

our manhood. To rob us of this would not enrich you and would make us poor indeed. Waive this demand which manhood forbids you to make and us to yield, and the past can be buried forever. Upon this platform we can meet and shake hands over the graves of our soldiers, and under the auspices of a restored Union march on together in peace and fraternity to grander achievements than we have ever known and a future far more glorious than our past.

Stripped of her wealth, and, I fear, growing poorer every year; crippled by the war, depressed in spirit, staggering under the weight of accumulated debt, the South looks and longs for peace as anxiously as ever the mariner looked for the star by which he might guide his wandering bark aright when "night and the tempest had gathered around him." If any one section of this country has a deeper interest than another in the restoration of fraternal peace and the stability of good government, the South is that section. If the northern people cannot bring themselves to the point of trusting the honor and relying on the pledges of the South, they certainly cannot be unmindful of the fact that her interest in keeping the peace is fully equalled by her inability to break it. But we have no desire to break it. If the flag that floats over this Capitol is not our flag, we have none; if this is not our country, we have none; we are aliens in the land of our birth and exiles in the homes of our childhood. Here the bones of our ancestors are buried, and here we expect our dust to sleep when our weary feet stand still upon the thorny road we have traveled. This country must be the home of our children; they will have no other home, no other country but this; here they must live, here die, and here be buried. For party purposes our loyalty may be doubted, and our names sought to be dishonored and detested, but if the time should ever come when a foreign enemy shall invade these shores and this country needs stout hearts and true to defend it, all will then see in that hour of trial and national danger—

Whose dripping blade and stalwart arm  
Will hew a red circle in the line,  
And fence their country's flag from harm.

Mr. Chairman, the national conventions of the two great parties will soon convene, when one or the other will nominate the man destined to preside over the affairs of this great country for the next four years. It will be a contest fraught with momentous interest to the whole country, but particularly to the suffering South. Her people will look to it with a concern more painful and profound than they could regard any mere party ascendancy. The struggle will possess enough of doubt and uncertainty on both sides to impress each one of the parties with the necessity of husbanding all their resources and putting forth all their strength. From this fact let us indulge the hope that each will be induced to nominate for that high office its best and broadest man.

I do not sympathize with the desire which I have heard expressed by some of my political friends that the republican party may nominate some narrow and sectional partisan, whose extreme and illiberal views may constitute an element of weakness to him in the contest. The situation is far too grave, and the consequences of the election of such a man will be far too vital and disastrous to my section, for me to regard his nomination with any other feeling than that of sincere deprecation. If the democratic party should fail in the coming contest to elect their candidate and victory should again perch on the republican standard, I earnestly trust that the best, the most national, the most just, the most honest, and the most liberal man in all the republican party may be elevated to the Presidency.

The interests of every section of the country demand as the Chief Executive Magistrate the services of a statesman who will stand on an elevation where party will not obscure his vision or passion warp his judgment, and who, by the exercise of a liberal policy and a broad charity toward every section of the country, will make each State feel that it is a State and a component part of the American Union. I hope he will have the breadth of mind to see that one section of this country cannot be given over to ruin and desolation without blasting the other; that the blow which kills the South must also paralyze the North; that he will hold the military subordinate to the civil authority; that he will fill the high places of the Government with statesmen of undoubted integrity and worthy of the high positions to which he may assign them; and that he will appoint to office honest and honorable men in every section of the country, and not a hungry horde of political buccaners, who will prey upon the people and consume their substance. May no corrupt rings, bloated with Treasury pap and wallowing on the green pastures of executive patronage, be allowed to rob the Government and to degrade the public service, and may the atmosphere that pervades his entire administration be so pure and healthful that official integrity shall again become the rule, and not the exception, in positions of trust and honor. Such a President the country needs, and to such an administration good men of all parties will give their hearty co-operation.

God gives us men! A time like this demands  
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands;  
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;  
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;  
Men who possess opinions and a will;  
Men who have honor—men who will not lie;  
Men who can stand before a demagogue,  
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking!  
Tall men, sun crowned, who live above the fog  
In public duty, and in private thinking.

During the delivery of the remarks of Mr. HOUSE the hour allowed under the rule expired, and his time was extended by unanimous consent, on motion of Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama.

Mr. DAVIS obtained the floor, and yielded to

Mr. JONES, of Kentucky, who moved that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. JONES, of Kentucky, having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. CLYMER reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union had had under consideration the bill (H. R. No. 3375) making appropriations for the naval service for the year ending June 30, 1877, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. CLYMER. I move that the House now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at ten o'clock and forty minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

The following memorials, petitions, and other papers were presented at the Clerk's desk under the rule, and referred as stated:

By Mr. ADAMS: The petition of W. D. McLean, James Stevens, and others, of Cohoes, New York, envelope manufacturers, printers, and stationers, for such legislation as will relieve them from injurious competition by the Government through the Post-Office Department in the manufacture, transportation, and sale of envelopes, postal cards, &c., to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BASS: Remonstrance of T. Guilford Smith and 200 other citizens of Buffalo, New York, against the passage of the Morrison tariff bill, to the Committee of Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLISS: The petition of Ann Vashage, widow of Adolph Vashage, late a private of Company L, Ninth New York Volunteers, for a pension, to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHITTENDEN: The petition of Mrs. M. Hart, for a pension, to the same committee.

By Mr. CROUNSE: The petition of members of Grange 424, Patrons of Husbandry, Jefferson County, Nebraska, for a return to former postage rates on third-class matter, to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HOPKINS: Resolutions of the Pittsburgh Coal Exchange, protesting against the construction of a bridge over the Ohio River at the foot of Elm street, Cincinnati, Ohio, and urging the passage of a law which will prevent the construction of bridges over navigable waters that will in any manner interfere with navigation, to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: The petition of J. W. Timberlake and other citizens of Logan County, Ohio, that the Indian Bureau shall not be transferred from the Interior to the War Department, to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MACDOUGALL: The petition of 1,173 late Union soldiers of Iowa, for the passage of a law granting bounty land to Union soldiers, to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MCFARLAND: The petition of George W. Huntsman, of Hawkins County, Tennessee, for a pension, to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers relating to the claim of Pleasant H. Starnes, late a captain in the Eighth Tennessee Cavalry, for pay as a captain from the 17th day of September, 1863, to the 7th day of April, 1864, to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, the petition of Mary A. Andes, widow of Adam Andes, deceased, a private in Captain Hartsell's Company, Lillard's Regiment, United States Army, in the war of 1812, to the Committee on Revolutionary Pensions.

By Mr. POTTER: The petition of John C. Hawley, that the Secretary of War be directed to enroll his name as a veteran volunteer as though he had enlisted as such under the provisions of the joint resolution of Congress approved July 13, 1864, providing for the re-enlistment during the continuance of the rebellion of veteran soldiers whose term of service was then about to expire, he being prevented from re-enlisting by reason of his being held as a prisoner of war by the rebels, to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STENGER: The petition of 10 citizens of McConnellsburgh, Fulton County, Pennsylvania, against making any change in the tariff laws at the present time, to the Committee of Ways and Means.

#### IN SENATE.

FRIDAY, May 19, 1876.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. BYRON SUNDERLAND, D. D.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Secretary will read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings.

Mr. MORTON. May I inquire if the court is not to meet at twelve o'clock to-day?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It is; but the Chair supposed the Journal could be read, unless some Senator objected.

Mr. HAMLIN. Yes; let the Journal be read.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Let both journals be read.

The Journal of yesterday's legislative proceedings was read and approved.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Pursuant to order the legislative and executive business will be suspended and the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of the articles of impeachment exhibited by the House of Representatives against William W. Belknap, late Secretary of War. The Sergeant-at-Arms will clear the galleries and close the doors.

While the doors were being closed, morning business was presented and received by the Chair as follows:

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. KERNAN presented the petition of John C. Barron, of New York, executor of Thomas Barron, praying that he may be refunded certain moneys taken from the Citizens' Bank of Louisiana during the late war under order of the general in command of the forces in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also presented the petition of James Colles, of the city of New York, praying that he may be refunded certain moneys taken from the Citizens' Bank of Louisiana during the late war under order of the general in command of the forces in that State; which was referred to the same committee.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. KEY, from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, to whom was referred the petition of John L. Divine, and J. C. Edmonson, guardian of the heirs of the estate of William E. Kennedy, deceased, praying remuneration for losses alleged to have been sustained by them by reason of the change made by the Postmaster-General in their contract for transporting the United States mails between Jacksonville, Alabama, and Chattanooga, Tennessee, in 1858 and 1859, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CAPERTON, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. No. 22) for the relief of James H. Burgess, of Frederick County, in the State of Virginia, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was ordered to be printed, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. No. 104) for the relief of John W. Watson, of the State of North Carolina, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was ordered to be printed, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. SPENCER asked, and by unanimous consent obtained, leave to introduce a bill (S. No. 850) to provide for the payment of outstanding certificates of the late board of audit of the District of Columbia and the settlement of certain claims against said District; which was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MERRIMON. At the request of a citizen of this District, a highly respected citizen, I ask leave to introduce a bill, the merits of which I know nothing about.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted to introduce a bill (S. No. 851) to amend the charter of the Washington Market Company; which was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MITCHELL asked, and by unanimous consent obtained, leave to introduce a bill (S. No. 852) for the relief of Elisha E. Rice; which was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. LOGAN asked, and by unanimous consent obtained, leave to introduce a bill (S. No. 853) for the relief of Horace K. Drake; which was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. OGLESBY asked, and by unanimous consent obtained, leave to introduce a bill (S. No. 854) to repeal a part of section 4713 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to pensions; which was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

#### IMPEACHMENT OF W. W. BELKNAP.

The Senate thereupon proceeded to deliberate upon the articles of impeachment exhibited by the House of Representatives against William W. Belknap, late Secretary of War.

The Senate then proceeded to the trial of the impeachment of William W. Belknap, late Secretary of War.

The Senate sitting for the trial of the impeachment of William W. Belknap having adjourned then resumed its

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a letter of the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in answer to a resolution of the Senate of March 16, 1876, a report of the Director of the Mint, showing the product in gold and silver in the United States and other countries of the world from 1845 to 1875, inclusive; which was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed.

#### DAVIDSON'S REPORT ON IRRIGATION.

Mr. SARGENT submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be requested to communicate to the Senate a report made to the Superintendent of the Coast Survey by George Davidson, assistant, describing and illustrating the methods employed for the irrigation of land in India and Southern Europe.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. SHERMAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were re-opened, and (at four o'clock and fifty minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned.

### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, May 19, 1876.

The House met at twelve o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. I. L. TOWNSEND.

The Journal of yesterday was read and approved.

#### ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE.

Mr. MORRISON. I offer the resolution which I now send to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I rise to a point of order upon that resolution; and I want the Chair to decide whether this is the right time to make an objection to a resolution. It appears from this morning's Journal that unanimous consent was given to the Committee on Printing because the point of order had not been taken in time. Now I make the point before this resolution of the gentleman from Illinois is read.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair accepts the point of order as being made now, but the resolution must be read before the Chair can rule on it.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. Does the Chair say that on the resolution of the gentleman from Illinois it will be in order to raise the question of order after it has been read?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will hear the resolution read before he decides upon it.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. Will it be in time to make the point of order after the resolution is read?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman reserves the point of order, as the Chair understands.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. Then do I understand the Chair to say that the point of order must be raised before the paper is read?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It has always been the custom of the Chair to allow a paper to be read for information. How can the Chair rule on it until it is read?

The Clerk read the resolution offered by Mr. MORRISON, as follows:

*Resolved*, (the Senate concurring,) That the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives be, and they are hereby, directed to adjourn their respective Houses without day on the 12th day of June next at four o'clock p. m.

Mr. MORRISON. I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee of Ways and Means.

The motion was agreed to.

#### FREEDMAN'S BANK.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I rise to a privileged question. I am instructed by the select committee on the investigation of the affairs of the Freedman's Bank to submit the majority and minority reports, and I ask that they be recommitted to the committee and ordered to be printed.

Mr. HALE. I object to that unless it is agreed that they shall not be brought back by a motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That will be understood.

The motion of Mr. DOUGLAS was agreed to.

#### SWAMP AND OVERFLOWED LANDS IN MISSOURI.

Mr. GAUSE, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on Public Lands, reported back the bill (H. R. No. 1253) granting to the State of Missouri all lands therein selected as swamp and overflowed lands, with amendments.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That all lands in the State of Missouri selected as swamp and overflowed lands, and now withheld from market as such, be, and the same are hereby, confirmed to said State, and all title thereto vested in said State; and it is hereby made the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to cause patents to issue for the same.

The amendments reported by the committee were read, as follows:

In line 4, after the word "land," insert the following: "And regularly reported as such to the Land Office."

Also, at the end of line 4, add the following: "So far as the same remain vacant and unappropriated, and do not interfere with any pre-emption, homestead, or other claim under any laws of the United States, and the claim whereto has not been rejected heretofore by the Commissioner of the General Land Office or other competent authority."

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill at this time?

Mr. HOLMAN. I ask that the bill be again reported.

The bill was again read.

Mr. JENKS. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair thinks that the objection comes too late, the amendments having been read.

Mr. GAUSE. I ask that the Clerk read a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office on this subject.



The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, GENERAL LAND OFFICE,  
Washington, D. C., April 18, 1876.

SIR: In reply to your letter of 15th instant, referring bill 1253, entitled "A bill granting to the State of Missouri all lands therein selected as swamp and overflowed lands," I have to say that I know of no objection to the passage thereof with the following amendments, to wit:

In fourth line, after the word "lands," insert the following:  
"And regularly reported as such to the General Land Office."

Between lines 4 and 5 insert the following:

"So far as the same remain vacant and unappropriated and not interfered with by any pre-emption, homestead, or other claim under any law of the United States, and the claim whereto under the swamp-land grant has not been heretofore rejected by the Commissioner of the General Land Office or other competent authority."

Very respectfully,

U. J. BAXTER,  
Acting Commissioner.

Hon. R. P. BLAND,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Mr. GAUSE. The amendments reported by the committee to the bill are in accordance with the suggestions made in that letter.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HOLMAN. I understand this to be a report from the Committee on Public Lands; is it a unanimous report from that committee?

Mr. GAUSE. It is.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. GAUSE moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the House a list of the special orders which has been made out by the Clerk, and would suggest that they be printed in the RECORD for the convenience of members.

No objection was made, and the list is as follows:

#### Special orders in the House.

Reported.	Title of bill.	Special order.
January 24...	A bill (H. R. No. 2284) to amend section 2324 of the Revised Statutes concerning mineral lands.	Special order for March 9, 1876, after the morning hour, and from day to day thereafter until disposed of. March 9, postponed until the legislative appropriation bill is disposed of.
March 9.....	A bill (H. R. No. 1993) to repeal section 11 of the act approved June 23, 1874, entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1874, and for other purposes," and to enact a substitute therefor.	Special order for Thursday, March 16, 1876, after the morning hour, and from day to day thereafter until disposed of, not to obstruct the consideration of the legislative appropriation bill.
March 16.....	A bill (H. R. No. 2685) for the distribution of the unappropriated moneys of the Geneva award.	Special order for March 29, 1876, after the morning hour, and from day to day thereafter until disposed of, not to interfere with the general appropriation bills. March 29, postponed and made the special order for Wednesday, April 5, after the morning hour. April 23, postponed until Friday, April 28, after the morning hour, and from day to day thereafter until disposed of, not to interfere with the general appropriation bills.
March 30.....	A bill (H. R. No. 2245) to carry into execution the provisions of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution, concerning citizenship, and to define certain rights of citizens of the United States in foreign countries, and certain duties of diplomatic and consular officers, and for other purposes.	Special order for Saturday, April 15, next, after the morning hour. April 15, postponed until Saturday, April 22, and from day to day thereafter until disposed of. April 22, further consideration postponed to Thursday, April 27, after the morning hour, and from day to day thereafter until disposed of.
March 30.....	A bill (H. R. No. 2798) to authorize the Washington, Cincinnati, and Saint Louis Railroad Company to construct a narrow-gauge railway from tide-water to the cities of Saint Louis and Chicago.	Special order for Tuesday, April 18, next, after the morning hour. April 18, postponed until Tuesday, May 9, after the morning hour, and from day to day thereafter until disposed of.
April 4.....	Joint resolution (H. R. No. 96) to provide for the protection of the Texas frontier on the lower Rio Grande.	Special order for Thursday, April 20, next, after the morning hour, not to interfere with the regular appropriation bills.
April 11.....	Joint resolution (H. R. No. 14) authorizing the appointment of commissioners to ascertain on what terms a mutually beneficial treaty of commerce with Canada can be arranged.	Special order for the third Tuesday in May, next, after the morning hour, and from day to day thereafter until disposed of, not to interfere with regular appropriation bills.
	A bill (H. R. No. 3156) to correct errors and supply omissions in the Revised Statutes of the United States.	Not reported, but made a special order for Wednesday, May 31, after the morning hour, and from day to day thereafter until disposed of.

#### Special orders in Committee of the Whole House, &c.—Continued.

Reported.	Title of bill.	Special order.
March 11.....	A bill (H. R. No. 58) to equalize the bounties of soldiers who served in the late war for the Union.	Special order for Thursday, March 23, after the morning hour, and from day to day thereafter until disposed of, to the exclusion of all other orders, excepting business of the Committees on Appropriations and Ways and Means. March 23, postponed until March 29, at 2 o'clock p. m. March 29, special order for Wednesday, April 5, after the morning hour. May 17, Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union discharged, and made special order in the House for Tuesday, May 23, after the morning hour, and from day to day thereafter until disposed of, not to obstruct the general appropriation bills.
May 8.....	A bill (H. R. No. 3430) to repair and rebuild the levees of the Mississippi River, to reclaim the alluvial lands thereof, to improve its navigation, and promote and protect its commerce.	Special order for Wednesday, May 17, after the morning hour, and from day to day thereafter until disposed of, not to obstruct the general appropriation bills. May 17, Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union discharged, and made a special order in the House for Wednesday, May 24, after the morning hour, and from day to day thereafter until disposed of, not to obstruct the general appropriation bills.
May 17.....	A bill (H. R. No. 3350) making appropriations for the payment of claims reported allowed by the commissioners of claims under the act of March 3, 1871, and for other purposes.	Special order for May 19, after the morning hour, and from day to day thereafter until disposed of, not to interfere with appropriation bills.

