their office, and whether they have not been allowed for extravagant expenditures?
V. Whether the Postmaster General has taken timely steps for the recovery of the different sums due the Department from Deputy Postmasters?
2. With respect to the first point of inquiry, the committee called on the Comptroller of the Treasury to be furnished with the duplicates of certain contracts, and the proposals, for the purpose of examining the same, which they were unable to obtain. They then addressed a letter to the Comptroller of the Treasury for the purpose of knowing on what principle the accounts of the Postmaster General were audited and settled. In reply, they learned that, from the practical construction given to the act for regulating the Post Office establishment, the receipts and not the contracts were taken as the criterion of settlement, and the Post Office accounts audited accordingly. If the duplicates of contracts and the proposals were merely to be deposited for safe-keeping with the Comptroller, and not as vouchers to direct him in passing upon the different payments made by the Postmaster General, it could be a matter of but little consequence whether the requisites of the law, in this particular, were complied with or not. The committee now learn that a different mode of settlement is determined on, and, though it'may be attended with some difficulty and delay, it certainly will produce more correctness and responsibility. (See letter A.)
3. On the second point of inquiry, the committee learned, from rumor, that contracts had been improperly obtained from the Department, and afterwards sold out to considerable profit; but, from a careful examinution of the books in which are entered the different proposals, though they find many instances in which the contract was not given to the lowest bidder, still they have not been enabled to discover any one which particular circumstances might not have justified.
4. On the third point of inquiry, as to moneys advanced contractors and other persons in the service of the De partment, in anticipation of their services, the committee find that, on the 1st day of January last, there were on the Post Office books unliquidated accounts, for moneys and draughts thus advanced, to the amount of - $\$ 54,35400$ That, since that time, there has been repaid by services rendered, - - - 17,28875

| That, of this sum, there was advanced by the late Postmaster General, | - |
| :--- | :--- | 13,70749

That most of these advances may have been properly made in aid of ' ${ }_{\text {ost }}$ Office contracts, though, in some instances, no such reason could have existed; that, of this amount, there will probably be lost something short of ten thousand dollars.

In connexion with this subject, the attention of the committee has been directed to the transportation of the mail between Philadelphia and New York, and the employment of Chester Bailey, as agent and contractor with the Department. They find, so early as 1811 , the mail between those cities was carried under the immediate contract of the Department, under the superintendence of Chester Bailey as agent, and with the property of the United States purchased for that purpose. That, for the year 1814, as will appear from the annexed account of Chester Bailey, (marked B,) the expense of transporting the mail between Philadelphia and Jersey city, to have been \$9, 15420 ; that the Postmaster General contracted with Chester Bailey (see letter of Postmaster General, marked C ,) for the transportation of the mail on the same route, at six thousand and five hundred dollars, giving him the use of the United States' property; that this arrangement continued until 1818, when Chester Bailey agreed to take at valuation the United States' property, and continue the carriage of the mail atithe same price; that the property was valued to him by two contractors at $\$ 2,885$, much less than the cost, or what must have been its real value; that since that time the mail has been carried by contract at six thousand five hundred dollars per annum. It further appears, that there has been paid to Chester Bailey for various services as agent of the Department, $\$ 10,04253$; that he receives an annual salary of eight hundred dollars, as agent, besides his travelling expenses when called on by the Department in discharge of such duties as may be required of him. Whatever necessity may have existed for his employment whilst the mail between Philadelphia and New York was carried at the expense of the Department, the committee can perceive no such necessity to exist at present.
4. The act regulating the Post Office Establishment declares that in no instance shall Deputy Postmasters receive a larger compensation than two thousand dollars, after deducting the expenditures incident to their office. It further provides, that every Deputy Postmaster, whose receipts shall amount to one thousand dollars, shall make an annual return of the expenses incident to his office. The act does not, in express terms, give to the Postmaster General a control over these expenses, many of which appear highly extravagant, and ought to be curtailed. From the annexed returns, (marked D, it will be seen, that the commissions of forty-one Deputy Postmasters, and the contingent expenses allowed for their offices, amount to
\$112,066 75 To which strould be added the extra compensation of the Deputy Postmaster in Washington, one of
the number, -
1,00000
Making,
\$113,066 75
The last object of inquiry with the committee was for the purpose of knowing whether the Postmaster General had directed suits, in all cases of failure, on the part of Deputy Postmasters, within the time prescribed by law, and,
if not, whether he had charged himself with the amount of their accounts for failing to do so. This was a fact difficult to ascertain, as well from the multiplicity of Deputy Postmasters, the number against whom suits had been brought, and the particular time of instituting the same. The committee find, from the balances, as stated on the books of the Post Office Department, there appears due to the General Post Office, up to the Ist day of January Jast,

 | That of this sum there was in suit, as near as could be ascertained, | - | - |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 100,000 | 00 |  |