#### Special orders in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

February 15..	A bill (H. R. No. 748) to apply the proceeds of sales of public lands to the education of the people.	May 3, made special order for Thursday, May 18, after the morning hour, and from day to day thereafter until disposed of, not to interfere with appropriation bills.
February 24..	A bill (H. R. No. 2283) granting pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Mexican, Florida, and Black Hawk wars, and certain widows of deceased soldiers and sailors of the same.	May 3, made a special order for Tuesday, May 16, after the morning hour, and from day to day thereafter until disposed of, not to interfere with general appropriation bills.
March 13.....	A bill (H. R. No. 2952) to transfer the conduct of Indian affairs from the Interior Department to the War Department.	Special order for Thursday, March 30, after the morning hour, and from day to day thereafter, to the exclusion of all other business, until disposed of. March 30, postponed until Tuesday, April 4, in the same order.
March 22.....	A bill (H. R. No. 2803) to provide for arrears of pensions on account of death, or wounds received or disease contracted in the service of the United States since the 4th day of March, 1861, and for the payment of the same.	Special order for Wednesday, April 5, 1876, after the morning hour, and from day to day thereafter until disposed of.
April 4.....	A bill (H. R. No. 3204) in relation to the Japanese indemnity fund.	Special order for Thursday, April 27, next, after the morning hour.
April 6.....	A bill (H. R. No. 2929) to provide for cheap transportation of freight between tide-water on or near the Atlantic Ocean and the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys.	Special order for May 10, after the morning hour, until disposed of, not to interfere with the regular appropriation bills.
April 13.....	A bill (H. R. No. 3132) to revise and simplify existing laws imposing duties on imports, and to reduce taxation.	Special order for Wednesday, April 26, next, after the morning hour, and from day to day thereafter until disposed of.
April 15.....	A bill (H. R. No. 2828) to amend the act entitled "An act amending the charter of the Freedman's Savings and Trust Company, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1874.	Special order for April 22, next, after the morning hour, and from day to day thereafter until disposed of, not to interfere with the regular appropriation bills.
May 5.....	A bill (H. R. No. 3375) making appropriations for the naval service for the year ending June 30, 1877, and for other purposes.	Special order for Monday, May 8, 1876, and from day to day thereafter until disposed of.
May 18.....	A bill (H. R. No. 3478) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, for the year ending June 30, 1877, and for other purposes.	Special order immediately after the passage of H. R. No. 3375. (naval appropriation bill,) and from day to day thereafter until disposed of.

## ADMISSION OF NEW MEXICO.

Mr. SOUTHARD, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on Territories, presented the majority and minority reports upon the bill for the admission of New Mexico, and moved that they be printed and recommitted to the committee, not to be brought back by a motion to reconsider.

The motion was agreed to.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will ask unanimous consent to lay before the House various bills on the Speaker's table, and if there be no objection, they will be read and referred to the proper committees.

No objection was made.

## LICK OBSERVATORY.

The first business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 677) granting a site for an observatory to the trustees of the Lick Observatory of the astronomical department of the University of California.

Mr. SAYLER. I ask unanimous consent that that bill be put upon its passage. This matter was considered by the Committee on Public Lands, and I was ordered by that committee to ask the passage of a bill similar to this. It is beneficial to the university and injurious to nobody, and I ask that the bill be put upon its passage.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SAYLER moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

## BILLS REFERRED.

The following Senate bills were taken from the Speaker's table, read a first and second time, and referred as indicated below:

A bill (S. No. 536) granting the right of way through the public lands for wagon-roads over the Blue Mountains, in the State of Oregon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. No. 696) for the relief of Angeline Logan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. No. 699) to confirm the sale of the marine-hospital building and grounds at Natchez, in the State of Mississippi—to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. No. 729) authorizing the issue of patents to the purchasers of certain Miami lands in Kansas—to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. No. 745) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to issue a register and change the name of the brig A. S. Pennell to the City of Maule—to the Committee on Commerce.

## RECEIVERS OF NATIONAL BANKS.

The Senate amendments to the bill (H. R. No. 2441) authorizing the appointment of receivers of national banks, and for other purposes, were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## WILLIAM L. MAURY.

The Senate amendment to the bill (H. R. No. 1618) to remove the political disabilities of William L. Maury, of New York, was taken from the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair would ask that the amendment of the Senate, simply a verbal one, be concurred in. This bill was introduced by the present occupant of the chair.

Mr. HOLMAN. Let the amendment be read.

The amendment of the Senate was to strike out the words "legal and" before the words "political disabilities."

There being no objection, the amendment was concurred in.

## EXPENDITURES IN THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

Mr. MEADE. I am directed by the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice to submit for adoption at the present time the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That for the purpose of enabling the committee of this House on expenditures in the Department of Justice to facilitate the discharge of the duties imposed upon them by the House resolution bearing date January 14, 1876, requiring said committee among other things to inquire into any errors, abuses, or frauds in said Department, it is hereby directed that said committee designate from the same a subcommittee, and that said subcommittee proceed to the cities of New York and Brooklyn, and make such examination there concerning the various offices, officials, and matters pertaining to the Department of Justice as may by said committee or said subcommittee be deemed necessary, requisite, or material in the premises.

Mr. HALE. I have no objection to this resolution, if it is adopted without taking up time.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. MEADE moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

## WASHINGTON NAVY-YARD.

Mr. FAULKNER. I ask unanimous consent to present and have referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs a memorial, signed by some 900 citizens of the city of Washington, concerning that portion of

House bill No. 3375 as relates to the Washington navy-yard. I also ask that the memorial, without the names, be printed in the RECORD; it is very brief.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The memorial is as follows:

*To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives:*

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition your honorable bodies not to pass that portion of House bill No. 3375 as relates to the Washington navy-yard, for the following reasons:

First. This yard possesses greater facilities for the manufacture of steam-engines, boilers, cables, anchors, galleys, guns, gun-carriages, and ordnance stores of all kinds, as well as the various outfits for naval vessels, than any other station of the United States. Has also within its limits a large copper-refining and rolling mill of sufficient capacity to furnish all the copper and lead required for the purposes of the Navy, even when the entire Navy is in active service. This is the only mill of the kind owned by the Government.

Second. The machinery now contained in this yard cost over \$3,000,000, and is in excellent condition, and prepared to execute any work that may be ordered. Besides the immense value of the workshops, offices, officers' quarters, wharves, marine railway, ship-houses, &c., which are all in fine order and fully prepared for the purposes for which they were constructed.

Third. The climate of Washington is such as to permit outdoor work to be done at all seasons of the year, which in itself is an important feature in an establishment of this kind.

Fourth. Ship and other timber can (as an inspection of the records will show) be furnished here as cheap as at any other yard in the country. And evidence is now on record that the water at this yard possesses special qualities (not possessed by any other location) for the seasoning and preservation of ship timber.

Fifth. Coal (bituminous being for the most part used) can be purchased at much lower rates than at any other station.

Sixth. It is the only yard that possesses facilities for the manufacture of guns, iron gun-carriages, and ordnance stores, and has for those purposes a fine machine-shop with all the necessary machinery, as also the finest foundry in the country.

Seventh. The yard being located so near the Department gives its officers opportunity to have immediate supervision over all work to which they may desire to give direct attention, and in case of testing inventions, &c., for the benefit of the Navy Department or Patent Office, the officials of those Departments are enabled to give these tests their personal attention without at the same time neglecting other duties, which would be the case were the experiments made elsewhere.

Eighth. This yard has been established for seventy years, and is now, so far as relates to a manufacturing yard, in a high state of perfection, and to sell or close the same would not in any way result to the interest of the Government.

Ninth. Labor is abundant, and can always be obtained at as low rates as at any other station in the United States.

Tenth. This yard, being located outside of any of the great States, is entirely removed from the effects of political influence, and is thereby enabled to do all work ordered with promptness, and at the same time for much less than similar work costs at other stations.

Eleventh. Vessels of eighteen feet draught can be brought to the yard; and with an expenditure of \$100,000 the channel can be so deepened as to admit the largest vessel in the Navy, when fully prepared for service, to come to it.

Twelfth. The water of the harbor is fresh, and affords the very best place of all the naval stations for the placing of the iron-clad vessels of our Navy. There is sufficient area in the harbor of this station to float nine-tenths of the vessels of our Navy.

During the late war nearly all of the shot, shell, &c., used in the Navy of the United States were manufactured at this yard, as also a large quantity of the same articles for the Army. The Government having some years ago discontinued all work at the arsenal in this city is an additional reason why they should not now close this yard.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BLOUNT. I move that the rules be suspended and that the House now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. JENKS. I move to amend that motion so that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar.

Mr. BAKER, of Indiana. Before action is taken upon the motion to go into Committee of the Whole, I desire to be heard upon a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman will state his question of privilege.

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. BAKER, of Indiana. On the 16th day of the present month the House had under consideration the motion of the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. VANCE,] the chairman of the Committee on Printing, to reconsider the vote by which the House recommitted to the Committee on Printing the report on the subject of the conduct of the Government Printing Office. On that subject, on the 16th day of May, the gentleman from Mississippi, [Mr. SINGLETON,] a member of that committee, addressed the House at great length. On the character and temper of that speech I disclaim any purpose to comment. My purpose is to call the attention of the House and country to the fact that in the course of the delivery of that speech the gentleman from Mississippi was interrupted on several occasions by his colleague on that committee, the gentleman from Rhode Island, [Mr. BALLOU,] who took occasion to dissent from some of the statements and conclusions of the gentleman from Mississippi and to qualify and explain others of his statements and conclusions. The other gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. EAMES] made some remarks which I find are also entirely omitted. On the same occasion the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARFIELD] called the gentleman from Mississippi to order for a breach of the rules of debate in alluding by name to a member of the Senate in violation of the rules of the House. Out of the action of the gentleman from Ohio in calling the gentleman from Mississippi to order grew an exciting and animating discussion, a discussion in its nature calculated to arrest the attention of the House. Of the merits of that controversy it is not my purpose to speak. I merely mention these things to call the attention of the House to their occurrence as a part of the current proceedings of the House.

The speech of the honorable gentleman from Mississippi is printed



in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 17, 1876. In the printed record of that speech the remarks made by the two gentlemen from Rhode Island [Mr. BALLOU and Mr. EAMES] are entirely omitted. The same also is true in reference to the point of order raised by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARFIELD] and the discussion which arose thereon, and the ruling of the Speaker on the question of order.

I should exceedingly regret to give occasion of offense to any gentleman by calling attention to this subject. I disclaim any such purpose. I entertain the highest respect and am animated by nothing but the most friendly feelings for the distinguished gentlemen who participated in that debate. I disclaim any purpose to ask to have placed upon the record anything which would prove unpleasant or injurious. The question is one which, in my judgment, rises above all considerations of personal feeling.

The RECORD was intended to be the faithful chronicle of all that is said and done on the floor of this House. It was intended to be the solemn and authentic memorial by which our acts, our conduct, and our speeches in the order of their occurrence and the language in which they were embodied should go to our constituents and remain for the use and guidance of our posterity. It is of the last importance that this RECORD should be authentic; that it should be a faithful and impartial witness of everything done and said on the floor of this House. The verity of this RECORD ought to be as absolute as that of the judgment of a court of last resort. It should set down nothing in malice, and in it nothing should be extenuated, nothing omitted. Everything should be placed upon the cold, undying record for the judgment of the present and future ages just as uttered, just as it occurred. The interests of truth demand it. The cause of justice to ourselves, to our constituents, and to those who come after us require at our hands that we see to it that we make our record speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

I send to the Clerk's desk for consideration and adoption at this time two resolutions, which I ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the reporters of this House who took down the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. SINGLETON, of the two gentlemen from Rhode Island, Mr. BALLOU and Mr. EAMES, and of the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. GARFIELD, and the ruling of the Speaker on the point of order made during the delivery of the speech of the gentleman from Mississippi, and which are omitted in his speech as printed in the RECORD of May 17, 1876, cause the same to be fully and truly printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Rules be, and they are hereby, instructed to inquire and report to this House whether any, and, if so, what, amendment is needed to existing rules to require the debates of this House to be printed without any change, alteration, or omission.

Mr. RANDALL. Does the Chair hold that that is a privileged question?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair holds that, according to the Digest, all matters connected with the omission, change, or alteration of the debates as published in the RECORD pertain to a question of privilege.

Mr. BAKER, of Indiana. I call the previous question on the resolutions.

Mr. SINGLETON. Will the gentleman allow me one remark?

Mr. BAKER, of Indiana. Certainly.

Mr. SINGLETON. I wish to say that so far as the reporters are concerned no blame can attach to them in regard to this matter. I understood from some gentleman, perhaps one of the reporters, who came to me, that it had been agreed by the gentlemen on the other side of the House who had been engaged in the little controversy that took place on that day that they did not care about their remarks going into the RECORD, and my response was that I did not myself care about it. So, I believe by general consent, the omission was made. I have no objection at all to the correction of the RECORD in the manner proposed. I never say anything upon this floor that I am not willing shall go before the House and the country. I am willing that every word of the controversy in question should appear.

Mr. GARFIELD. I desire that the exact facts of this case, so far as they relate to me, shall be known. The gentleman from Mississippi, [Mr. LAMAR,] whom I do not now see in his seat, came to me shortly after that debate and, as I understood, from the gentleman from Mississippi, [Mr. SINGLETON,] stating that the gentleman's speech was in manuscript, and asking if I had any objection to allowing it to be printed continuously without the interruptions. I answered that so far as I was personally concerned I had no objection to his leaving out what I had said. The suggestion did not come from me; it came, as I understood, directly in the form of a request through the gentleman from Mississippi, [Mr. SINGLETON,] I suggested either to him [Mr. LAMAR] or to the reporter, who also spoke to me on the subject, that the gentleman's manuscript speech might appear in continuous form, with the interruptions added at the close, and thus the record would be preserved. But I understood it was the wish of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SINGLETON] that the interruptions should be left out altogether; and, as I felt it might be ungracious on my part to object, I said that I would make no personal objection.

I quite agree with the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. BAKER,] that our RECORD ought fully to show substantially what occurs in the House. No other than verbal corrections should be allowed. In this case I understood that I was only granting a personal favor in consenting that, so far as I was concerned, the

small part which I took in that debate might be omitted. The proposition certainly did not originate with me, and my concurrence in it was a matter of courtesy. What I said was what I deemed my duty to say, and I had no desire to suppress it.

Mr. SINGLETON. I wish simply to say that it did not originate with me; I had nothing to do with it.

Mr. BAKER, of Indiana. I now yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island, [Mr. BALLOU.]

Mr. BALLOU. I think it was one of the reporters who came to me and said that it was the wish of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SINGLETON] that the matter should be left out and that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARFIELD] assented. I said that, if such was the case, I should not put in any objection. I assented supposing that it was a request and for the purpose of having the speech appear continuously.

Mr. RANDALL. We cannot hear anything that the gentleman is saying.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The House must come to order. The Chair will call gentlemen by name, if necessary, to preserve order.

Mr. BALLOU. I do not know that it is worth while for me to repeat what I have just stated. One of the reporters told me that it was the wish of the gentleman from Mississippi that the colloquial remarks should be omitted and that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARFIELD] who had taken some part in them had assented to the arrangement. Understanding that such was the general wish, I put in no objection, but assented to it. I wish, however, to say that I made no remark on that day, and I have made no remark in connection with this general subject, which I wish to recall or which I am ashamed to have upon the record; and I trust that while I remain a member of this House I may never do that which I shall be ashamed to have appear.

Mr. BAKER, of Indiana. I now yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island, [Mr. EAMES.]

Mr. EAMES. Mr. Speaker, I took no part whatever in the discussion of the resolution reported from the Committee on Printing, but, when the point of order was raised by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARFIELD] in regard to mentioning the name of a Senator, I did make a few remarks. After the debate was over I learned from my colleague [Mr. BALLOU] that there was an understanding between the gentleman from Mississippi, [Mr. SINGLETON,] the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. GARFIELD,] and my colleague that the remarks which were made in the discussion of the point of order should not appear in the RECORD. Upon learning that, I went myself to one of the reporters and stated to him that, inasmuch as what I had said had a bearing simply upon that point, I supposed that my remarks would also be left out. This is all that I have had to do in connection with this matter.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. BAKER, of Indiana. I desire, before the hour expires, to say a few words more. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. RANDALL.]

Mr. RANDALL. There are two points in this matter which it is well to consider. The first is whether a member should be allowed to review a speech after its delivery. So far I know, that right has always been conceded and in almost all instances exercised.

Now the next point is that which relates to personal matters in debate, about which the House and the public have not much concern. In the spirit of good feeling and with a view to the proper dignity of the proceedings of Congress and the best manner of preserving its records, the practice has always been that a personal controversy on this floor might, by the request and with the concurrence of the parties involved in it, be left out of the RECORD.