But whether these suits were instituted in the time prescribed by law, the committee have not been enabled to ascertain. In conclusion, the committee will submit a brief comparative view of the receipts and expenditures of the Department, between a former and the last year.
The receipts of the Post Office Department, for the year 1816, were, For transportation of the mail,
Compensation and incidental expenses,

| - | - | - |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| - | - | $\$ 521,970$ |
| - | - | 282,452 |

$\$ 961,78200$
$\checkmark 32,970$
804,422 00
Balance in favor of the Department,
 157,36000

The receipts for the year 1821 were, -

-     -         -             - $\$ 814,998 \quad 06$

For transportation of the mail,
Compensation and incidental expenses,

Against the Department,
On the 31st of December last there were six hundred and ninety-three contracts for the carriage of the mail on one thousand and forty-eight post routes; but whether these increased objects of expenditure, or the want of a proper degree of management in the Post Office concerns, has produced this large difference, the committee will not undertake to decide.

As the investigation of the committee has resulted in what may require legislative enactments, and as they have no power to report by bill, they submit the following resolution:

Resolved, That the committee appointed to investigate the affairs of the Post Office Department be discharged from the further consideration of the subject.

Sir:
Treastiry Department, Comptroller's Offyee, Marcil 11, 1822.
I have had the honor to receive your letter, dated the 7th instant, in which you inform me that " the Committee of Investigation into the Post Office affairs, are desirous of knowing whether, in receiving the duplicate of contracts and proposals entered into with that Department, I feel it my duty, under the existing law, to compare the amounts contracted for with what is actually paid; and whether, in the change of any contract where more is given, any information is lodged in my office; and, if not, by what authority the Postmaster General is credited by such expenditures."

In answering the inquiries you have made, it may be proper to observe, that the Post Office laws, so far as respected the manner of settling the accounts of the General Post Office at the Treasury, had received a practical construction long anterior to my coming into office, which was on the 1st of March, 1815; at which time the accounts of the General Post Office had only been settled up to the third quarter of 1808 , inclusive. The manner in which the accounts were settled was to credit the General Post Office with the amount of all the moneys stated to have been expended for carrying the mail, for which receipts for that specific object were produced. These receipts were uniformily considered the true criterion by which to judge of the amount actually expended for carrying the mail. No comparison was made between the amount called for in the contracts and the sums expended according to the receipts produced. And taking it for granted, after so long a practice had obtained, that the law had received a correct interpretation, these accounts have been constantly settled upon the same principles, since my coming into office, until lately. A call from a committee of the House of Representatives, at the last session of Congress, though not embracing the nature of the inquiry you have made, nevertheless led me necessarily to a comparison between the amount contracted for in carrying the mail, and the sums actually paid for the same object, as appeared by the receipts produced, the latter being much greater. This circumstance called my attention specially to the examination of the Post Office laws, which, although silent as to any special use directed to be made of the duplicate contract, required by law to be filed in the Comptroller's office, I was, nevertheless, induced to believe, from a full view of the whole laws, that the mode of settlement which had been so long adopted was erroneous, and I accordingly concluded to consult the Secretary of the Treasury upon the subject, (as is the uniform practice of the Treasury in all cases of doubt, or where a change of any former practice is contemplated, and we accorded in opinion, that the contracts ought to be the criterion by which to judge of the true amount of the sums for which the General Post Office could properly receive credit on account of money paid for transportation of the mail, although receipts to a greater amount than that called for in the contract might be produced; and instructions were accordingly given to the Fifth Auditor of the Treasury (who reports upon these accounts to my office) to compare the amounts contracted for with what is actually paid, which the receipts will prove, and to make the former, and not the latter, as heretofore, the criterion by which to allow the General Post Office credit for transportation of the mail. No report from the Auditor has yet been made, under this mode of examination; but he has informed me, verbally, that very great difficulties occur in progressing with the settlements according to this mode, from the want of the duplicate contracts, which are absolutely necessary in settling the accounts according to the mode now contemplated, and which are not to be found in the Comptroller's office. The foregoing information has only been recently received, but application will be made for the duplicates to be furnished in all cases where they have not been furnished; and every exertion will be made to progress with the mode of settlement which has been decided upon. But whether we shall be able to carry it into full effect, without some change in the present Post Office laws, I am at present unable to say.