Now, in so far as this proceeding is concerned, the two gentlemen from Rhode Island, the gentleman from Ohio, and the gentleman from Mississippi have in no manner, so far as my knowledge goes, acted differently from many, very many, who have gone before. I recollect distinctly, in one instance where I was involved with the Speaker of the House, that he and I agreed the record should be purged of what had passed between us in controversy. Neither of us desired at that time anything we said should appear. It was said, it is true, in the heat of debate, just as what was said by these gentlemen in the debate in which they were engaged, but both the Speaker and myself considered at that time it was proper to eliminate it from the record. I think these gentlemen have not only acted in due line of example, but they have acted so as to make harmony in our proceedings and have reconciled their difference and affronts on the floor in a manner worthy of men and gentlemen.

Mr. PATTERSON. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania refer to any controversy between himself and the Speaker of the present House?

Mr. RANDALL. Not at all, but a Speaker of a former House; and I only brought it up as an example of what has been so frequently done under like circumstances. Mr. BLAINE, then Speaker, suggested to a friend of his, Mr. Peters, of Maine, that the record should be purged, and it was purged, and properly purged, and I felt myself better when it was done, and I have no doubt the gentleman from Maine did after cool reflection, just as these four gentlemen, I have no doubt, do now.

Mr. BAKER, of Indiana. I now yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.



Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say just one word in reference to this matter. Having during the debate and after its close sat adjoining the gentleman from Mississippi, I presume a great deal of the trouble which has grown out of this matter occurred from the fact that the gentleman from Mississippi, by reason of interruptions on the part of other gentlemen, and the consequent consumption of his time, was prevented from finishing his speech. A portion of the speech which has been printed in the RECORD had not been delivered at that time. The reporters came to the gentleman from Mississippi while I was sitting near him to see how his speech should be arranged for printing in the RECORD. They asked the gentleman if it was desired by him that this controversy should go into the RECORD, and the gentleman from Mississippi then replied that it was a matter of indifference to him; that if the other gentlemen were satisfied to have it go in he was entirely satisfied; that all he desired in the matter was, that if the remarks made by the gentleman from Ohio and the two gentlemen from Rhode Island went into the RECORD he should insist, in justice to himself, the remarks he made should go in also, but beyond that he had no interest in the matter whatever.

Sitting next to the gentleman from Mississippi during this conversation with the reporters, it seems to me, in view of the remarks made by gentlemen that they hoped they should never have to expunge anything from the RECORD they had said, that it is but a simple act of justice for me to say this much in reference to the part which the gentleman from Mississippi had in eliminating this controversy from the RECORD.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, one word more. Much of this debate was injected against the consent of the gentleman from Mississippi, and the gentlemen carrying on this controversy were not recognized by the Speaker at all with any view to make the remarks they did on that occasion.

Mr. BAKER, of Indiana. I introduced this question of privilege on my own responsibility and upon my own motion, without any previous consultation with any person whatever. I did it from a sense of duty. I agree to some extent with the observation made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that there ought to be some degree of liberality in correcting remarks which are made extemporaneously on the floor of the House in the heat of debate. But I believe, Mr. Speaker, that these corrections and emendations should not go further than correcting the grammatical sense of the text, or in making merely verbal alterations. Wherever whole paragraphs, whole sentences, in fact whole speeches, are eliminated from the RECORD, then the RECORD ceases to be the truthful exponent of the action and deliberation had on the floor of this House.

Mr. ATKINS. I rise to a question of order. It is impossible to hear what the gentleman says.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* called the House to order, and directed gentlemen to resume their seats.

Mr. BAKER, of Indiana. I was about saying, Mr. Speaker, that I agree, so far as mere verbal or grammatical corrections are concerned, it is proper they should be made; but when it went to emasculation of the RECORD by striking out whole sentences and whole paragraphs, entirely changing the current of debates occurring upon the floor of this House, I for one say I believe that it is a fatal perversion of the purpose for which a record was intended to be kept by the House of Representatives.

It is said that gentlemen on the floor of the House, where two individuals who may happen to become engaged in angry and exciting colloquy, have a right by common consent to cause the records of the proceedings of the House, participated in by the whole members of the House by being present in their capacity as legislators—that these two gentlemen should have the right to entirely emasculate it from the RECORD, and to have the proceedings of this House changed and say nothing of it. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the record of this House should not be allowed to rest at the mercy of any one, whether two or a dozen members upon the floor of this House.

If it is to be worth anything to the country, worth anything to the public history of the nation, if it is to be of any value to posterity, I say that the demand is imperative that the record of our proceedings should be absolutely truthful, and should represent them exactly as they occurred.

We will see, Mr. Speaker, when the vote is taken, whether or not the House will sustain the suggestion made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. RANDALL,] that the proposition to correct the RECORD in this case, where whole paragraphs have been omitted, is to be voted down, and the country notified that the RECORD, which the law requires shall be a truthful report of our proceedings, is to be emasculated—not to speak the truth, but to speak so much of the truth as the actors engaged in the debate may see fit to have go down upon the RECORD as the truth. I insist that the cause of truth, that the cause of justice, that the interests of our constituents, and of the country, and of posterity, demand that no man shall be permitted to make the RECORD speak differently from what is really uttered in the progress of debate on the floor of this House. And for one, whenever I see any attempt at omission, or any attempt to make the RECORD speak substantially different from what occurred here on the floor of the House, I will feel it my oath-bound duty to stand up in my place and protest against it, and call the attention of the country to the fact that members on the floor of this House boldly state as a

rule that individuals who may have been guilty of conduct on the floor of the House that is unseemly, that they are ashamed of, have the right, without taking the judgment of the House upon it, to change the record in order that it may more perfectly harmonize with the exhibition of the Christian amenities of discussion that ought to have obtained.

I now call for a vote.

Mr. HOOKER rose.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Mississippi, [Mr. HOOKER?]

Mr. BAKER, of Indiana. I think the debate has gone far enough. I call for a vote.

Mr. RANDALL. I move that the whole subject be laid on the table.

Mr. BAKER, of Indiana. On that motion I call for the yeas and nays. On the question of ordering the yeas and nays there were—ayes 28, noes 177; the affirmative not being one-fifth of the whole vote.

Mr. BAKER, of Indiana. I call for tellers on the yeas and nays. Tellers were ordered; and Mr. RANDALL, and Mr. BAKER of Indiana, were appointed.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 34, noes 139.

So (the affirmative being less than one-fifth of the whole vote) the yeas and nays were not ordered.

The motion of Mr. RANDALL was agreed to.

Mr. RANDALL moved to reconsider the vote just taken; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BLOUNT. I now insist on my motion that the rules be suspended, and that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the naval appropriation bill. I cannot yield further.

Mr. BRIGHT. I rise to a question of order. Is it in order to call for the regular order at this time, which is the morning hour?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair would rule that that would be in order.

Mr. BRIGHT. Then I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The regular order this morning would be the call of the committees for private bills.

Mr. HOLMAN. Will the Chair permit me a remark? The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] moves to suspend the rules that the House may resolve itself into Committee of the Whole. I submit that that is the regular order, and that if the gentleman had the floor for that motion to suspend the rules to go into Committee of the Whole on an appropriation bill it can be carried by a majority vote. If he had the floor for that motion he had the right to have it put. If the gentleman from Tennessee desires to submit some other motion it can only be submitted by voting down the motion to suspend the rules.

Mr. HALE. I think that must be very clear. That has been the invariable practice.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair would rule that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] having been recognized an hour ago, and, being on the floor, having yielded for various matters to a number of members, is entitled to make his motion.

Mr. BLOUNT. I now make that motion, that the rules be suspended and that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama. I desire to amend that motion so that when the House shall go into Committee of the Whole the bill to be considered shall be the bill (H. R. No. 2283) granting pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Mexican, Florida, and the Black Hawk wars, and certain widows of deceased soldiers and sailors of the same.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Alabama cannot move to amend the motion.

Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama. Then I hope the House will vote down the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CONGER. I desire to request the gentleman from Georgia to permit us—

Mr. BLOUNT. Is the question debatable?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It is not.

Mr. CONGER. I wish to make a request of the Chair.

Several members called for the regular order.

Mr. CONGER. Will the gentleman allow me to make a suggestion about the order of business; or is there such a determination about this business being taken up that we cannot have a word upon the subject? I ask permission of the gentleman to make a suggestion about the order of business.

Mr. BLOUNT. There has been a great deal of time lost already, and I must decline yielding further.

The question being taken on Mr. BLOUNT's motion, there were—ayes 93, noes 91.

Mr. BRIGHT called for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. BRIGHT and Mr. BLOUNT were appointed.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 93, noes 83. So the motion was agreed to.



## PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. LAMAR. Mr. Speaker, before the House goes into Committee of the Whole I ask unanimous consent to make a very brief personal explanation.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. LAMAR. Mr. Speaker, I was not present this morning when the attention of the House was called to an altercation which took place the other day between my colleague [Mr. SINGLETON] and the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. GARFIELD,] and the running discussion which occurred between the gentleman from Ohio and my colleague. After that discussion took place, sitting near my colleague, I heard a conversation between him and one of the reporters (who had in his hand the manuscript of my colleague's speech) in reference to the omission from the RECORD of the personalities between the gentleman from Ohio and my colleague. I heard that conversation, and seeing no disposition upon the part of my colleague to initiate anything of that kind I voluntarily, and not at his request, and, so far as I know, without his knowledge, approached the gentleman from Ohio and used this language to him, if I recollect it, though I am not by any means certain of my language: "General, you have no objection to that altercation between yourself and SINGLETON being omitted, have you?" And he expressed, as I understood, a willingness to have it done, which willingness I communicated to my colleague. I understand that this morning the gentleman from Ohio stated that he was in some way under the impression that I came at the request of my colleague, [Mr. SINGLETON,] and that it was his desire that this omission should take place. If I said anything of the kind or if there was anything in the manner in which I spoke to him to leave that impression upon his mind, I was not happy either in my language or manner. I did not intend to convey that impression, nor did I intend to convey the impression to the gentleman that it was even my colleague's desire. I simply understood that these gentlemen privately entertained kindly feelings toward each other, and that there was an entire willingness on the part of each of them that whatever unpleasantness had occurred between them should disappear and not be published in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair desires to say a word in justice to the reporters; that the rule of the House is that when a member is called to order he shall take his seat, and all matters that occur in the House after that call to order and while the Chair is endeavoring to preserve order and to inaugurate the debate in order were formerly omitted from the RECORD. The Chair is not clear but that they should be omitted now. The only person aggrieved by the omission of anything in that report would be the Chair himself and the gavel used on that occasion.

Mr. LAMAR. I would add that in making the suggestion to these gentlemen I considered it in accordance with the common-law rule of the House, that personalities occurring between two members are within their mutual control, and that they may be stricken out if both agree that it shall be done. I have not only seen that rule acted on but I have heard it repeatedly stated formally from the chair.

Mr. GARFIELD. The gentleman's recollection and my own are perfectly at one. The reporter had spoken to me as he had to the gentleman from Rhode Island, and my answer was that the interruption was in the speech of the gentleman from Mississippi, and not in mine, and therefore I had no control over it. Very soon after that the gentleman from Mississippi came down the aisle from his colleague's seat, and, both from that and from what had already passed, I assumed that he had come at his colleague's suggestion, and I acted on the supposition that I was granting a request from his colleague. But I certainly had no reason or disposition to have anything whatever which I had said stricken out for my own sake, nor did I desire anything to be retained for my own advantage.

## NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The House then resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, (Mr. CLYMER in the chair,) and resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. No. 3375) making appropriations for the naval service for the year ending June 30, 1877, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, by the courtesy of my friend from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] I am permitted to express my views as a member of a subcommittee on naval affairs in so far as the question of navy-yards is concerned. The measures heretofore presented by the Committee on Appropriations have met with my hearty approbation and commanded my most zealous support. I believe that no stride has been taken in the direction of retrenchment and reform not thoroughly justified by every consideration of prudence, by every requirement of good government, and I rise not for the purpose of opposing the committee in so far as their bill relates to reduction of expenditures, but rather because it has in this respect not fully met the public expectation. The committee charged with the duty of inquiry into the condition of the navy-yards of the United States and of ascertaining whether or not their number cannot be reduced, and, if so, in what mode, have conscientiously examined this whole subject and have had before them nearly one hundred witnesses, and they have in so far as one particular navy-yard is concerned unanimously agreed,

with one exception, as to their policy. I am not, however, speaking for the Naval Committee as such, but in my own behalf as one of the individual members of the committee.

I am convinced, after a due consideration of all this testimony so submitted to the committee, after a full examination of all the witnesses competent to testify regarding this subject-matter, that the number of navy-yards, now amounting to nine, can be reduced to three without any detriment to the public service; and that the three which should be retained are the navy-yard at Brooklyn, the navy-yard at Norfolk, and the navy-yard at Mare Island on the Pacific coast.

Mr. HARRIS, of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman mean to say that the Naval Committee have reached any such conclusion or made any such recommendation?

Mr. WILLIS. If the acoustics of this Hall had been more admirably adjusted, the gentleman would have thoroughly understood that I especially disclaimed speaking for the whole committee; that I was speaking only for myself as an individual member of that committee.

Mr. DANFORD. Will the gentleman allow me a moment?

Mr. WILLIS. Certainly.

Mr. DANFORD. The gentleman in prefacing his remarks spoke of the action of the subcommittee on naval affairs upon the subject of navy-yards, their number, &c. As the record shows that I am a member of that subcommittee, I ask the gentleman whether he intends to say to the Committee of the Whole that I, as a member of that subcommittee, agreed to the proposition to which he has referred?

Mr. WILLIS. I now state that in my remarks I have in no wise committed the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. DANFORD,] I have qualified them throughout.

There is not a doubt but that all the business, all the work of construction, all the work of repairs demanded by the best interests of this country, if committed to a private establishment, could be well executed and well carried out in one immense dock-yard. It occurs to me as very strange that the Government should not in this respect recognize those considerations which govern private individuals in their business affairs. Government work is to-day almost at a standstill. It is justly the policy of this Congress to reduce expenditures to such an extent that construction and repair to any great amount will be entirely out of the question. It, therefore, is befitting when we have such an opportunity, an opportunity that will in no wise conflict with the best interests of the Government, to recognize it and bow to it.

The reason why the Brooklyn navy-yard should be retained is because it is the center of a grand commercial population; within a radius of thirty miles there are more than two millions of people. It is because more than \$20,000,000 have already been expended to make it sufficient to meet all the needs and requirements of the naval service. It is because only a few miles back from and above that city the broad Hudson becomes fresh, and iron-clads can rendezvous there without their bottoms being injured and becoming covered with barnacles, without the Government incurring expense. It is because if a notice be posted on the walls of that yard to the effect that workmen are required, before the following morning a response will be made by thousands upon thousands of persons seeking work. It is because, furthermore, that the approaches to the yard, both that through the Narrows and through the Sound, are never frozen up even in the coldest winters.

It is true that other yards possess all these excellencies, excepting perhaps population and the material resources of a great city and communication with all parts of the country. But it being the fact that we can dispense with many of these yards, that only a few should be retained, it behooves us to consider which should be selected for retention.

There is the Kittery navy-yard, a most excellent retreat in the hot summer months, where ships returning from long voyages with their seamen out of health can retire for sanitary purposes. There is Pensacola, which in the contingency of a war with Mexico or with the islands of the Caribbean Sea might be used to excellent purpose. And inasmuch as these yards, if sold, would yield but a small amount of money to the Government, and such sale would involve a great sacrifice, it would not be good policy to dispose of those two yards. A small amount of money should be appropriated to keep them in a state of thorough repair and to secure the Government property from damage.

In my judgment it is entirely proper, as this bill provides, that the navy-yards at Charlestown, Massachusetts, and Washington, District of Columbia, should be sold at such time and on such condition as will be most advantageous to the United States. Herein we take no issue with the Committee on Appropriations. The reason why we recommend the sale of these yards is predicated upon the fact that the land is situated in the heart of two cities, and when the country shall have recovered from its condition of depression and paralysis of industry the ground will undoubtedly command a fair market price.

In connection with this subject of dock-yards I shall take the liberty of reading an extract from Barry's work on dock-yard economy, the ablest author who has written upon this subject, and a work which shows a thorough familiarity of the author with the dock-yards of



both France and England and with the whole system of dock-yard economy.

Mr. O'NEILL. I would like the gentleman to explain to this House why in a preceding Congress—I think in the Congress before the last—an effort was made here by a representative from the city of Brooklyn to secure the sale of the Brooklyn navy-yard. He introduced a bill for that purpose and urged it here. What was the reason for urging the sale of that yard? I do not want to interrupt the gentleman in his remarks, but I think this is a proper place for him to give that information.

Mr. WILLIS. The gentleman who introduced that bill must upon his own conscience answer what were his motives for the act.

Mr. O'NEILL. I merely asked the question because I thought the gentleman now representing the district in which the Brooklyn navy-yard is could tell us why the citizens of Brooklyn at that time through their Representative on this floor, a very able gentleman, urged Congress to authorize the sale of the Brooklyn navy-yard.

Mr. WILLIS. I suppose that the reason was that heretofore it has been an administration nursery, where a good many republican votes have been manufactured for the thirty days preceding elections. I am impartial in this matter. I represent neither Brooklyn nor Philadelphia.

I will now read from the volume which I have named and now hold in my hand:

There is an obvious consequence of some importance arising out of this first intention, (of dock-yards.) It is that, as the dock-yards have their origin in the necessities of naval war and in the absence of great private establishments in which ships of war could be built, there is not another word to be said in support of the continuance of the dock-yards than that they exist, or, what is the same thing, that we possess them. Manifestly, if up to the present time war had been unknown, and all at once its ghastly forms presented themselves to men's minds as something with which at last they must become familiar, no sane man would have thought of providing ships in any other way for the public service than ships are provided for private persons; because, if it were impossible to supply the public service properly, the question would arise whether it would not be as much the duty of the Government to save private persons from what we shall call the rapacity and incompetency of the ship-builders as to save the public. From this conclusion there is no logical escape. Some may answer that the dock-yard work is better and more to be depended on than ship-yard work; but surely it must be apparent that this is only saying the dock-yard officials are incapable of superintending ship-yard work, and that workmen cannot perform their tasks in so satisfactory a manner outside of the dock-yards as they can within. The objection, it will be shown hereafter, is altogether groundless. The first intention of the dock yards was to provide that which could not be conveniently or so well provided elsewhere; therefore all that the warmest friends of the dock-yards can rationally say in support of them is that we have them, and for that reason we ought to use and cherish them. But exactly the same logic would lead us to use and cherish the coats of mail in the Tower of London, because we have them, and the battle-axes, broadswords, and unmelting cannon of the last century that still encumber our great arsenals.