In answer to the question you ask, whether in the change of any contract when more is given, any information is lodged in my office, and, if not, by what authority the Postmaster General is credited by such expenditures, I have to observe, that I do not know of any information having been lodged in my office, in cases where a change of the terms of the original contract has taken place; and the grounds upon which the Postmaster General has hitherto received credit has been the evidence of his payments made for carrying the mail, according to the receipts which have been produced, predicated upon the principle upon which the accounts of the General Post Office had been settled since its first establishment.

I have the honor to be, with considerations of high respect, your obedient servant,
JOSEPH ANDERSON, Comptroller.
The Hon. R. M. Sanders, House of Representatives.


| $\$ 30000$ | Nov. 30, 1807, |
| :---: | :---: |
| 60000 |  |
| 7423 | May 31, 1809, |
| 52500 500 | June 20, 1809, |
| 40000 | June 20, 1809, |
| 13000 | Aug. 29, 1809, |
| 5000 | March 31, 1809, |
| 10000 | Jan. 10, 1811, April 1, 1811, |
| 2,000 00 | July 1, 1811, |
| 24323 | Oct. 1, 1811, |
| 1,00000 | Oct. 1, 1811, |
| 11131 | May 20, 1812, |
| 23000 |  |
| 77000 | May 20, 1812, |
| 50000 |  |
| 5000 | June 28, 1812, |
| 40000 | June 30, 1813, |
| 375 1,000 1,000 | July 1, 1813, |
| 1,684 35 | Oct. 1, 1813, |
| 1,500 00 | Jan. 1, 1814, |
| 75000 | Jan. 1, 1814, |
| 1,000 00 | July 1, 1814, |
| 1,000 00 |  |
| 1,600 00 | Oct. 1, 1814, |
| 22099 51650 | Jan. 1, 1815, |
| 3,391 62 | Jan. 1, i815, |
| 43561 | Jan. 1, 1815, |
| 19759 | Jan. 1, 1815, |
| 3,713 300 300 | April |
| 4,403 60 |  |
| 70000 | June 30, 1816, |
| 50000 | Dec. 31, 1816, |
| 16200 | Jan. 1, 1817, |
| 50000 |  |
| 40000 | March 29, 1817, |
| 1,19144 10000 | March 31, 1817, |
| 10000 | April 1, 1817, |
| 10000 | April 1, 1817, |
| 1,325 00 | Sept. 19, 1817, |

[^0]| Dec. | 20, 1816, | To a draught on Aaron H |  | - | \$2,250 00 | Sept. 19, 1817, | By his salary as agent, from July | \$800 00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| May | 9, 1817, | To a draught on Theodorus Bailey, |  | - | 1,450 00 | Sept. 19, 1817, | By detection and prosecution to conviction of James Yeatman, mail carrier, for rob. |  |
| Aug. | 6, 1817, | To cash sent him-a check, |  | - | 1,675 00 |  | bing the Huntingdon mail in 1816, | 20000 |
| Oct. | 1, 1817, | To cash paid him, | - | - | 825 400 400 | Sept. 19, 1817, | By detection and prosecution to conviction of John Rose, for robbing the mail at |  |
| Dec. | 9, 1817, 12, 1817 | To a draught on Joseph E. Sprague, To cash paid him, | - | - | 40000 60000 |  | Fredericksburg Post Office in 1816, By transporting the mail, Philadelphia and Jersey city, July ${ }^{-1}$ to October 1, 1817, - | 200 1,625 00 |
| Dec. | 20, 1817, | To cash paid him, - |  | - | 600 500 000 | Oct. 1, 1817, | By transporting the mail, Philadelphia and Jersey city, July 1 to October 1, 1817, - | $\begin{aligned} & 1,625 \\ & 1,000 \\ & 1,000 \end{aligned}$ |
| Sept. | 1, 1818, | 'To Chester Bailey for balance, |  |  | 5,851 82 | Jan. 1,1818, <br> Feb. 1,1818, <br> Feb. 1, 1818,  | By transporting the mail, Philadelphia and Jersey city, Oct. I to December 31, 1817, <br> By Chester Bailey, for amount of stage property appraised by John Tomlinson and <br> Alexander McCalla, June 28, 1816, viz: six teams, <br> And $\$ 150$ per team, for advantage of the road, - | 1,62500 3,78500 |
|  |  |  |  |  | \$48,207 99 |  |  | \$48,207 99 |

Dr.
Mr. Chester Bailey, mail contractor and agent, in account with the General Post Office.

Feb. 17, 1818,

March 30, 1818,
April 10, 1818,
April 14, 1818,
June 8, 1818,
June
June
24, 1818,
July
June 24,1818 ,
July 15,1818,
Aug. 6, 1818,
Sept.
S4, 1818,
Set.
24,
Oct. 1, 1818,
Nov. 14, 1818 ,
Nov. 19, 1818 ,
Nov. 27,1818,
Jan. $\quad 1819$,
Jan. $\quad 2,1819$,
Feb.
19,
1819,
March 25, 1819 ,
April 9,1819 ,
April 13, 1819',
May 20, 1819,
June 28, 1819,
June 30,1819,
July 31,1819,

To New York mail stage account for sis teams, appraiserl by John Tomand $\$ 150$ per team, for the advantage of the road, -
To cash sent him,
To cash sent him in small bills, -
To cash sent him in notes
To cash sent him in notes,
To cash sent him in a check,
To cash sent him in a check,
To cash sent him in a check,
To cash sent him in a check,
To cash sent him in a check,
To cash paid him,
To cash paid him,
To cash sent him, a check,
To a draught on Zenas Well
To cash paid him,

## To cash paid

To cash sent him, a check,
To cash paid his draught, of 23d instant, in favor of S . Reynolds
To cash paid him, a check,
To cash paid him, a check,
To cash paid him, a check,
To cash delivered Mr. Sargent, a check, -
To cash delivered Mr. Sargent, a check, -
To cash paid him, a check, -


By New York mail stage account, for balance of that account By cash received of William Gholson
By cash received in bis letter of the 11 th instant,
By cash received of Andrew Coyle,
By cash received for his draught on John Davis
By cash received for J. 'Taylor's check,
By James Hewitt's note and account,
Borter and Co.'s draught of the
14 th instant,
By Edwin Portel' and Co.'s draught of the 14th instant,
By transporting the mail, Philadelphia and Jersey city, from January 1,1818 , to January 1,1820 , is eight quarters, at $\$ 1,625$ per
Buarter, ${ }^{\text {By }}$ salary as agent, fiom July 1, 1817, to April 1, 1820, is eleven quarters, at $\$ 200$ per quarter,
By James Shethar for his draught,
By cash received of Mr. Wallack,
By cash recetved of P. Bradley,
By transportation for delivering the mail on board, and receiving the mail from on board the steamboat at Philadelphia, from April 1, to December 31, 1819, 244 days, at $\$ 1$ per dollar per day,
By transportation for his share of carrying the mail, Philadelphia and Jersey city, from January 1, 1820, to December 31,1821 , is eight quarters, at $\$ 80616$ per quarter,
Thomas Ward's share for carrying the mail on said route from January 1, 1820, to the 22d May, 1821, at $\$ 53846$ per quar-
ter, is

| Sept. 30, 1819, | To cash, J. Montgomery's draught, | ${ }^{99} 42$ | Jan. 1, 1822, |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Oct. } & \mathbf{7 , 1 8 1 9} \\ \text { Jan. } & 1,1820, \\ \end{array}$ | To cash paid him, a check, To cash paid him, a check, | 2,500 1,885 1,00 |  | quarters, at $\$ 200$ per quarter, <br> Balance per contra, | 1,200 1,470 03 |
| Feb. 22, 1820, | To cash sent him, a clieck, - | 1800 00 |  |  |  |
| March 8, 1820, | To cash, a draught on S. Fisher, - | 2100 |  |  |  |
| March 8,1820, | To cash sent him, a check, - | $\begin{array}{r}400 \\ 544 \\ 62 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| March 30, 1820, | To a draught on Mary Davenport, | 10323 |  |  |  |
| $\leftrightarrows$ April 4, 1820, | To cash paid his draught of 24th March, by check, - | 25000 |  |  |  |
|  | To cash in notes and checks, ${ }^{-}$- Wilson \& Co. | 680 67 60 45 |  |  |  |
| May 16, 1820 , | To cash paid him, a check, - - | 28038 |  |  |  |
|  | To cash paid him, a check, - - - - | $\begin{array}{r}20000 \\ 1,000 \\ \hline 00\end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { July } \\ & 6,1820, \\ & \text { Aug } \\ 24 & 1820\end{array}$ | To cash paid T. Ward's order, favor of N. Dunn, by request of C. Bailey, | 12100 |  |  |  |
| Aug. 24, 1820, | To cash sent him, a check, ${ }^{-}{ }^{-}{ }^{-}$- ${ }^{-}$ | 1,544 62 |  |  |  |
| Aug. 31, 1820, | To cash sent to him to buy an iron chest for the General Post Office \$98, which he bought for $\$ 88$ - difference, | 6000 |  |  |  |
| Nov. <br> Nov. <br> $9,1820,180$, <br> 1820, | To a draught on Thomas Cornwell, - |  |  |  |  |
| Nov. ${ }_{\text {Now }} \mathbf{9}, 1820,1820$, | To a draught on Joseph Hulme, ${ }^{\text {T }}$, |  |  |  |  |
| Nov. 9, 1820, | To a draught on Isaac Hulme, - - - - 10969 |  |  |  |  |
| Nov. 15, 1820, | To cash paid him, | 56769 500 00 |  |  |  |
| March 8, 1821, | To cash paid him, - ${ }^{\text {To a draught on Stephen Morford, }}$ | 1,20339 14547 |  |  |  |
| April 12, 1821 , | To cash paid him, - | 145 40 00 |  |  |  |
| April 27, 1821, | To cash sent, a check, - - - - | 50000 |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { May } & \text { 7, } \\ \text { July } \\ & \text { 2, 1821, }\end{array}$ |  | 50000 |  |  |  |
| July 2,1821 , | To a draught on George Allen, - - - - 1,000 00 |  |  |  |  |
| July 2, 1821, | To a draught on Joseph Hulme, - - - - 3700 |  |  |  |  |
| Aug. 20, 1821, | To cash sent him, a check, - ${ }^{-}{ }^{-}$- ${ }^{-}$ | 20000 |  |  |  |
| Oct. ${ }_{\text {Oct. }} \mathbf{1 6 , 1 8 2 1 ,}$ | To cash paid his draught, of October 4, in favor of J. Reeside, | $\begin{aligned} & 60000 \\ & 200 \\ & 200 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Dec. 18, 1821, | To a draught on J . Worrell, surety of Henry Comby, for collection, \$1,100, yet unpaid, - - - - - \$1,100 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | \$36,508 05 |  |  | \$36,508 05 |
| Jan. 1, 1822, | To balance due the General Post Office, - | \$1,470 03 |  |  |  |