Mr. Chairman, these reasons must commend themselves to all intelligent men. Now, all the work that needs to be done for the United States Navy can be done better in one yard than in eight yards. Yet we have eight separate establishments. We have the bureau system carried into each yard. We have sixty-four distinct sets of books where we should have but one. We have sixty-four clerks where we should have but one. We have eight different parties acting as responsible heads where we should have but one responsible head. Without reference to what ought to be done regarding other yards, there can at least be no discussion as to what ought to be done regarding the creation of a new dock-yard. Notwithstanding the manufacturing interests of this country had climbed to that height where ships could be built with the same facility and at as slight cost in this country as anywhere else upon the globe; notwithstanding in every exigency we have been compelled to resort to private enterprise to enlarge our Navy, we find this Administration, after a period of war, when the people were burdened with a mountainous debt, devising a method whereby another large load shall be added to the oppressive weight and thrust upon our people. A commission, composed of seven distinguished officers of the Navy, at the head of which was Commodore Stringham, was appointed to select a new navy-yard; and the majority of that commission reported that it was utterly incompatible with the public interests to establish a navy-yard at League Island. But we find that by virtue of political maneuvers, by virtue of tactics with which I am unfamiliar, the Government was induced to resolve upon this change, resolved upon it notwithstanding what was contained in the report made by the majority of that commission.

Mr. O'NEILL. Let the gentleman frankly say that in establishing the navy-yard at League Island it was always the intention to do away with the old Philadelphia navy-yard.

Mr. WILLIS. Undoubtedly. In obedience to the wishes of Philadelphia, which city wanted a double bounty—a navy-yard removed, a navy-yard created.

Mr. O'NEILL. Because Philadelphia had the best place in the world to offer for a navy-yard, as is established to-day.

Mr. KELLEY. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIS] will allow me one moment—

Mr. WILLIS. If my time is limited I must insist on proceeding. If gentlemen wish to indulge in *ipse dixit*, they must seek some other time and occasion. I will now read from a report made by experts who, if they were men of only tolerable understanding, must be as capable as the distinguished gentleman from Philadelphia of coming to a correct conclusion upon this subject.

I read from the report signed by a majority of this commission:

League Island is a reclaimed marsh, surrounded by a dry stone wall and embankment of earth, raised to exclude the river. A portion of the island was reclaimed many years since, and is known as the old meadow; we have no positive information on this point, but presume that at the time the wall and embankment were built all the land worth reclaiming was embraced within the inclosure; subsequently, and about eighteen years since, as we are informed, the inclosure was extended so as to embrace an additional area, now known as the new meadow. According to a plan which has been submitted to the board by a committee from the board of trade, this old meadow contained two hundred and nineteen acres and the new meadow one hundred and fifty-five acres. On the north of the island, and between it and the main, there is a channel, which we are told was of sufficient depth in former days to float large ships of war; now it is a narrow and shallow channel, not sufficient to float vessels of any size used by the Navy. Large areas of marshes have formed on the east and west ends and on the north side of the island, and the whole appearance indicates a constant and rapid accumulation from the immense deposits of the Delaware River.

I wish to call the attention of the committee to what I am about to read further:

To raise the surface of this island to a height which would render it safe from the encroachments of high tides will require a filling in of from nine to ten feet over the whole area; and if, as has been suggested, a line of wharf front be carried out to the twenty-three-foot line, it will involve an additional filling of a space one mile long and averaging four hundred and eighty-one feet wide and nineteen feet deep.

Mr. Chairman, I will also call the attention of the committee to another feature of this report which, in my judgment, is of supreme importance in the consideration of this matter:

League Island is situated on a fresh-water river, nearly surrounded by marshes covered with vegetable matter and exposed to the sun at every low tide during the day; and, although we are told that it is as healthy as other places in the vicinity, we cannot believe that League Island can be regarded as a healthy place.

And then the majority of this commission—

Resolved, That, in the opinion of the board, the public interests will not be promoted by acquiring the title to League Island for naval purposes.

It is signed by S. H. Stringham, presiding officer; W. H. Gardner, commodore; G. J. Van Brunt, commodore; and W. P. S. Sanger, engineer.

Mr. O'NEILL. Will the gentleman from New York please give the committee the date of that report?

Mr. WILLIS. I will permit my friend from Pennsylvania to pursue the subject at his leisure, but will not permit him to interrupt me.

Mr. RANDALL. I hope the gentleman will insert in his speech various other reports in favor of League Island which have since been made as a set-off against that solitary one against it.

Mr. WILLIS. I have already stated to the committee that this is an original report made by competent experts and is in all respects sufficient for our purpose, but despite the filing of such an opinion, and the due consideration thereof, various contrivances have been resorted to which have resulted in a pledge on the part of the Congress of the United States to impose upon the people of the country a foolish and utterly unwarranted expenditure of at least \$40,000,000.

In addition to what has been before urged in regard to League Island, let me say that it is no less than seventy miles from the sea. A few vessels of the enemy rendezvousing in its mouth could blockade the grand navy which happened to be at that particular point, and prevent its issuing forth to protect the coasts of the country.

There is beyond this still another objection. Every winter, sometimes for months, those narrow channels which surround that mud-flat, properly called an island, for it is very much of an island, being surrounded by water on top as well as on all sides—those narrow channels are blockaded by ice, rendering League Island useless for any just purpose for which navy-yards are maintained.

But I do not wish to detain the committee longer on this subject-matter. I wish to justify the position that has been assumed by myself in making the report of the subcommittee on this subject. When the proper time comes, in view of all the considerations presented, I shall take the liberty of moving an amendment to give effect to the recommendations urged in that report.

Mr. RANDALL. Will the gentleman from New York allow me to ask a question?

Mr. WILLIS. I will, with pleasure.

Mr. RANDALL. Did you ever personally inspect League Island?

Mr. WILLIS. I did not; but I trust to the eyes of Commodore Stringham rather than to the judgment of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania on this question.

Mr. RANDALL. When you rely on another, then we will come back to his say-so. For the gentleman himself to rise up here and inveigh against League Island when he has never seen it, as he himself confesses, seems to be a most extraordinary proceeding.

Mr. WILLIS. I saw it sufficiently in the report, made by eyewitnesses, who thoroughly understood their duty in the premises.

Mr. RANDALL. That is on paper.

Mr. WILLIS. I wish also to say on this subject that although the Navy of the United States is very inconsiderable compared to that of France or Great Britain, France having 402, England 242, and the United States 117 ships of war, the acreage for dock-yards in England amounts to only 866 acres, and in France to only 865; while in the United States, exclusive of League Island, it amounts to 1,595 acres. The fact appears by the following tabular statement:



*English dock-yards.*

	Area.	Slips.	Docks.
	<i>Acres.</i>		
1. Deptford .....	38	5	2
2. Woolwich .....	56	6	3
3. Chatham .....	95	8	4
4. St. Mary's Island* .....	284	0	0
5. Sheerness .....	57	1	5
6. Portsmouth .....	115	5	11
7. Devonport .....	71	6	5
8. Keyham .....	73	0	3
9. Pembroke .....	77	13	1
Totals .....	866	44	34

*French dock-yards.*

	Area.	Slips.	Docks.
	<i>Acres.</i>		
1. Cherbourg .....	256	12	7
2. Brest .....	131	12	4
3. L'Orient .....	106	18	2
4. Rochefort .....	132	14	3
5. Toulon .....	240	20	8
Totals .....	865	76	24

*United States dock-yards.*

	Area.	Slips.	Docks.
	<i>Acres.</i>		
1. Portsmouth, New Hampshire .....	164	3	1
2. Boston, Massachusetts .....	84	3	1
3. New York .....	193	2	1
4. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania .....	20	2	1
5. Washington, District of Columbia .....	42	2	0
6. Norfolk, Virginia .....	109	3	1
7. Pensacola, Florida .....	83	1	1
8. Mare Island, California .....	900	1	1
Totals .....	1,595	17	7

BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS, May 17, 1876.

I also add as part of my remarks the report of the subcommittee, written by myself, and which is the embodiment of my views and suggestions upon the subject I am now discussing:

The subcommittee on naval affairs, who were instructed to take into consideration and investigate the subjects embraced under the second head of the subdivision of House resolution No. —, introduced by Mr. MORRISON, namely, "On navy-yards and their management, to inquire whether their number may be reduced, and, if so, in what mode and to what extent, and, in their management, what change can be made to reduce the costs thereof, and reform the alleged abuses and corruptions existing therein," respectfully submit the following as their report:

The United States Government now possess the following navy-yards, to wit: Washington, Norfolk, Kittery, Brooklyn, New London, Charlestown, League Island, Pensacola, and Mare Island, all, save the two latter, being situated upon the Atlantic coast.

After considering duly a vast amount of testimony bearing upon the subject-matter, the scope of work to be done in and about the repair and construction of vessels and other labor required by the Navy, having due reference to the efficiency of the service, your committee recommend:

First. That all navy-yards be closed, excepting the one at Brooklyn, the one at Norfolk, and the one at Mare Island, which be kept open for the purposes of repair.

Second. That eventually but two yards be maintained and kept open, to wit, the one at Mare Island and the one at Brooklyn.

Third. That no naval station be authorized or established unless in case of necessity when it shall be selected at such of the closed yards as may be most expedient in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy.

Fourth. That sale be made of the navy-yards at Charlestown and Washington with all convenient speed.

Fifth. That the Kittery and Pensacola yards be retained as Government property, that the same may be used in period of war or other exigency.

Sixth. That no further money be expended upon League Island, and that said island, together with the yard at New London, be receded to the original grantors at such time, in such mode, and upon such conditions as may be deemed expedient and just; and, at all events, that no further money be expended in the creation, enlargement, or improvement of either.

Seventh. That provision be made to guard, at the slightest possible cost, all the property and material of any description whatsoever in or about the yards to be closed pursuant to the foregoing suggestions, until the same may be disposed of with the least prejudice to the Government.

The foregoing recommendations have reference to the first branch of the inquiry, as hereinbefore stated. The yard at Brooklyn is confessedly the most valuable and important one owned by the Government. The testimony of all witnesses examined is uniform in this respect, and, without reference to its intrinsic excellence and fitness, it is, while sufficiently remote from the sea for purposes of defense, sufficiently convenient for the purposes of coast defense; it would cost more than \$20,000,000 to replace it; it has at hand all the resources of men and material which a commercial city in communication with every part of the country, containing more than a million of people, can yield, and there are yet a million more of people within a radius of thirty miles. The approaches to the yard by Sound or Narrows are never frozen up. A notice that workmen are required posted upon the outer gates of the yard is responded to by thousands within a few hours. A few miles

above the city the waters of the broad Hudson become fresh—a retreat just at hand where a fleet of iron-clads could rendezvous and avoid the inconvenience or damage resulting from salt water. One yard is sufficient for all the purposes of the Government, where all the resources of the Government could be centered and work prosecuted under the control and direction of one competent official, avoiding the confusion inseparable from having the business of the Navy divided up under so many different heads, dividing responsibility and thereby reducing effectiveness to the minimum.

Other yards have undoubted excellences, but can be dispensed with. The best of these upon the Atlantic coast, reference to geographical position, depth of water, distance from the sea, and defensibility being considered, is Norfolk. League Island is too remote from the sea; is upon narrow rivers, which are invariably blocked every winter with ice, sometimes for months; it is near a large city; is accessible to coal and iron regions, and the water is fresh; considerations indeed favorable, but overshadowed by an objection to its locality, its annual blockade of ice; and another yet more commanding, indeed, insuperable, the immense cost which its completion would necessitate. Let us resign ourselves with composure to the amount of money already uselessly expended and halt where we are. The sum of money required to complete the yard, to render it in anywise fit for the purposes intended, is variously estimated at from twenty to sixty million dollars. The island is nothing but a mud-flat, which will require endless filling and piling; it will require for years and years an annual appropriation from Congress, and the American people should decide, before further money is invested, whether they are willing to pay the cost of this yard, say, at a low estimate, \$40,000,000.

A naval station in time of peace, when so many navy-yards are scattered along the full length of our coast, is wholly needless, and, unless made such with no outlay, without justification.

The land comprising the Charlestown and Washington navy-yards, being in the central portions of large cities, could be advantageously sold, especially when the country shall have recovered from business depression.

The land comprising Kittery and Pensacola would, if sold, yield but a trifling sum of money to the Treasury, and their retention may be of ultimate service to the Government.

As League Island and New London were respectively ceded to the Government on condition that they should be used as navy-yards and naval establishments maintained thereon, good faith demands that in due time proper steps be taken to surrender the same and cause their reconveyance to the bodies-politic from whom they were received.

The value of governmental property at the several yards designated as proper ones to be closed is immense, amounting to several millions of dollars. The most prudent precautions must be employed to prevent destruction either from want of care or removal. A proper amount of money, therefore, appropriated for such purpose would be an intelligent exercise of economy.

Respectfully submitted.

Mr. HARRIS, of Massachusetts. I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIS] whether the subcommittee or the general Committee on Naval Affairs have ever taken any testimony whatever on the subject of the sale of any navy-yard of the United States?

Mr. WILLIS. I wish to say distinctly that they have. But in so far as my remarks are concerned and in so far as this particular appendix, which I have asked leave to print, is concerned, they are my own individual views, and I am alone responsible therefor, although I believe for the honor and credit of this Congress that they will be shared and sustained by a majority of the members thereof.

Mr. HARRIS, of Massachusetts. I would ask my friend if he has ever visited any navy-yard in this country except that of Brooklyn?

Mr. WILLIS. It is not my business to travel around, after the manner of clowns, looking at what may be in Boston, or what may be in Philadelphia, or sundry other small towns. But I have sought information from such genuine and authentic sources as must put all gentlemen to the blush who would indulge in any statements to the contrary, not having the knowledge of experts on the subject.

Mr. O'NEILL. The gentleman from New York is so obliging that I really dislike to ask permission of him to say a word.

Mr. WILLIS. Justice to my distinguished colleague on the Committee on Naval Affairs, the gentleman from Tennessee, [Mr. WHITTHORNE,] compels me to say that I must yield to nobody but him.

Mr. O'NEILL. There is one question I wish to ask the gentleman, whether he was ever in the Brooklyn navy-yard?

Mr. WILLIS. Yes; and now the gentleman, having placed himself on the witness-stand and wishing to testify, he may state whether there is anything in the report signed by Admiral Stringham and four other naval officers which is not strictly true.

Mr. O'NEILL. That report belongs to a past generation of men; forgotten almost, except for their deeds in the Navy of the United States fighting her enemies gallantly.

Mr. WILLIS. And with them simplicity and true economy have been also forgotten.

Mr. DUNNELL. Will the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WHITTHORNE] yield to me for one moment?

Mr. WHITTHORNE. For what purpose?

Mr. DUNNELL. I rise to express the hope that these gentlemen who are participating in these personal altercations which are so rich will not strike them out of the RECORD to-morrow.

Mr. HAMILTON, of New Jersey. I hope they will not go into the RECORD. They were out of order, every one of them.

Mr. WHITTHORNE. It is not my purpose on this occasion to review the general condition of the Navy. I had hoped that prior to the discussion on this bill it would have suited the convenience of the Committee on Appropriations to have reported the Army appropriation bill, with the view that whatever reduction might be made in the pay of the Army that reduction should be made in the naval service, so that the services hereafter would harmonize alike in their assimilation of grade and of pay. That has not been done, and there has been brought upon the House, and more particularly on the Committee on Naval Affairs, the consideration of questions that they would have liked to be postponed for the reason I have intimated.

I purpose simply on this occasion, Mr. Chairman, to call the attention of the House to what I have been instructed to do by the Com-



mittee on Naval Affairs, to wit: To offer for the consideration and approval of the Committee of the Whole three distinct propositions, which are to be found embodied in the bills which I had the honor to report from that committee the day before yesterday.

These bills refer, first, to the reduction of the pay and the number of officers in the Navy; secondly, to the reduction of the navy-yards; and, thirdly, to the re-organization of the Marine Corps. And it is to these subjects that I propose now to call the attention of the committee.

The first, sir, is the question of the reduction of pay. In order that the Committee of the Whole may fully understand the purposes and labors of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I have to invite your attention to what is the present pay of the Navy and to what is proposed by the Committee on Appropriations. Speaking in round numbers, without referring now to the bill, the amount reported by the Committee on Appropriations is \$6,250,000, while the sum of \$7,600,000 is demanded in the estimates submitted from the Treasury Department. I am of the opinion that, if the recommendations made by the Committee on Naval Affairs shall meet the approval of this House, the sum reported from the Committee on Appropriations may be reduced from four to five hundred thousand dollars; in other words, making the appropriations \$5,750,000.