## C.

General Post Office, April, 1822.
In transmitting the account of Chester Bailey to the committee, which embraces a period of near fifteen years, I trust the committee will not think it improper for me to accompany it with a few remarks immediately relative to the subject.

In my late communication to the committee I did not notice the employment of Mr . Bailey as a special agent of my predecessor for the transmission of a daily mail to Monticello, in Virginia, during President Jefferson's residence at that place in the year 1807.

The account shows that the expense of that mail constitutes the first charge against Mr . Bailey.
In 1809 and 1810 the mail was carried so irregularly between the cities of Philadelphia and New York, that my predecessor found it necessary to carry a part of that mail at the expense of the United States, that he might more effectually secure the due and faithful transmission of mails between those cities.

To effect that object he employed Mr. Bailey to purchase the necessary property, and to superintend it; the fidelity and ability with which he executed that trust was fully approved of, and met the most decided approbation of my predecessor.

The mail's annual expense, before the purchase, was $\$ 4,500$ per annum: the receipts from passengers was not equal to the expense and support of the line of mail stages, and, when aided by the mail money, the whole amount of receipts were less than the actual expenditures for stages and sulkies; yet the mail was carried with so much greater regularity than it had been by individuals, that the arrangement was continued, and in full operation, when I entered upon my official duties in 1814.

I, however, considered it to be my duty to ascertain the cost of transporting said mail, in the opinion of others; I therefore included that route in the first advertisement that I published; and the only offer I received was from Messrs. Groodyear and Woodruff, at $\$ 6,500$ per annum; the question then occurred to me, was it expedient to sell the property of the United States and accept the offer, or continue the arrangement of my predecessor, regulating the mail's expenditure by the only bid I received, although my advertisement was published more than four months.

After a full examination of the subject, I viewed it best for the public interest to maintain the entire control of that line, which operated as a check upon contractors, both in repressing exorbitant demands, and stimulating contractors to a faithful discharge of their duty.

But, on closing the accounts for the year 1814, the expenses of this line were greater than we anticipated; and passengers were generally turning their attention to steamboats.

I therefore believed it to be for the interest of the United States to continue the control of that line, without the immediate agency of this Department. I therefore tendered to Mr. Bailey the use of the United States' property, and to allow him at the rate of $\$ 6,500$ per annum for the mail's transport, without any allowance for sulkies during the bad state of the roads; he carried, or caused the mail to be carried, with great punctuality, and to the general acceptance of the public and of this Department.
In June, 1816, I thought it advisable for the United States to sell the property to Mr. Bailey, at the valuation of two disinterested men, both selected by this Department, viz: Messrs. John Tomlinson and Alexander McCalla, of Philadelphia. I preferred this mode of sale by valuation, as being beneficial to the public in receiving a just value for the property.

In my succeeding advertisement, although published from May till October, 1817, I received no offer except from Chester Bailey; I therefore continued the former arrangement with him, at the former rate, having every advantage, as to fines, by a verbal contract, as though a formal contract had been entered into. It may be proper to add, that the greatest interest the public ever held in that line did not exceed one-half of the distance between Philadelphia and New York, although it entirely controlled the whole.

In my following advertisement I received but one bid, viz: from Ward, Lyon, and Bailey, which was at $\$ 6,500$ per annum. I closed with their offer, and entered into a contract with Thomas Ward, of Newark, N. J. and Chester Bailey, a copy of which contract is enclosed.

No agent has ever served this Department more faithfully or usefully than Mr. Bailey has done; he has been the means of prosecuting to conviction more offenders against the Post Office law, within the last ten years, than all other persons in the United States unconnected with this Department.

The account exhibits a balance against him of $\$ 1,47003$; but, on adjusting his account against the Department, it is highly probable that a balance will be found in his favor.

I have the honor to be, respectfully, your obedient servant,
R. J. MEIGS, Jun.

Hon. Romulus M. Sanders, Chairman of Committee on Post Office Concerns.



| Post Offices. | Postmasters. |  |  | Clerk hire and other expenses. | Gross amount of commissions, \&c. | Nett compensation. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New Haven, Connecticut, - | W. H. Jones, - | - | Office rent, $\$ 125$; wood, $\$ 3150$; candles, oil, $\& \mathrm{c} . \$ 1250$, Samuel C. Carter, clerk, \$125, and board, washing, \&c. \$125, - $\quad-\quad-\quad-\quad-$ | $\begin{array}{r} 16900 \\ 25000 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 1,44339 \\ 41900 \end{array}$ |  |
| New York city, - - | Theo. Bailey, |  | Office rent, $\$ 1,000$; fuel, wood and coal, $\$ 80$; candles and oil, $\$ 65$, <br> Stationary, $\$ 75$; extra printing, labels, accounts, \&c. $\$ 3$ 25; office lamp, $\$ 722$, <br> Extra printing, blanks, \&c. \$11 50; lodging for two clerks having charge of office at night, \$50, <br> Porter services, $\$ 150$; scavenger and sti'eet cleaners, $\$ 15$, <br> J. R. Bailey, clerk, $\$ 1,000$; Anthony Wiley, clerk, $\$ 1,000$; J. S. Reynolds, clerk, $\$ 1,000$, <br> J. M. Read, $\$ 600$;'T. 'T. Peek, $\$ 600$; W. Taylor', $\$ 600$, <br> W. A. Colman, $\$ 700$; George W. Peek, clerk, $\$ 350$, | $\begin{array}{r} 1,14500 \\ 8547 \\ 6150 \\ 16500 \\ 3,000 \\ 1,800 \\ 1,800 \\ 1,050 \\ \hline 00 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8,96873 \\ & 7,30697 \end{aligned}$ | 81,024 39 |
| New Orleans, Louisiana, - | T. B. Johnson, - | - | Office rent, $\$ 720$; fuel, $\$ 24$; candles, ink, sand, paper, quills, brushes, \&c. $\$ 150$, Bernard Cazeaum, clerk, $\$ 900 ;$ J. Santo Domingo, $\$ 600 ;$ G. Lafferranderie, $\$ 360$, | $\begin{array}{r} 89400 \\ 1,86000 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4,17584 \\ & 2,751 \\ & \hline, 70 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Petersburg, Virginia, | Thomas Shore, - | - | Ofice rent, $\$ 200$; John Butts, clerk for six months, $\$ 150$, <br> W. O. Gee, four months, $\$ 62$ '50; Lewis Lansford, four months, $\$ 50$, - <br> W. Holdcroft, six months, \$155; James Blanks, three months, \$37 50, <br> Board for two clerks, $\$ 450$; board for one clerk, four months, $\$ 67$; washing for three clerks, $\$ 58$, Fuel, $\$ 70$; candles, \&c. $\$ 100$; servant, $\$ 100$; moving office, $\$ 45$, | $\begin{aligned} & 35000 \\ & 11250 \\ & 19250 \\ & 57500 \\ & 31500 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,54379 \\ & 1,54500 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, | Richard Bache, - | - | Office rent, $\$ 1,200$; services of porter, $\$ 200$; fuel, $\$ 150$; stationary, $\$ 115$, <br> Watching at the office, $\$ 2850$; quills, $\$ 8$; candles, $\$ 32$ 27; stationary, $\$ 750$, Candles, $\$ 6436$; oil, $\$ 15$; Peter Morgan, for salary, $\$ 41250$, <br> F. C. Dumling, clerk, $\$ 1,200$; Hugh Newman, clerk, $\$ 831$ 25; J. Bewley, clerk, $\$ 500$, <br> J. C. Dumling, $\$ 500$; John Sutter, $\$ 500$; John Talbert, clerk, $\$ 26389$, <br> A. D. Bache, $\$ 400$; surplus to the credit of the General Post Office, $\$ 1236$, | $\begin{array}{r} 1,66500 \\ 7627 \\ 49186 \\ 2,53125 \\ 1,26389 \\ 41236 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8,44063 \\ & 6,440 \quad 63 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, - | John Johnston, - | - | Office rent, $\$ 258$; fuel, $\$ 30$; candles, $\$ 15$, <br> John S. Johnston, clerk, $\$ 600$; James Dick, clerk, $\$ 500$, | $\begin{array}{r} 29500 \\ 1,10000 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,671 \\ & 1,395 \\ & 1,31 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Portland, Maine, - - | Robert Ilsley, - | - | Office rent, $\$ 80$; wood, $\$ 3647$; oil, $\$ 1375$; stationary, $\$ 7$ 123, Parker Ilsley, clerk, \$400; John Hull, \$200; Robert Hull, \$75, | $\begin{array}{ll} 137 & 34 \frac{1}{2} \\ 675 & 00 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2,33440 \\ 81244 \frac{1}{2} \end{array}$ |  |
| Portsmouth, New Hampshire, | Jonathan Payson, | - | Office rent, $\$ 75$; fuel, $\$ 1237 \frac{1}{2}$; candles, $\$ 140$; sundries, $\$ 2525$, Samuel Hall, jun., clerk, $\$ 600$; Nathan Melcher, clerk, $\$ 150$, - | $\begin{aligned} & 11402 \frac{1}{2} \\ & 750000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,86139 \frac{1}{2} \\ \quad 864020 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 99737 |