Now, sir, in the amendment which I shall have the honor to submit to this committee—I speak relatively or comparatively—the proposed reduction averages about 10 per cent. in the pay of officers upon the active and retired list. At that point the committee for the present stopped. They propose in the discharge of the duties devolving upon them to submit to this Congress before it adjourns sundry other measures which, in the opinion of the committee, will materially reduce the expenses in the management of the Navy. But just now, sir, I desire to invoke your particular attention to this statement. I submit it as a statement merely, and I ask the attention of the Committee on Appropriations, or the gentleman who has reported this bill, or of any gentleman who takes an interest in the naval service, to the fact that I have correctly tabulated the present rate of the pay of the Navy. I submit the tabulated statement showing that expense, as nearly as it can be done from the last Naval Register:

Line officers, active list, (776) .....	\$1,902,500
Staff officers, active list, (392) .....	1,562,600
Line officers, retired list, (109) .....	333,825
Staff officers, retired list, (135) .....	224,030
<b>Total pay commissioned officers .....</b>	<b>4,022,955</b>
Warrant officers, active list, (212) .....	\$270,600
Warrant officers, retired list, (28) .....	28,650
Cadet midshipmen and engineers, (317) .....	158,500
Mates, (50) .....	18,000
	<b>475,750</b>
	<b>4,498,705</b>
Estimated for officers volunteer Navy .....	<b>40,400</b>
	<b>4,539,105</b>
Estimated pay for petty officers and seamen, &c., 7,500, at average of \$20 per month .....	<b>1,800,000</b>
	<b>6,339,105</b>

Will you reflect, gentlemen, for a moment on the fact that the number of officers on the active list of the Navy line and staff is to-day 1,368; that those upon the retired list, including chaplains and professors of mathematics, foot up a total of 1,612 officers; and if you add to this the cadet midshipmen and the cadet engineers you have a total of 1,924, and adding to that number the volunteer officers, which the amendment which I propose to offer will abolish, you have 1,953 officers for the United States Navy, that number including the cadet midshipmen and the cadet engineers, who are officers in embryo? Now then, take 1,953 as the number of our officers who either are commissioned or may be commissioned, and you have that number of officers commanding 7,500 men. Is it not time, in view of the immense amount of money that you are paying to this class of officers, that you should commence the work not only of reduction of pay but of reduction of their number? The Committee on Naval Affairs, believing the establishment to be top-heavy, and representing the great body of the taxpayers of the country and not representing one particular class, believe it just to the people that the reduction should be made not alone among sailors, but among the officers of the Navy. I apprehend that no man will take issue with me on that question; but the difficulty with the committee was how it should be done with justice to the officers of the Navy. We got over that difficulty by providing that hereafter in the rank of rear-admirals the number should be reduced from twelve to three; that we awaited the slow process of death or retirement to make that reduction. The number of commodores is now twenty-five, and we propose to reduce it to six, and so on, following that idea through all the grades of officers, with the intention that the number of officers in the Navy shall eventually be made to correspond with the number of men in the Navy.

In addition to that I desire to call the attention of the committee to the further fact that to-day—and I am making no comment or reflection, nor do I so intend anything I may now say on the management of any party or of any Secretary—but I do call attention to the fact that to-day, with all of our efforts, it would not be possible to put into commission or to put afloat more than eighty vessels. We have to-day in the squadron service or active sea service but fifty-one

vessels, and merely for the purpose of keeping those fifty-one afloat the people of the United States are taxed over \$4,000,000 to sustain an unnecessary number of officers. Right here, Mr. Chairman, speaking for the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I desire to say that they have no thought or purpose whatever to make war on the Navy. I think myself, as an American citizen to-day and as an American citizen in the past, I have never seen an hour when I did not feel honor and pride in the officers of the Navy of the United States. They are gallant soldiers and men of courage, who do honor to the service and the flag under which they have taken commissions, and I would be false to myself and false to justice and false to my country if I made war upon the Navy. And in all the efforts I make for reform and reformation I have not one single object or purpose except to so reform and re-organize the Navy that it may become hereafter in the time of peace what it always has been in time of war, the pride and honor of the country. But, sir, right in that connection, and speaking of the pay of the Navy, it will appear upon reference to the expenditures, as reported from the Treasury Department, made for the naval service from 1869 to 1875 that there has been paid out within the period of six years for the pay of the Navy, Marine Corps, and the incidental expenses connected with the service, aside from the Bureau expenditures, \$64,140,767.90.

Now, gentlemen, reflect for a moment that this large amount has been gathered from your tax-laden and oppressed constituents within the last six years, an amount of \$64,000,000 and over.

Now, sir, in view of these facts, upon which I think no gentleman will take issue with me, I submit to the House that it is our duty to travel in the direction indicated by the Committee on Naval Affairs.

It may be, Mr. Chairman, that upon this question of the reduction of pay and number of the officers of the Navy I shall take occasion to trespass upon the attention of the committee when we consider the bill by sections, but just now I pass from that question to the next, and that is the question of navy-yards.

I am not here upon this occasion to give expression to any individual sentiment that I may have. I only express myself generally and as the representative of the Committee on Naval Affairs. Their recommendation has for its object and purpose economy and efficiency in the naval service. With that end and purpose in view they have authorized and instructed me to recommend the passage of a bill which abolishes the navy-yard at League Island and at New London, but retains for general purposes the navy-yards at Kittery, Charlestown, Brooklyn, and Norfolk, and retains for special purposes the navy-yards at Pensacola and Mare Island.

Now in reference to the Pensacola navy-yard; it is, I believe, a matter well known to most of the gentlemen upon this floor that during the continuation of that yard it has seldom been used for any other purpose than as a rendezvous and repairing station; that in the whole history of that yard but one or two vessels have been built there. And the recommendation of the committee in regard to the Mare Island navy-yard is in harmony with its past history.

Mr. PAGE. Will the gentleman allow me a moment?

Mr. WHITTHORNE. Certainly.

Mr. PAGE. What facts in the possession of the Committee on Naval Affairs have caused them to recommend the discontinuance of the navy-yard at Mare Island and the making it a naval rendezvous?

Mr. WHITTHORNE. A rendezvous and repairing station.

Mr. PAGE. Yes. Does not the gentleman know that for the two thousand miles of the Pacific coast there is but the one navy-yard at Mare Island? I would like the gentleman to inform the Committee of the Whole upon what information or facts in possession of the Committee on Naval Affairs they base this recommendation.

Mr. WHITTHORNE. The information in possession of the committee was that there was not means enough at hand in the form of timbers and other materials to make the navy-yard at Mare Island a general construction yard. It is within the information of the committee that vast amounts of timber and other material at very great expense—I can use no other term—at very great expense to the Government have been transhipped or carried from our eastern sea-coast to Mare Island; that in the articles of live oak and coal and other things the Government has been obliged to pay enormous prices to secure those articles. And in the opinion of the committee no more should be done at that yard than has been done in the past; that is to say, nothing but the necessary repair or construction of a vessel.

I do not mention it as a fact within the knowledge of the committee, but I mention it only upon that information which is accessible to every gentleman upon this floor. It is said that a gentleman in the State of New York is now building a vessel to be put together at Mare Island, and instead of sending the various parts of that vessel by water, he is sending it across the country by railroad.

It was in view of these facts and with no intention or purpose on the part of the committee to prejudice the Mare Island navy-yard, simply to keep it within its past history, that we recommend that it should be retained as a repairing yard as well as a naval rendezvous. The gentleman misapprehends the bill of the committee if he supposes that the Mare Island yard is to be simply a Navy rendezvous. In the opinion of the committee there should be done there in the future what has been or ought to have been legally and legitimately done there in the past.

Mr. PAGE. I dislike to interrupt the gentleman from Tennessee, [Mr. WHITTHORNE,] but I would ask him, as chairman of the Com-



mittee on Naval Affairs, if he would deem it safe, with two thousand miles of sea-coast, and Mare Island the only navy-yard on that coast, to do away with that navy-yard as a yard of construction? I believe that in the past ships have been constructed there, immense works have been done at Mare Island, and the cost of such works, I think, will bear favorable comparison, so far as economy is concerned, with any other navy-yard in the United States, with the exception perhaps of some additional freight paid upon certain classes of timber.

Mr. WHITTHORNE. I think when my friend from California [Mr. PAGE] comes to understand thoroughly the action of the Committee on Naval Affairs he will see that that action is not as prejudicial to his navy-yard as he now takes it to be. The committee have reflected upon the number of vessels likely to be repaired at that station. For instance, whatever squadron may be maintained by the United States upon the North or the South Pacific, the vessels would have to go to this navy-yard for repairs, and very likely the draught upon the resources of that navy-yard, in the way of material and other supplies, will in the future as it has been in the past be larger than their capacity to meet.

There are things alleged about that yard which, I will not say have caused the country to wonder how they could be, but there are things which if true I have no doubt the gentleman regrets. I do not intend now to assert that they are true, but if they be true they ought not to exist in the future. It was with these views that the Committee on Naval Affairs made the recommendation as to the Pensacola and Mare Island navy-yards.

When we come to the other yards, Kittery, Charlestown, Brooklyn, and Norfolk, I agree with my colleague upon the committee, who has just addressed the House, [Mr. WILLIS,] that the navy-yards at Brooklyn and at Norfolk are essential to the public service, and I might here announce my own willingness to pause; but I am here to represent, on behalf of my committee, that the navy-yards at Kittery and Charlestown are not without their advantages to the service. In the opinion of the committee those advantages are of such a character as to demand the continuance of those yards as general stations. For Kittery it is to be said that, when our ships have been upon long voyages and the vessels as well as men have become infected with disease, it is necessary that they should be carried to some water in the latitude of the Kittery navy-yard; and it was for this general purpose that the majority of the committee thought it their duty to recommend the continuance of that yard.

As for Charlestown, it possesses advantages in the manufacturing of certain articles such as are not possessed by any other establishment in the Union, especially in the manufacture of rope. At that yard the Government, as I am informed by the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. HARRIS,] my colleague on the committee, is able to carry out a policy which I trust will ever be the policy of the Navy Department—not to permit any shyster or broker-contractor to come between them and the manufacturer of the iron which goes into the construction of our ships. If the Charlestown navy-yard possesses this advantage, it certainly should be preserved as a manufacturing establishment for the benefit of the United States Navy.

The navy-yard at Washington City, it will be observed, the committee recommend to be continued as a manufacturing establishment. It is said that this yard has machinery whose ability to execute fine workmanship is not equaled, certainly not surpassed, by any establishment in the world. With this general idea the Committee on Naval Affairs have recommended that the Washington navy-yard be continued as a manufacturing establishment.

I have given the reasons why certain yards should in the opinion of the committee be continued. I now come to those yards of which they recommend the abolition. I cannot appropriately discuss or give to the committee the reasons that operated upon the mind of the Naval Committee in recommending the retrocession of League Island to the authority that gave it to the United States; but, sir, with proper time and opportunity I think my friends from Philadelphia will find that the Committee on Naval Affairs have reasons as thick and plenty as blackberries. No reason can be urged for the continuance of a navy-yard at League Island that would not apply to every fresh-water branch that enters the Atlantic Ocean. That is the only argument that can be made in favor of League Island. But, on the other hand, the committee will bring to the attention of the House and the country the fact that to make League Island a navy-yard will require an expenditure from the public Treasury, at the very lowest estimate, of \$20,000,000, and in the opinion of competent officers recently on duty at that station, \$50,000,000. In view of this expenditure the question will be presented whether this House is willing to launch this country into such an expenditure for the building of a navy-yard there, when we have superior yards already in existence. That is the only practical question before the House.

Mr. O'NEILL. Will the gentleman allow me a single remark?

Mr. WHITTHORNE. I have not the time.

Mr. O'NEILL. If the gentleman will state that League Island navy-yard was established as an iron-clad navy-yard, for which fresh water was a necessity, he will perhaps discuss this subject more intelligently.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WHITTHORNE] declines to yield.

Mr. WHITTHORNE. This question will most likely come up at another time; and then we will canvass the reasons on which the recommendation of the committee is based.

I have not now the time to give the reasons which operated upon the mind of the committee in recommending the surrender of New London. I will only call attention to the recommendation of a committee upon the part of the Senate during the second session of the Forty-third Congress, of which committee Senator SARGENT of California was chairman, and which recommended the abolition of the navy-yard at New London.

I pass now to the remaining suggestion of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the recommendation for the re-organization of the Marine Corps. I have time only to state briefly that the proposition is to reduce the number of privates in that corps from fifteen hundred to twelve hundred and the number of officers to sixty-six, being nine less than the number recommended by the Committee on Appropriations. We also recommend the abolition of the staff in that corps. In this connection we recommend such measures as will, in the judgment of the committee, be promotive of efficiency in that corps as well as economy in the general service.

Having thus hastily called attention to the recommendations of the committee, I take occasion to say that at the proper time these propositions will be submitted as amendments to the pending bill and the concurrence of the House asked for them.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, it affords me pleasure to bring to the attention of the House a measure of retrenchment which, while it proposes a large reduction, comes here with the indorsement of the entire Committee on Appropriations. It is only due to the Secretary of the Navy for me to state that in our conferences with him upon this bill and the reductions therein proposed he has entered no protest. He has yielded to us all the sources of information freely and fully. There has been no attempt to oppose us in our purposes, but we have been uniformly met with the statement: "This is your Navy; make such appropriations as you may deem fit; it is only my province to conduct the duties of my Department."

Sir, I have no fear that in these reductions the public service will be at all injured. In the first place I do not consider that the continued keeping up of the Navy of the United States at a high state is at all consistent with the genius of our people any more than to maintain a large standing army.

It is our great good fortune that, unlike the great powers of Europe, which are continually meditating destruction of each other both upon land and upon sea, we are isolated, disconnected with those controversies which are continually and as it would seem necessarily arising there. While this Government has been in existence but a hundred years our Navy has been called upon but once worthy of mention to go out against a foreign foe, and that was during the war of 1812. I know we have had other troubles, but they amounted to naught.

It was charged against the administration of Jefferson as well as against the administration of Madison that they had almost wholly neglected the Navy. What was the result? When the trial of strength did come, although we encountered an enemy who, by reason of the blows she had given to the Spanish, French, and Dutch navies, was riding the ocean with contempt for the rest of the world, who does not remember with pride our struggle, and that it was our own despised little Navy which first brought her to a recognition of the fact that there was one power she must and should respect? But how did it happen? Much was due to the fact that our Navy was composed of men of skill, of courage, and of endurance, and a great deal that we found our commercial marine ready at once to come to our rescue. It was our hidden but our easily available strength. The alarm sounded on every occasion when an effort is made to enlarge our Navy is not justified from our own experience. The moral force of reason does not justify it and the great aid of diplomacy does not justify it. If I entertained a doubt on this point, the fact that on my own committee are gentlemen of long experience, who have been here for many years, who, without regard to party, concur in this report, and the further fact that a high Cabinet officer at the head of the Department fails to enter any protest are sufficient reasons why I should not hesitate to go forward.

In addition to this, who does not feel the paralysis of the industries of our land? Tell me a State in any section of this country, in New England, the Middle States, the Southern or Western States, or upon the great Pacific slope, tell me any of them whose Representatives upon this floor will not testify to the fact that labor with them is in enforced idleness; that business of every kind, manufacturing, mercantile, or agriculture, refuses to yield those profits which we found in the days of our peace and prosperity? If this be true, if this is the popular demand, if this is the feeling of the committee, if this is the feeling of Cabinet officers, the country, I say, is to be congratulated that here there is to be retrenchment to which there can be no reasonable objection.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with these preliminary remarks, it is but due to the House that I should briefly call attention to the reduction in the Navy appropriation bill we have brought forward, and to give some of the reasons which induced the committee to report it.

I will add, however, that the appropriations under this bill as reported amounted to \$12,808,655.40; and the appropriations for the last year, or rather for the current fiscal year, were \$17,011,306.90, showing a reduction on the appropriations for the last year, or the current fiscal year, of \$4,202,651.50; to which may be added, if the statement of the Fourth Auditor be correct, that the pay of the Navy fund has

heretofore been sufficient by reason of unexpended balances of previous years not covered back into the Treasury; but which balances are now exhausted, and upon which now there can be no reliance; to which may be added, if that statement be correct, another million of dollars, making a reduction in the expenditures of the Navy Department for the current fiscal year of \$5,202,651.50. The estimates for the next fiscal year were \$20,871,666.40; and deducting from that the appropriation contained in this bill we have a difference between the estimates and the amount actually appropriated of \$8,063,011.

I shall take up the discussion of this bill by paragraphs in the order in which they appear in print. First I am brought by that arrangement to the pay of the Navy. The estimates were \$7,600,000, and the appropriation in the bill is \$6,250,000. I think I shall be able to show to the satisfaction of the House that that reduction is not sufficient, and I shall therefore at the proper time introduce an amendment reducing it still further. I will here call attention to the following tables of the years 1857, 1859, and 1860, and 1873, 1874, and 1875, showing the estimates of appropriations and expenditures for the naval service for those years:

TABLE 1.—Showing estimates, appropriations, and expenditures for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1857.

For what purpose.	Estimates.	Appropriations.	Expenditures.
For pay and subsistence of the Navy and medicines.....	\$4,262,168 00	\$4,262,168 00	\$4,241,321 25
For pay of civil establishment, navy-yards.....	125,782 00	125,782 00	
For increase, repairs, ordnance, and equipment.....	3,088,660 00	3,020,500 00	2,886,102 95
For contingent expenses.....	859,750 00	859,750 00	862,467 73
For navy-yards.....	2,217,989 00	1,620,030 58	1,781,124 45
For magazines.....	142,600 00	92,600 00	80,729 10
For hospitals.....	84,400 00	70,800 00	45,892 92
For the Naval Academy.....	39,595 22	39,595 22	39,172 23
For the Marine Corps.....	851,113 31	657,113 31	503,670 93
For steam-mail service.....	1,408,850 00	1,478,600 00	1,059,866 67
For Stevens's war steamer.....	86,717 84	86,717 84	
For six steam-frigates.....			840,556 73
For five sloops-of-war.....			
For seven steam-sloops and one steamer.....			
For miscellaneous.....	356,880 00	450,178 48	385,951 73
Total.....	13,524,505 37	12,764,235 43	12,796,856 69

TABLE 2.—Showing estimates, appropriations, and expenditures for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1859.