ABSTRACT-Continued.

| Post Offices. | Postmasters. |  |  | Clerk hire and other expenses. | Gross amount of commissions, \&c. | Nett compensation. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fayetteville, N. Carolina, - | John McRae, - |  | Office rent, $\$ 350$; candles and oil, $\$ 90$; wood, $\$ 30$; porter $\$ 40$, A. H. McRae, clerk, $\$ 400$; Duncnu McRae, clerk, $\$ 200$; Owen Kenain, $\$ 100^{\circ}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 51000 \\ 70000 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 3,03884 \\ 1,21000 \end{array}$ | - |
| Chambersburg, Penn. | Jacob Deckhert, - |  | Fuel, $\mathbf{\$ 1 0}$; candles, $\$ 16$, <br> Clerk, N. J. Neily, aged 26 years, who remained until some time in August last; salary and boarding at the rate of $\$ 450$ per annum, say ten months, | $\begin{array}{r} 2600 \\ 37500 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 97144 \\ & 40100 \end{aligned}$ | \$1,828 84 |
| Fredericksburg, Virginia, - | W. T. Gray, - |  | Office rent, $\$ 75$; fuel, $\$ 2160$; oil, $\$ 9$; candles, $\$ 1050$, Clerk, Lewis Timberlake, $\$ 450$; stationary, brushes, and making fires, $\$ 1845{ }^{-} \quad$ - $\quad-$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11610 \\ & 468 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,08455 \\ 58455 \end{array}$ | 57044 |
| Norfolk, Virginia, | A. J. McConnico, |  | Office rent, $\$ 93$ 33; fuel, $\$ 20$; candles, $\$ 5$; making fires, \&c., $\$ 50$, Clerk, F. C. Fontaine, $\$ 600$, from September 1,1819 , to September $30,1820, \quad=\quad-\quad=$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16833 \\ & 6000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,91292 \\ 768 \\ 93 \end{array}$ | 50000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,144 59 |

Statement of the receipts and disbursements of sundry Postmasters, made in conformity to the 41 st section of the Post Office law, for the year ending September 30, 1820.