For what purpose.	Estimates.	Appropriations.	Expenditures.
For pay and subsistence of the Navy.....	\$4,779,255 00	\$4,779,255 00	\$4,526,707 32
For the civil establishment, navy-yards.....	139,232 00	139,232 00	
For increase, repairs, ordnance, and equipment.....	3,448,000 00	3,448,000 00	3,554,335 42
For contingent expenses.....	897,600 00	897,600 00	904,817 25
For navy-yards.....	1,952,509 00	1,592,689 00	1,447,212 46
For magazines.....	209,615 00	129,615 00	146,219 66
For hospitals.....	159,866 00	80,792 00	68,736 09
For the Naval Academy.....	45,671 22	45,671 22	43,666 67
For the Marine Corps.....	624,660 01	641,460 01	674,463 26
For steam mail-service.....	935,850 00		457,985 91
For six steam-frigates.....			352,104 15
For five steam sloops-of-war.....	1,350,000 00	1,350,000 00	1,014,531 91
For seven screw sloops-of-war and one side-wheel steamer.....		1,200,000 00	999,197 01
For miscellaneous.....	74,040 00	294,040 00	492,261 10
Total.....	14,616,298 23	14,598,354 23	14,682,738 21

TABLE 3.—Showing estimates, appropriations, and expenditures for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1860.

For what purpose.	Estimates.	Appropriations.	Expenditures.
For pay and subsistence of the Navy.....	\$4,911,879 00	\$5,578,273 00	\$5,126,547 20
For the civil establishment, navy-yards.....	152,454 00	152,454 00	
For increase, repairs, ordnance, and equipment.....	3,663,000 00	1,863,000 00	1,390,041 23
For contingent expenses.....	896,000 00	896,000 00	853,100 34
For navy-yards.....	2,001,827 00	121,000 00	634,005 46
For magazines.....	203,457 00	114,957 00	108,300 61
For hospitals.....	153,935 00	76,085 00	67,546 73
For the Naval Academy.....	51,040 25	50,000 00	51,334 41
For the Marine Corps.....	703,394 55	663,394 00	609,651 77
For steam mail-service.....			196,154 09
For six steam-frigates.....			91,115 39
For five sloops-of-war.....			669,812 09
For seven sloops and one steamer.....	674,000 00	674,000 00	811,792 51
For miscellaneous.....	87,384 00	342,000 00	903,748 36
Total.....	13,500,370 80	10,531,163 00	11,513,150 19

TABLE 4.—Showing estimates, appropriations, and expenditures for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1873.

For what purpose.	Estimates.	Appropriations.	Expenditures.
For pay and subsistence of the Navy, including medicines and surgeons' necessities.....	\$6,475,674 00	\$6,315,000 00	\$6,432,882 72
For the civil establishment at the navy-yards.....	322,559 00	326,184 00	419,531 41
For increase, repairs, ordnance, and equipment.....	5,459,039 00	5,338,751 00	7,217,747 60
For provisions and clothing.....	1,587,600 00	1,587,600 00	2,631,776 36
For contingent expenses.....	1,194,500 00	1,232,000 00	1,185,135 20
For navy-yards and magazines.....	1,822,538 00	1,071,200 00	2,463,451 05
For the Naval Academy.....	193,408 25	193,498 25	190,654 07
For the Marine Corps.....	1,049,652 70	1,044,652 70	1,071,516 70
For miscellaneous.....	5,000 00	5,000 00	5,000 00
For the Bureau of Navigation and Naval Observatory.....	231,100 00	241,700 00	314,182 08
For the Bureau of Steam Engineering.....	1,650,000 00	1,650,000 00	1,641,769 08

TABLE 5.—Showing estimates, appropriations, and expenditures for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1874.

For what purpose.	Estimates.	Appropriations.	Expenditures.
For pay and subsistence of the Navy, including medicines and surgeons' necessities.....	\$6,618,508 00	\$6,315,000 00	\$7,633,807 55
For the civil establishment at the navy-yards.....	312,321 00	300,767 00	385,467 33
For increase, repairs, ordnance, and equipment.....	5,910,192 00	5,493,751 00	10,847,755 05
For provisions and clothing.....	1,587,600 00	1,587,600 00	2,019,027 68
For contingent expenses.....	1,312,200 00	1,372,000 00	2,037,103 23
For navy-yards and magazines.....	2,336,967 00	666,200 00	1,607,325, 83
For the Naval Academy.....	193,430 90	193,407 40	247,477 88
For the Marine Corps.....	1,177,311 25	1,105,611 25	1,681,122 29
For miscellaneous.....	5,000 00	5,000 00	5,000 00
For the Bureau of Navigation, Naval Observatory, and hydrographic work.....	417,400 00	306,400 00	424,329 68
For the Bureau of Steam Engineering.....	2,400,000 00	2,300,000 00	2,735,599 87

TABLE 6.—Showing estimates, appropriations, and expenditures for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1875.

For what purpose.	Estimates.	Appropriations.	Expenditures.
For pay and subsistence of the Navy, including medicines and surgeons' necessities.....	\$6,592,200 00	\$6,285,000 00	\$6,511,167 84
For the civil establishment at the navy-yards.....	412,122 00	199,899 80	194,224 17
For increase, repairs, ordnance, and equipment.....	5,500,344 71	4,705,000 00	5,793,119 56
For provisions and clothing.....	1,587,600 00	1,335,000 00	1,681,730 18
For contingent expenses.....	1,167,000 00	1,055,000 00	1,062,278 90
For navy-yards and magazines.....	1,015,589 28	1,198,000 00	1,197,264 39
For the Naval Academy.....	191,307 40	175,707 00	178,813 47
For the Marine Corps.....	1,105,611 25	879,616 00	997,511 96
For miscellaneous.....	5,000 00	5,000 00	5,000 00
For the Bureau of Navigation, Naval Observatory, and hydrographic work.....	241,350 00	212,850 00	275,350 50
For the Bureau of Steam Engineering.....	2,200,000 00	1,800,000 00	1,811,878 69

I have selected the years 1857, 1859, and 1860, because it has been so common on this floor to charge that the administration of Mr. Buchanan was an exceedingly extravagant one. I do not propose to raise the question whether it was or was not. I am not here to defend any administration, but I take these years for the purpose of comparison with the years 1873, 1874, and 1875.

I will now call the attention of the House to the fact that in the year 1859, when the number of men in the Navy was the same as it is at this time, the pay of the Navy was \$4,536,707.32. The estimate of the Department for the same number of officers and men for the next fiscal year is \$7,600,000. The difference is a very marked one. Members can at their own leisure compare the tables for those several years, and they will find a difference of several millions of dollars in this matter of the pay of the Navy.

I shall ask, Mr. Chairman, in this connection to publish a statement made and handed to me by the Secretary of the Navy, in which he shows or claims that his estimate for 1877 is absolutely correct, and from which it appears that less than \$2,000,000 of that sum are paid to the seamen and petty officers; showing that a very large proportion of it, nearly \$5,000,000, goes to the retired-list and to the pay of the officers.

The statement as furnished by the Secretary of the Navy is as follows:



Amount required to pay officers of the Navy as they are borne on the Register of January 1, 1875.

	Number.	Pay per annum.	Amount.	Totals.
Admiral .....	1	\$13,000		\$13,000
Vice-admiral, other duty .....	1	8,000		8,000
Rear-admirals:				
at sea .....	6	6,000	\$36,000	
other duty .....	4	5,000	20,000	
waiting orders .....	2	4,000	8,000	
Commodores:				
other duty .....	18	4,000	72,000	
waiting orders .....	7	3,000	21,000	
Captains:				
at sea .....	22	4,500	99,000	
other duty .....	20	3,500	70,000	
waiting orders .....	8	2,800	22,400	
Commanders:				
at sea .....	17	3,500	59,500	
other duty .....	51	3,000	153,000	
waiting orders .....	22	2,300	50,600	
Lieutenant-commanders:				
first four years, waiting orders .....	1	2,000	2,000	
after four years .....	51	3,000	153,000	
at sea .....	40	2,600	104,000	
waiting orders .....	20	2,200	44,000	
Lieutenants:				
first five years .....	123	2,400	295,200	
at sea .....	68	2,000	136,000	
other duty .....	18	1,600	28,800	
waiting orders .....	31	2,600	80,600	
after five years .....	9	2,200	19,800	
at sea .....	5	1,800	9,000	
other duty .....				
waiting orders .....				
Masters:				
first five years .....	78	1,800	140,400	
at sea .....	9	1,500	13,500	
other duty .....	13	1,200	15,600	
waiting orders .....				
Ensigns:				
first five years .....	38	1,200	45,600	
at sea .....	1	1,000	1,000	
other duty .....	6	800	4,800	
waiting orders .....				
Midshipmen:				
at sea .....	78	1,000	78,000	
waiting orders .....	3	600	1,800	
Medical directors and inspectors and fleet surgeons:	32	4,400		
Surgeons:				
first five years .....	8	2,800	\$22,400	
at sea .....	7	2,400	16,800	
other duty .....	1	2,000	2,000	
waiting orders .....	12	3,200	38,400	
second five years .....	7	2,800	19,600	
at sea .....	4	2,400	9,600	
other duty .....				
waiting orders .....				
Surgeons:				
third five years .....	2	3,500	7,000	
at sea .....	5	3,200	16,000	
other duty .....	2	2,600	5,200	
Passed assistant surgeons:				
first five years .....	3	2,000	6,000	
at sea .....	5	1,800	9,000	
other duty .....	2	1,500	3,000	
waiting orders .....	13	2,200	28,600	
after five years .....	9	2,000	18,000	
at sea .....	1	1,700	1,700	
other duty .....				
waiting orders .....				
Assistant surgeons:				
at sea .....	32	1,700	54,400	
other duty .....	9	1,400	12,600	
waiting orders .....	3	1,000	3,000	
Pay directors, inspectors, and fleet paymasters:	29	4,400		
Paymasters:				
first five years .....	2	2,800	5,600	
at sea .....	6	2,400	14,400	
other duty .....	4	2,000	8,000	
waiting orders .....	9	3,200	28,800	
second five years .....	13	2,800	36,400	
at sea .....	3	2,400	7,200	
other duty .....	2	3,500	7,000	
waiting orders .....	4	3,200	12,800	
third five years .....	4	3,600	10,400	
Passed assistant paymasters:				
first five years .....	7	2,000	14,000	
at sea .....	2	1,500	3,000	
other duty .....	8	2,200	17,600	
waiting orders .....	8	2,000	16,000	
after five years .....	5	1,700	8,500	
Assistant paymasters:				
first five years .....	10	1,700	17,000	
at sea .....	2	1,400	2,800	
other duty .....				
waiting orders .....				

Amount required to pay officers of the Navy, &c.—Continued.

	Number.	Pay per annum.	Amount.	Totals.
Assistant paymasters—Continued.				
after five years .....	7	1,900	13,300	
at sea .....	1	1,600	1,600	
other duty .....	1	1,200	1,200	
waiting orders .....				
Chief engineers ranking with commanders, fleet engineers, Chief Engineers:				
first five years .....	25	4,400		
at sea .....	10	2,800	28,000	
other duty .....	10	2,400	24,000	
waiting orders .....	2	2,000	4,000	
second five years .....	1	2,800	2,800	
at sea .....	7	3,500	24,500	
other duty .....	6	3,200	19,200	
waiting orders .....	6	2,600	15,600	
Passed-assistant engineers:				
after five years .....	45	2,200	99,000	
at sea .....	32	2,600	83,200	
other duty .....	15	1,700	25,500	
waiting orders .....				
Assistant engineers:				
first five years .....	7	1,700	11,900	
at sea .....	7	1,000	7,000	
other duty .....				
waiting orders .....				
after five years .....	12	1,900	22,800	
at sea .....	8	1,600	12,800	
other duty .....	8	1,200	9,600	
waiting orders .....				
Cadet engineers .....	10	500		
Chaplains:				
first five years .....	4	2,500	10,000	
at sea .....	4	2,000	8,000	
other duty .....	3	1,600	4,800	
waiting orders .....	2	2,800	5,600	
after five years .....	6	2,300	13,800	
at sea .....	5	1,900	9,500	
other duty .....				
waiting orders .....				
Professors:				
first five years, other duty .....	4	2,400	9,600	
second five years, other duty .....	1	2,700	2,700	
after fifteen years, other duty .....	7	3,500	24,500	
Secretaries .....	2	2,500		
Constructors:				
first five years, other duty .....	3	3,200	9,600	
second five years, other duty .....	2	3,400	6,800	
third five years, other duty .....	2	3,700	7,400	
Assistant-constructors:				
first four years, other duty .....	3	2,000	6,000	
second four years, other duty .....	4	2,200	8,800	
Civil engineers:				
first five years .....	6	2,400	14,400	
second five years .....	3	2,700	8,100	
after fifteen years .....	1	3,500	3,500	
Warrant officers:				
first three years .....	36	1,200	43,200	
at sea .....	5	900	4,500	
other duty .....	7	700	4,900	
waiting orders .....	18	1,300	23,400	
second three years .....	13	1,000	13,000	
at sea .....	4	800	3,200	
other duty .....	11	1,400	15,400	
waiting orders .....	5	1,300	6,500	
third three years .....	2	900	1,800	
at sea .....	1	1,600	1,600	
other duty .....	2	1,300	2,600	
waiting orders .....	1	1,000	1,000	
fourth three years .....	30	1,800	54,000	
at sea .....	54	1,600	86,400	
other duty .....	20	1,200	24,000	
waiting orders .....				
Mates:				
at sea .....	25	900	22,500	
other duty .....	26	700	18,200	
waiting orders .....	3	500	1,500	
Cadet midshipmen and engineers .....	297	500		
Secretaries to commanding officer squadrons ..	6	2,000	12,000	
Secretaries to Naval Academy .....	1	1,800	1,800	
Clerks, paymasters, commanding officers, &c				
Retired-list:				
rear-admirals .....	38	4,500	171,000	
commodores .....	39	3,750	146,250	
captains .....	17	3,375	57,375	
commanders .....	13	2,625	34,125	
lieutenant-commanders .....	9	2,250	20,250	
lieutenants .....	6	1,950	11,700	
masters .....	12	1,500	18,000	
ensigns .....	4	1,050	4,200	
midshipmen .....	3	750	2,250	
chief engineers .....	5	3,150	15,750	
passed assistant engineers .....	14	1,650	23,100	
warrant officers .....	32	1,350	43,200	
constructors .....	4	3,150	12,600	
professors .....	3	2,625	7,875	
chaplains .....	8	2,100	16,800	
assistant engineers .....	19	1,425	27,075	



## Amount required to pay officers of the Navy, &amp;c.—Continued.

	Number.	Pay per annum.	Amount.	Totals.
Retired list—Continued:				
medical directors.....	23	\$3,300	.....	\$75,900
pay directors.....	10	3,300	.....	33,000
medical inspectors.....	1	3,300	.....	3,300
passed assistant surgeons.....	2	1,650	.....	3,300
assistant surgeons.....	5	1,425	.....	7,125
surgeons.....	2	3,150	.....	6,300
paymasters.....	3	3,150	.....	9,450
passed assistant paymasters.....	1	1,650	.....	1,650
assistant paymasters.....	1	1,425	.....	1,425
Total.....				4,615,100
Actual cost of 8,500 men.....				2,720,000
Balance traveling expenses, &c.....				7,335,100

Why, Mr. Chairman, is there this difference between the years preceding the war and the present time? Permit me to state here, however, that there are three grades of service in the Navy: sea service, shore service, and waiting orders. An examination of the table furnished me by the Secretary of the Navy will show that not one-tenth of the officers on the pay-roll are on waiting orders or furlough, the rest being on sea and shore duty.

The statement of my friend from Tennessee [Mr. WHITHORNE] as to the small number of vessels in the service is one well worthy our attention in this connection. The Revised Statutes expressly provide that in addition to this pay the Secretary of the Navy may, in his discretion, furlough officers and further reduce their pay. Before the war it was exceedingly common to put the best officers in the service on furlough. Gradually there was a disposition to depart from it. Officers were put upon waiting orders where they could have nothing else to do, until now it seems it has grown up, notwithstanding the laws of the land, to that point where officers feel it an indignity to put them on furlough pay. There is no question in my mind in addition to that but what there are a great number of officers who are on shore duty and that that duty is almost absolutely nothing.

The only correction that can be made in this matter is by the appropriation bill itself. I make no charge against any Administration or against any Cabinet officer. I can understand that these importunities will come upon any officer that may happen to be at the head of the Department, and come from gentlemen of courage, of learning, of honor, and come with power. The Representatives of the people have it in their power to check this abuse, and they ought by all means to do it. And with this view, and being thoroughly aware that I am correct in the statement I am making, I shall offer an amendment hereafter for a further reduction of this appropriation.

Again, sir, I feel it my duty in passing to call the attention of the House to a note in the estimates by the Fourth Auditor on the subject of the pay of the Navy. In reference to the estimate of the current expenses of the year he says:

This is the amount made up by close computation and examination of the rolls by both the Fourth Auditor's Office and the Navy Department. The appropriations for the last three years have been too small to make the payments required by the provision of existing laws. The deficit has only been made up by the balances of the appropriations for pay, available by law for this purpose; all these that can be legally used are now exhausted.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this statement cannot be true. In 1873, when the number of the Navy was eighty-five hundred men, the appropriations were \$6,315,000, while the expenditures were \$6,432,882, being in excess of the appropriation. In 1874 the appropriations were \$6,316,000, and the expenditures were \$7,633,000. It will be remembered that was the year in which the Secretary of the Navy enlisted some fifteen hundred additional men when we were apprehending trouble with Spain. In 1875 the appropriations were \$6,285,000, and the expenditures \$6,511,000.

It will be observed therefore, Mr. Chairman, that every year the expenditures have exceeded the appropriations. But while in practice they may have relied upon the fund here referred to, with the single exception of 1874, they never have reached in the expenditures of the Department the amount here claimed. Now, there has been an effort on the part of the Fourth Auditor to make an explanation of this based on the fact that officers and men were off on duty and did not get home in time to get their pay during the fiscal year. But when we take it year by year and strike the average, we shall find that this point was never reached except in a single instance when we were apprehending trouble abroad and enlisted an additional number of men. It is not my purpose, sir, to say how this statement happens to come from the Fourth Auditor. It seems to me, sir, to say the least, that it shows that the accounts in that Office are not perfectly kept. I would not say, it would be unkind to say, that there was purposely a false statement.

Mr. HALE. Will the gentleman allow me to make a suggestion there?

Mr. BLOUNT. Yes, sir.

Mr. HALE. Is it not the fact that all this matter of the adjustment of the pay of the officers and men of the Navy is in the Fourth

Auditor's Office of the Treasury Department and not in the Navy Department?

Mr. BLOUNT. That is true. I did not charge that this came from the Navy Department at all.

The next subject to which I shall call the attention of the House of any importance—for I shall not go into the numerous details of reductions and shall only take up prominent heads and give reasons for the larger reductions—is in reference to the Bureau of Ordnance.

In that Bureau, sir, we have reduced the amount about one-half. We can do so because too much has already been spent and there is no reason why we may not reduce largely the expenditures in this branch. In the next place we propose to at least suspend work in a large number of the navy-yards, and many of the expenditures under this item growing out of the fact of the large number of navy-yards now in operation. In addition to that, the reduction of the number of men in the Navy to one thousand and the consequent reduction of our cruising vessels will justify the decrease.

Now, sir, when we shall reach the details of this bill I will then at the proper time give in detail the reason, which will probably be more satisfactory to the House. In reference to the Bureau of Equipment and Recruiting, we have been able to reduce the sum from \$1,250,000 to \$1,000,000. The reduction of men and the consequent reduction of the number of cruising vessels authorize the demand of this Bureau. One of the large items involved here is the purchase of coal. The committee have thought that there might easily be a reduction here by reason of the withdrawal of the cruising vessels and the reduction of men in the service, and that there might be a further reduction of the item of coal, as the vessels in our Navy are all full-rigged, are all sailing-vessels if need be, and could by economy do with less coal.

Further the reduction is not a large one, only \$250,000 from the appropriation of last year. The appropriation of last year exceeded that of the year before. The expenditures in all of these Bureaus are limited to the amount of money Congress may see fit to give. The more we give the more we are called upon to give. In the Bureau of Yards and Docks we have reduced the appropriation from \$860,000 to \$440,000. Here, again, comes the matter of the reduction of the navy-yards and of the expenditures in them. They have been reduced more than one-half. That is the theory of the bill, and the general reduction in the Navy will authorize and justify what we have done in the premises. In reference to the Bureau of Clothing and Provisions, we have reduced the amount of the appropriation from \$1,279,000 to \$93,000. And the general reasons which I have given in reference to the other Bureaus apply also to this Bureau.

Coming on, sir, to the Bureau of Construction and Repairs, the committee have reduced the appropriation on that item to \$1,500,000. I will here call attention to several reports of the Navy Department, showing that for several years since the war a large amount of repairs were made, and especially during the year of 1874.

A great many of our monitors repaired. The wood work in them was substituted by iron.

Report dated November 29, 1873: Thirteen vessels sold. Six live-oak cruising vessels repaired. Eight new sloops-of-war authorized by the Forty-second Congress in process of building. Repairing of iron-clads continued.

In conclusion, I am glad to be able to report the fighting-force of our Navy in good and effective condition. During the last two years the whole fleet of our single-turreted monitors has been thoroughly overhauled and repaired, their sides raised up, their rotten wooden beams and decks replaced by iron, and their turrets and machinery put in complete order, so that they are now efficient to their utmost capacity, and ready to go to sea at any time as soon as crews can be put on board and organized. These, with the Dictator and Roanoke, also in good order, make a fleet of sixteen iron-clads, powerful for any naval purpose which does not require long voyages or great speed. Two powerful iron torpedo-vessels have also been completed, and are ready for service, fully equipped with this most powerful weapon of modern warfare. Four of our powerful double-turreted monitors, namely, the Terror, the Miantonomah, the Monadnock, and the Amphitrite, (by far the most formidable vessels ever in our Navy,) are also now in hand undergoing repairs, and the plans are also being matured for the repair of the Puritan, the only one of our efficient iron-clads which remains untouched. The eight new sloops specially authorized, and built entirely of live-oak or iron, are about ready to be added to our cruising navy, and seven other of our vessels have been or are being thoroughly repaired with like durable material and supplied with new and improved machinery, so as to be in all respects equal to new ships of their class. We shall thus have added, by the end of the year, fifteen new and active ships to our cruising navy, to take the places of those vessels which are worn out and must be relieved. Most of our powerful wooden ships of the first class were also put in condition at the time of our threatened difficulties of last year, and are now in commission or in ordinary, ready for immediate service when needed. Thus all that there is of our Navy either is or will shortly be in the best state possible for vessels of their respective classes, and all will be, and will continue to be effective for service, except those of our cruisers which, built hastily of green white-oak, are now rapidly reaching the limits of their sea-life, and are one by one falling out of the line of active duty, to be laid up or sold as unfit for further service.

Warned by the rapid decay of our white-oak ships, the Department has required that all new wooden ships should be built and all our expensive repairs made of live-oak, and has, for this purpose and for the future necessities of the service, secured and accumulated a large quantity of this almost invaluable but rapidly disappearing material in the various navy-yards, where it will be properly cared for and seasoned, for use as occasion may require.

This statement certainly shows our Navy to-day in a better condition of effective and permanent strength than it has been for years; and when we understand that three years ago none of our now efficient iron-clads, except the Dictator and the Terror, were fit for any service whatever, and that during that time we have, in addition to putting them in repair, practically built fifteen live-oak cruising ships, and carried on also the necessary repairs to maintain the Navy afloat, and that at that time there was scarcely a stick of live-oak timber in the Government yards, where now is gathered an adequate supply of this most valuable and improving material; and when we remember that it has been possible, under the direction of our skilled



and practical officers, so to utilize the liberality of Congress that this has been accomplished out of the comparatively small portion of the naval appropriations which it is possible to devote to the actual building and equipment of ships, we are justified in feeling some pride in the prospect that the American Navy will be able in the future, as in the past, to contribute its fair proportion to the strength, resources, and dignity of a powerful though peaceful nation.

GEO. M. ROBESON,  
Secretary of the Navy.

The President.

Secretary Welles on page 41 of the date of December 1, 1866, says the force in the navy-yards has been principally employed in placing in efficient condition vessels which had been almost constantly used during the war.

On page 25 of his report of December, 1866, he says fourteen ships are in course of construction in the several navy-yards; four of them iron-clads with turrets. On page 38 of same report he says \$7,976,192 paid for labor and superintendence in navy-yards.

In report of 1867 and 1868: Four vessels launched during the year. The steam machinery for seven more such vessels is completed. Four smaller vessels in process of construction, and the machinery completed.

In report for 1868 and 1869 the Secretary says two iron-clads were sold and others recommended to be sold because they deteriorate.

A commission, with Admiral Goldsborough at its head, to examine steam machinery, on page 143 shows many vessels built during the war and a vast amount of repairing done in 1868, 1869, and 1870.

December 1, 1869, Secretary Robeson claimed that the Navy was out of repair, (see page 6 of 1869 and 1870;) that by reason of steam-vessels being full-rigged with sails a saving in coal of \$2,000,000 could be effected.

It will be remembered that during the year 1874 we were apprehensive of trouble with Spain, and not only new vessels were provided, but others were repaired under the prompt and proper action on the part of the Administration to put it in condition for active service. The whole Navy underwent repair.

The Secretary of the Navy in his last report says that the Navy is in finer condition than it ever has been. The officer at the head of the Bureau of Construction and Repair says that one hundred and two vessels have been repaired during the year. Here is his list of vessels repaired:

Vessels repaired and built under the cognizance of the Bureau of Construction and Repair.

Enterprise.	Glance.	California.
Marion.	Mayflower.	Comanche.
Adams.	Nantucket.	Independence.
Cohasset.	Napa.	Iroquois.
Essex.	Nebraska.	Jamestown.
Iowa.	Passaic.	Lackawanna.
Leyden.	Pilgrim.	Mohican.
Niagara.	Potomac.	Monterey.
Ohio.	Quinnebaug.	Narragansett.
Oregon.	Ranger.	Nyack.
Pennsylvania.	St. Louis.	Pensacola.
Quinnebaug.	Alarm.	Portsmouth.
Saint Mary's.	Catskill.	Saranac.
Shawnee.	Despatch.	Tuscarora.
Tallapoosa.	Fortune.	Ajax.
Terror.	Gettysburg.	Canandaigua.
Vandalia.	Hero.	Despatch.
Virginia.	Nipsic.	Kansas.
Wabash.	Piscataqua.	Mahopac.
Wachusett.	Relief.	Manhattan.
Wassuc.	Rescue.	Ossipee.
Alarm.	Triana.	Rose.
Alert.	Wyoming.	Saugus.
Blue Light.	Brooklyn.	Canonicus.
Catskill.	Canandaigua.	Wyandotte.
Colorado.	Constellation.	Nahant.
Intrepid.	Dictator.	Jason.
Minnesota.	Fortune.	Passaic.
Montauk.	Frolic.	Lehigh.
Powhatan.	Huron.	Nantucket.
Swatara.	Jean Sands.	Catskill.
Tennessee.	New Hampshire.	Montauk.
Trenton.	Ossipee.	Amphitrite.
Alert.	Powhatan.	Miantonomah.
Alliance.	Shawmut.	Terror.
Antietam.	Snowdrop.	Puritan.
Constitution.	Worcester.	Monadnock.
Frolic.	Benicia.	

BUREAU OF CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR,  
November 17, 1875.

The committee, therefore, have thought that this is a time when we could retrench in the matter of construction and repair, and while I am not authorized to state that the Secretary of the Navy indorses this measure, I do say that he says there never was a time in the history of the American Navy when there could be a reduction in this Bureau so well as now.

In reference to the Naval Academy at Annapolis, the committee have seen it proper to leave it intact. They have been struck at the great difference in the pay of professors and officers of that institution and the pay of similar officers at the institution at West Point. Having just passed through the consideration of the Military Academy bill and considered it in detail, when we came to the modest appropriation asked for by the Naval Academy we could see no place where any retrenchment could be had.

In reference to the Marine Corps we propose a reduction. The present number of officers is ninety-three, and we propose a gradual reduction down to seventy-five.

There have been several bills introduced by the Committee on Naval Affairs as amendments to this bill which I do not care at this time to discuss. I have no authority from the Committee on Appropriations either to accept or reject them. At the proper time they will have what consideration the House may see fit to give them.

Before concluding, Mr. Chairman, I desire to say a few words in reference to our navy-yards. We have at this time nine navy-yards. We have appropriated under the heading of the Bureau of Construction and Repairs one million and a half of dollars. How absurd it is, sir, to think that we are keeping up nine navy-yards in this country with all of their bureaus, which have grown up during the war, with their civil lists, with their expenses, and with almost infinite details, simply for the purpose of doing the little repairing that is now proposed. The committee have not seen fit to ask now for the sale of these several yards. It is a grave question, and one worthy of consideration, whether or not we had best sell them or simply close them and keep them for time of peril, and they have therefore gone no further than simply to direct the Secretary of the Navy to suspend many of them and to report upon the matter and manner of their sale.

We have gone one step further in reference to the yard at New London and have absolutely directed that measures should be taken for its retrocession. In connection with several of these yards, the one at Washington, the one at New London, and the one at Philadelphia, I shall insert a report of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate, who had this matter of reduction of navy-yards under consideration, and the comments of which I think are sufficient to satisfy every member of the House, and which I accept and adopt as my own:

LEAGUE ISLAND, PHILADELPHIA, AND WASHINGTON NAVY-YARDS.

These navy-yards should be concentrated at League Island. Congress provided by act of February 18, 1867, "that if League Island be selected, the navy-yard at Philadelphia shall be dispensed with and disposed of by the United States as soon as the public convenience will admit." Subsequent legislation has provided for the partial removal of articles from the Philadelphia yard. The sooner the whole transfer is completed and that yard closed up the better. The navy-yard at Philadelphia has less area than any other, less than twenty-two acres, entirely too small for the purposes of the Government, is much exposed to fire, and its site would sell for several millions of money. The location of the yard has retarded the growth of the city in that direction, the undeveloped water-front below having long been needed for commercial purposes, as well as the site of the yard itself, which now operates as an effectual barrier to the necessary communication with the wharves below. These considerations would not be conclusive if the interests of the Government absolutely required the place for a navy-yard, for local must give way to general good. But League Island is a better place for a navy-yard, and is now partially improved as such, as we shall show. But these facts account for the great rise in value of the old site commercially, and guarantee that it will sell for a sum that will duplicate all its facilities at League Island in a permanent and substantial manner, even at a forced sale. It is an absurdity to prolong a state of things by which two navy-yards are maintained within three miles of each other; and the Government should hasten the work at League Island, so as to abolish the Philadelphia yard, stop expense of repairs at the latter point, and realize for the Treasury the proceeds from the sale of its valuable site. The buildings at the Philadelphia yard are forty-two in number, of which twenty-two are wood, and the repairs are estimated at \$70,000. Its streets are narrow and tortuous, and the transportation of timber and heavy articles through them is extremely difficult. It has but eight hundred and twenty feet water-front measured on the port warden's line, and of this front more than one-half (four hundred and forty feet) is taken up with the floating sectional dry-dock, its deep berth and shallow basin, and the openings for the launching-ways of the ship-houses. There is but one pier. The buildings are crowded in together, with little regard to plan, and the work at the yard is hindered and made expensive by confusion resulting from confined space and other inconveniences. To put the dry-dock in order will cost \$119,000. The tools and machinery are valuable, and will be available for the plant of the League Island yard.

The Washington navy-yard has too small an area for an extensive establishment, and has of late years been used rather for a repairing and manufacturing yard than for building. The approach to it is by a crooked and difficult channel; it is far from the sea; is remote from supplies of timber, iron, and coal; the number of skilled artisans is limited; and there is no work done at it that cannot be more cheaply done and the materials more cheaply obtained at League Island, when that yard is put in proper condition to do it. The Washington navy-yard is well supplied with good buildings, tools, and machinery, and in a better locality for its purposes would be of great value. The estimate for repairs of buildings is about \$19,000.

League Island has many striking advantages as a site for a navy-yard. It is inaccessible to a hostile fleet from the sea, being within the defenses of a great city; a great manufacturing population surrounds it—skilled wood and iron workers, busy in time of peace in the creation and repair of the commercial marine, and furnishing an inexhaustible supply of skilled labor; it is in the midst of a great coal and iron region; it is ample in its area, and has a water-front of great extent and value; and its fresh water is needed to preserve our iron vessels.

NEW LONDON NAVY-YARD.

The site for this navy-yard was conveyed to the Government by the State of Connecticut. It has a water front on the river Thames of one mile, and a mean breadth of six hundred and seventy feet. The map of the Coast Survey shows the channel to be very narrow, and along most of the water front at a very considerable distance from the shore line. The channel is so narrow opposite the navy-yard that an ordinary-sized Government vessel could not swing at anchor with the tide without striking on either side, and vessels like the Franklin, Wabash, Minnesota, Colorado, Tennessee, New York, and the Iowa class, which draw about twenty-one feet, and are about three hundred feet long, some longer, would need to be handled with care to turn them around at the upper end of the yard without striking.

As to the other yards, we propose to act further for the reasons which I have already stated.

In addition, there is a proposition in regard to establishing a naval rendezvous at Tybee, off the coast of Georgia. I call attention to a memorial on that subject setting forth all the advantages of such a rendezvous, and a statement from the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, who, if anybody knows, certainly ought to know whether this is right and proper:

To the honorable the Senators and Representatives from the State of Georgia in the Congress of the United States:

The mayor and aldermen of the city of Savannah, and the Chamber of Commerce and Board of Trade, and Central Railroad and Banking Company, and Atlantic



and Gulf Railroad Company, and commissioners of pilotage, of said city, beg leave to call your earnest attention to the plan said to be entertained by the authorities of the General Government for the establishment of a naval station at Port Royal and to lay before you some reasons why said plan is inexpedient and unnecessary, subjecting the Government to large and useless expenditures without commensurate resulting benefits, to the injury of the great local interests represented by your memorialists as well as to the general commercial interests of the people of Georgia, and, without justification, to an increase of burdens of the General Government.

Assuming it to be expedient for the national defense and for the economy of the Navy to establish a naval station at an appropriate point on the South Atlantic coast, it will not be denied that the harbor of Port Royal affords for this purpose an advantage confined to its capacity to float a larger number of vessels than any other harbor on the South Atlantic coast; but this advantage is overcome by other considerations of greater value.

It is claimed for Port Royal harbor that the depth of water carried into it is greater than that of any other harbor on the South Atlantic coast. But this we can deny with confidence, the depth of water over the entrance of Port Royal and Savannah being the same, namely, nineteen feet at mean low tide. In this respect, therefore, no superiority can be asserted for the former, each allowing vessels of the same draught, while there is no other harbor on the South Atlantic coast known to have as deep water over its ocean bar. In a comparison of the inner capacities of the two ports the area of Port Royal is greater than that of Savannah, but the area of the latter is amply sufficient to contain safely and conveniently any fleet the United States are ever likely to concentrate on the South Atlantic coast in times of peace or war, while it is well known that the anchorage of the ports is equally esteemed, whether for holding-ground or protection during storms.