| Post Offices. | Postmasters. |  | Amount of commissions. | Nett compensation. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fredericksburg, Va. | W. F. Gray, | Allowance on free letters, Commission on letter postage, Commission on newspapers, <br> From which deduct, for expenses of office: <br> For one year's rent, paid Mrs. Smith, \$75 00 fuel, 80 bushels of coal, at 27 cts .2160 six gallons of oil, at \$1 50, - 900 fifty lbs. of candles, at 21 cts. - 1050 clerk hire, paid L. Timberlake, aged 23 years, sundries, stationary, brushes, making fires, \&c. | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 2378 \\ 97665 \\ 8412 \\ \hline \$ 1,08455 \end{array}$ <br> 58455 | 850000 |
| Norfolk, Virginia, - | A. J. McConnico, - | Commission on letters, \&c. \&c. <br> From which deduct, for expenses of office: <br> For office rent; paid Matthew Glenn, §93 33 five cords of wood, at $\$ 4$, and 20 <br> lbs. of candles, at 25 cts: <br> 2500 <br> olerk hire, paid Francis C. Fon- <br> taine, aged 28 years, - 60000 <br> sundries, making fires, brushes, <br> \&c. \&c. per account, <br> - 5000 | $1,91292$ <br> 76833 | \$1,144 59 |
| Wilmington, Del. - | Joseph Bringhurst, | To May 15th: <br> Commission on Ietters, \&c. \&c. <br> From which deduct, for clerk hire, \&c. per account, | $\begin{aligned} & 47894 \\ & 190 \quad 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r}\$ 28884 \\ \\ \\ \hline 82847\end{array}$ |
| , | N. G. Williamson, | From May 15th: <br> Commission on letters, \&c. \&c. <br> From which deduct, for expenses of office: <br> For rent, candles and oil, per acc't, - \$48 56 clerk hire, paid S. McDowell, aged 32 years, - <br> do. C. Grubb, aged 15 years, $\quad \mathbf{5 0} 00$ | 50703 <br> 24856 |  |
| Washington, Penn. | Hugh Wylie, - | Commission on letters, \&c. \&c. <br> From which deduct, for expenses of office: <br> For office rent, $\$ 75$, wood and candles, $\$ 8900$ clerk hire, paid M. Hamilton, aged 27 years, - - 15000 do. D. Wyllie, aged 22 years, 15000 | $1,61497$ $38950$ | \$1,225 47 |

Note.-The above, with those heretofore sent to the committee, embrace all the statements required under the 41st section of the Post Office law.


[^0]:    By amount of his account for carrying a daily mail between Fredericksburg and Monticello, August 1 to September 26,1807 ,
    By anount of his account of expenses and agency in transporting the mail between
    Chilicothe and Frankfort, January 20 to March 1, 1809,
    By payment to $S$. Speake, for selling a horse,
    By cash received for a horse and sadule sold' to Mr. Hughes,
    By cash received for his services as clerk,
    By cash received of A. Bradley,
    By transporting the mail, Philadelphia and Trenton, January 1 to April 1, 1811, By transporting the mail, Philadelphia and Trenton, April 1 to July 1, 1811 ,
    By transmitting the mail, Philadelphia and Trenton, July 1 to Oct. 1, 1811, $\quad-$
    By his salary as agent, rom January 1 to October 1,1811 , is three quarters, at $\$ 250$
    per annum,
    By incidentals, for expenses incurred in discovering mail robbers, Philadelphia and
    y incidentals, for expenses incurred in discovering mait robbers, Philadelpha and By ditto, in Virginia and Tennessee, April 1 to O October 1, 1810 , $\quad . \quad-\quad 51162$
    By cash received of Mr. Coyle,
    By transporting the mail, Pliladelphia and Trenton, from October 1, 1811, to April
    By transporting the mail, Philadel,
    1, 1813, six quarters, at $\$ 375$,
    1, 1813, six quarters, at \$375,
    By ditto, April 1 to July 1, 1813,
    By ditto, July 1 to October 1, 1813,
    By ditto, October 1 to December 1, 1813
    By transporting the mail between Trenton and New Brunswick, September 1 to December I, 1813, - Philadelphia and Jersey city, from December 1, 1813, to By transporting the mail, Philadelphia and Jersey city, from December 1, 1813, to By transporting the mail, Philadelphia and Jerrsḕ city, from May 1 to Ö́ctober, 1814, at $\$ 1,125$ per quarter,
    By transporting the mail, Philadelphia and Jersey city, October 1 to December $\mathbf{1}^{-}$, 1814 , at $\$ 1,125$ per quarter, - By transporting same mail in sulkies, from December 1 to 31 , 1814, one month,
    By his salary as agent, from October 1 , 1811, to October 1 , 1814 , three years, at $\$ 600$ By per annum, By transporting the mail, Philadelphia and Jersey city, from January 1, 1815, to April 1, 1816 , five quarters, at $\$ 1,625$, per quarter,
    By his bill for travelling expenses,
     $31,181 G$, is three quarters, at $\$ 1,625$ per quarter,
    By cash received of him,
    transportation, for expenditures for the mail stage beyond the receipts, from Sctaer 1, 181, to
    By transpor ting the mail, Philadelphia and Jersey city, January 1 to April 1, 1817,
    By transporting the mail, Philadelphia and Jersey city, Ariil to July 1 , 1812,
    