It is therefore evident that the only natural advantage which can be claimed for Port Royal over the port of Savannah is in area, and this advantage is not necessary to be considered in view of the sufficiency of the area of the latter.

We now ask your earnest attention to other points looking to the superiority of the port of Savannah as a naval station in respect to economy and convenience:

First. Port Royal is wholly undefended by fortifications, but the port of Savannah is protected by Fort Pulaski, capable of mounting the heaviest class of modern armament, while the Government holds two hundred and ten acres of land on Tybee Island, intended for the site of additional fortifications to defend the channel still more completely, to bring hostile vessels under concentrated fire, and more effectually cover any shipping seeking protection from an enemy. These defenses have been established by the General Government at great cost, and there can be no good reason assigned why, for the protection of a naval station, the Government should expend large sums of money at Port Royal when all the protection needed for a naval station already exists or may be economically added to that already established in the harbor of Savannah. In short, Port Royal would require the erection of new costly works, already constructed at Savannah, and the Government be subjected to useless and unjustifiable expense.

It has been said that it is not the purpose of the Government authorities to erect permanent fortifications in Port Royal harbor, and that the foregoing suggestions are not well founded; but with what expediency and economy could a station for the South Atlantic fleet be established at any given point without surrounding it with adequate means of protection in times of war?

If it is to be believed that iron-clad vessels will afford sufficient protection to such a station, either such vessels must be so constructed as to take the place of permanent land defenses and cost commensurate sums of money, or, if otherwise, such vessels must be confined to that one position and become unavailable when required at other points. The Government must be subjected to greater expense in either case: in the one to provide new stationary and in the other to increase the number of maneuvering vessels.

Second. The Government already owns ample available land accommodations in Savannah harbor for the purposes of a naval station, namely, the whole of Cockspar Island, on which Fort Pulaski rests, and two hundred and ten acres of land on Tybee Island, facing the anchorage and available for workshops, coal depots, storehouses, &c.

Third. Port Royal is little more than a natural harbor; it does not possess any important commercial establishment. While, therefore, it should not present any important local reasons for naval defense, it offers no advantage as a point of local supply for any portion of the Navy of the United States. Nor does it contain any of the facilities necessary as a place of naval resort. It has neither workshops nor docks. All these must be erected at the cost of the Government, even for temporary purposes of the most unimportant character. On the contrary, the city of Savannah does possess an extensive commercial establishment, with all its essential appliances. Its exports are the greatest in value on the South Atlantic coast—one-third in value of those of the Atlantic and Gulf ports, employing in 1875 shipping carrying 1,061,000 tons and manned by 30,600 seamen. Its imports are large in value, paying a revenue into the Government Treasury since the close of the war, in the shape of custom-house duties, of \$2,396,464. Its several railway communications leading from every portion of the Union, and its marine, concentrating from all civilized countries, bring every species of supplies demanded by a large local population and by extensive external commerce. It has workshops on a large scale. Its marine railway and dry-dock are capable of larger accommodations for the repairs of vessels than those of any port on the South Atlantic and are sufficient to receive an ordinary man-of-war. In addition to these advantages for affording general supplies and naval facilities, no American harbor excels that of Savannah in the character of the water fitted for naval use. Vessels are supplied directly from the Savannah River with water of the most wholesome kind and the least capable of putrescence, while it affords the best possible remedy against the destructiveness of the ship-worm. On the contrary, Port Royal harbor has no such facilities; drinking-water can be obtained there only from springs and wells with difficulty and expense, while it is of doubtful durability on the voyage.

Fourth. But while we venture to lay these pregnant facts before you as combining sufficient reasons why a naval station should not be established at Port Royal, and because the Government will thereby be subject to causeless and unjustifiable expenditures, we beg leave to add that, in our apprehension, such outlays will necessarily result in the establishment of a growing commerce at that point, to the serious and lasting detriment of the commerce of the city of Savannah and other parts of the State of Georgia. It should not be lost sight of that this city, in her corporate capacity, has expended from her treasury at least one-quarter of a million of dollars in the improvement of the navigation of the river, from which the Government has derived a large amount of revenue, cited above in the import duties paid by vessels profiting by the deepening of the river channel, and that Congress, recognizing the wisdom of our efforts, has in the past three years assumed the work of improvements, in order to perfect what Savannah, by her own unaided efforts, had conceived.

These advantages, with all the facilities and accommodations they contain, have been developed during a long period of industry and enterprise and at a vast outlay of public and private capital, from which the General Government itself has drawn large revenues; and we do most solemnly urge that the General Government should not, without such forcible reasons as cannot be made apparent in this case, seek to create a great public establishment, to be paid for in part from revenue derived from the people of Savannah and other ports and the people of the State of Georgia, and to threaten permanent and vital injury to their most valuable interests.

We do therefore respectfully ask the grave attention of our honorable Senators and Representatives to this important subject, invoking their just protection for the

great interests we have the honor to represent, and which we believe to be endangered by impending plans looking not so carefully to the establishment of a naval station at Port Royal as to the creation of a new commercial port at the expense of the General Government and to the irremediable detriment of vested interests existing elsewhere.

E. C. ANDERSON,  
Mayor, for and in behalf of the City Council.  
OCTAVUS COHEN,  
President Chamber Commerce.  
J. W. LATHROP,  
President Savannah Cotton Exchange.  
WM. M. WADLEY,  
President Central Railroad.  
JOHN SCREVEN,  
President Atlantic and Gulf Railroad.  
JOHN STODDARD,  
Chairman Commissioners of Pilotage.

SAVANNAH, February 4, 1876.

[Indorsement on the foregoing by the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, to whom the above was referred by the Secretary of the Navy for a report.]

BUREAU OF NAVIGATION, NAVY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, March 7, 1876.

[Relating to and accompanying memorial of the city of Savannah to Congress, setting forth the advantages of their waters for a naval station, referred to this Bureau by the Navy Department.]

The points are fairly presented in the memorial, and in comparison with the harbor of Port Royal.

First. The depth of water on the Savannah River bar is sufficient.

Second. The anchorage off Tybee Island and within the bar is ample in extent and is salubrious at all seasons.

Third. Pure fresh water is found at all seasons of the year at the head of Elba Island, or at a distance of about ten miles from the entrance of the river, and several miles lower down during a considerable part of the year. This would not only be of great advantage and economy for drinking supply, but also in preventing rust and the accumulation of barnacles and other animal and vegetable growths on the bottoms of iron vessels. This condition is of marked contrast to Port Royal. The fresh-water bills of the Dictator for six months amount to \$4,584.18, at the rate of \$9,168.36 yearly. With the force now making rendezvous at Port Royal, the cost for drinking-water will be not less than \$100,000 yearly. The vegetable and animal growth in Port Royal harbor on the bottoms of iron vessels is surprisingly great.

Fourth. The sufficiency of fortifications of the Savannah River, and the insufficiency, or rather absence, of them at Port Royal.

Fifth. The facilities of obtaining repairs and supplies of all kinds at reasonable rates and, if desired, directly from the North by steamers.

Sixth. The facility of hauling up or putting vessels into dry-dock, for repairs, and of sufficient capacity for all classes of vessels usual in those waters and at no greater cost than at northern ports.

Seventh. Should the yellow fever become epidemic at Savannah or in those waters, which is of rare occurrence, the proximity to Port Royal, Warsaw, and other sounds and ports less frequented, to which naval vessels could go.

Eighth. The proximity of an agreeable cultivated society, a preventive of low dissipation to the personnel, though affording necessary recreation and maintaining the morale, so necessary to effectiveness.

Ninth. Should the War Department allow the use of the wharf on Cockspar Island and the erection of sheds for coal and other supplies, and, if found convenient, to temporarily turn over Fort Pulaski to the Navy, with sheds, storehouses, &c., the supplies of coal, provisions, and other stores would be far safer from depredation or injury than would be the case at Port Royal without a considerable expenditure, and they would be landed and taken on board at small cost and with great facility.

For a depot of supplies, as above shown, the waters of Savannah River have special advantages. A personal knowledge of the localities mentioned enables me to give an expression of opinion such as would not be possible otherwise.

Respectfully submitted, March 8, 1876.

DANIEL AMMEN,  
Chief of Bureau of Navigation.

[Unofficial.]

BUREAU OF NAVIGATION, NAVY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, May 17, 1876.

DEAR SIR: In compliance with your request I have to state that the anchorage at Tybee Roads is regarded by all seamen as perfectly safe, and that it would be rough only when the wind set squarely in, and not across the broad flats at the entrance.

All vessels drawing sixteen or eighteen feet could on the first high tide go up beyond Cockspar Island where the water would be smooth, and could do so at low water, when the wind set squarely in, owing to the banking effects of the winds.

Referring to the comparison asked, I would say that Port Royal Harbor, low down, where the vessels usually laid, was generally as rough, or rougher than Tybee Roads, and not at all as smooth as above Cockspar Island.

The importance of fresh water for the bottoms of iron vessels is well known, and that it is simply a question of a very short time when the iron bottom lying quietly in salt water in a hot climate, will be actually rusted out or disintegrated.

The very considerable cost of fresh water for drinking purposes that would have to be purchased at Port Royal, would be far less than the cost of iron vessels through deterioration when lying quietly in salt water.

Very respectfully yours,

DANIEL AMMEN,  
Chief of Bureau of Navigation.

Hon. J. H. BLOUNT, M. C.

At the present time our vessels are rendezvousing at Port Royal, where there is no fresh water for our iron-clads, no storehouses, and no docks. Some of the iron-clads have been brought from Pensacola for the reason that there is no fresh water at that point. It is urged that Savannah is a proper place for a naval rendezvous, first, because the anchorage there is good and, second, because there is a dry-dock and ship-yard there, with fresh water and communication with New York by land and water. The Government is already in possession of three hundred acres of land on Cockspar Island, quite as much or more land on Tybee Island. On Tybee Island there is every facility for stores, and great numbers of buildings that are now of no use.

There will be no expenditure required by the Government to make that a naval rendezvous. The Secretary of War recommends it, and



I am informed that the Secretary of the Navy thinks it is a proper thing to be done. It will be to the advantage of the Government, in order that the buildings now under the control of the War Department may be utilized for this purpose.

The chief of the Bureau of Navigation states in his communication that in the item of water alone for the vessels at Port Royal the sum of \$100,000 has been expended. That shows how improper it was to select that place as a naval rendezvous and how very proper that the provision in reference to Tybee Island should be adopted.

At this late stage of the session and in view of the feeling of members that the business of the country shall be proceeded with instead of our time being taken up in debate, I do not feel at liberty to go further than I have in occupying the time of the House. I will therefore yield the remainder of my time to the honorable gentleman from Maine, [Mr. HALE.]

Mr. HALE. I will yield the time allotted to me to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. FREEMAN.] Before he proceeds, allow me to say that the gentleman represents a district in which is located one of these yards; and as he desires to present his views upon the subject, and for the further reason that I am desirous that we shall as soon as possible get to the five-minutes debate upon this bill, I will yield my time to him and not take it myself.

Mr. FREEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] for his courtesy.

It had not been my intention to consume the time of the House upon matters outside of the committee upon which I have the honor of serving, but the importance of the amendment which I understand is to be offered to the bill under consideration, not only to those whom I more immediately represent but to the vital interests of the country at large, has impelled me to feel not merely the inclination but the solemn duty of entering my protest against the principle upon which it claims to be based. I had rather say, sir, want of principle, for I fail to appreciate the patriotism or the statesmanship or even the political sagacity from which it can claim existence. Do gentlemen remember that this is a great nation, destined to become the greatest on the face of the globe, if it shall not be stricken down and its natural future destroyed by ignorance or intentionally insidious legislation? These, sir, are the dangers to be feared, and not the provision of the proper and necessary funds for carrying out the functions of Government. It is a most remarkable picture that we find presents itself, if we look back to the early days of 1861. The party now in power in this House for the first time since those dark days had wielded possession of the Government for many years before. Yet the condition of this branch of service, so vital to the preservation of the nation's life at that time, was worse than pitiable. So little prepared were we for a foreign war that we could not secure, with all the tonnage of the country, an efficient closing of our own ports. It is within the memory of every member of this House that so helpless were we from fatal want of foresight or intentional neglect that two cruisers alone were able to sweep the broad seas of almost every vestige of American commerce.

And I beg to say, sir, to this House that I refer to this past in no spirit wanting in fraternal regard, for I would to God while its experiences must live its memories might be buried from the face of the earth and blotted from every heart. But I do so, nevertheless, to invoke the teachings of its philosophy and to gather forethought from the lessons of its sad experiences. What would have been the result, nay, what must inevitably be the result if by the unforeseen wisdom of Providence we should be engaged this year in a foreign war? Why, sir, Great Britain, France, Italy, and even poor torn Spain could blow the American Navy to atoms. It may not be palatable to American pride, but it is exactly the existing state of facts. And yet to-day the American Navy is in a better condition than it has ever been since we have had a Government. But it has fallen far out of sight of the natural growth and increase of the nation, and a casual comparison of the figures will show how little our wise men have appreciated the corresponding growth of our relations and interests abroad and our dignity among the nations of the world.

Navy are not capable of springing into vitality in a day; and I propose to give a few of the figures to show how important this branch of the service has been considered by every European power. England, with all her magnificent ship-yards costing hundreds of millions already created, expended in the year ending March 31, 1874, £10,244,355; in 1875, £10,678,092; in 1876, £10,825,194; and in 1877 the estimates are for nearly fifty-seven millions of dollars, or nearly 450 per cent. more than the amount appropriated in this bill. These countries have a length of coast not to be mentioned in extent with ours. During the last hundred years the populations have grown but a fractional degree of the extent of our own young land, which has increased, despite its trials and internecine struggle, 1,300 per cent. And, sir, if this is the history of past growth, what is to be expected of the future? Are we to close our eyes to these facts and thoughts in legislating upon a subject of the gravity and importance of the one under consideration? Are we to hack and hew away at this appropriation involving the future welfare and safety of this people with the same disregard of the public necessity and duty as has characterized the legislation on the diplomatic bill or that pertaining to pinched and beggarly clerks?

Sir, I raise my voice against any such ruinous policy. I am opposed to an economy which is to expose us, as in the Virginian affair, without a moment's warning, to the hasty and inconsiderate expenditure

of emergency money, which a proper state of national defense would have prevented. Has this nation no dignity? Has it no foreign relations involving high national duties? Is it to go on forgetful in the present of the possible dangers of the future? Are we proof against the passions and dangers which older nations watch with such jealous care? It seems to me far otherwise. Of all countries, this is essentially a maritime one. The ocean is certain to be alive with its commerce. It is but a question of time, and of comparatively approximate time. One long line of coast sweeping the edges of the Atlantic and Pacific and the Gulf of Mexico, will be teeming with busy ports. Give them protection and a feeling of security, such as that accorded by other nations to those sailing beneath their flags. Let us look at this matter in a broad spirit of patriotism, and be not penny-wise and pound-foolish.

Let me say, sir, that by the Constitution authority is granted to the legislating power to establish and maintain a navy, and this involves a duty of a lofty and imperious character. It should be exercised with stability, and should not be subject to the varying impulses of changing and uncertain legislation. All such legislation should be founded upon a scientific regard for the seriousness of the consequences. It should be guided by the intelligence of the best minds, and not be wafted upon the shifting current of vacillating party politics.

The introduction of steam worked of itself a wonderful change in the relations and conditions of maritime nations. Time and the experience of war here in our own land in one year revolutionized the system of war-ships and naval warfare throughout the world. I ask the Clerk to read a passage I have marked in the report of the Secretary of the Navy for 1874.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### A COMPARISON WITH FOREIGN NAVIES.

While we have been satisfied with our iron vessels built during the civil war, many of which proved worthless, the following is the result of the enterprise of foreign nations, who seem to vie with each other in the race of building iron-clads and casting heavy guns.

England has built, and is building, since the introduction of iron-clads, fifty-five vessels of 322,858 tons, iron-clad, armor-plated ships, and iron-plated gun-boats. France has built forty-four iron-cased vessels of all kinds, or 188,375 tons; Russia, twenty-four iron-plated vessels, or 67,000 tons; Italy, twenty-two, or 75,101 tons; Austria, nine, or 36,119 tons; Turkey, four, or 16,884 tons; Spain, eleven, or 42,000 tons; Sweden, five, or 5,100 tons; Denmark, six, or 10,836 tons; Holland, five, or — tons; Germany, eleven, or 63,776 tons; one hundred and ninety-six iron-clads, all told, to say nothing of Chili and Peru, which have a larger force of these vessels than the combined forces of all the foreign nations on their coasts.

The nation that seems to be advancing most rapidly in naval power is the German Empire, which, from having a very small force of vessels in 1869, has now a very respectable one, and in a few years will possess an iron-clad navy only inferior in size to those of England, France, and Russia.

Mr. FREEMAN. Hence the necessity, only too evident to those whose position and education had best fitted them to judge, for the corresponding revolution in material and conveniences to suit the changed condition of things. And this progress and improvement still necessitate and create additional change. Hence the introduction of iron-clads worked a great modification and alteration in the requirements of such vessels as were laid up either for repairs or in ordinary. They demanded imperatively such water as would act less disastrously upon the iron plates than salt water. It is interesting to mark this era in naval affairs. As early as March 25, 1862, the Secretary of the Navy called attention to this general subject in a communication to the House Committee on Naval Affairs. On June 9 following he said:

It is now generally conceded that vessels for fighting purposes must be heavily plated with iron, if they are not built entirely of that material. In this, as in most costly fabrics, economy is reached through durability. Iron ship-building is new in this country, but few persons are engaged in it, and it is a novelty in our yards. Heavy iron beams, shafting, and thick iron plates can be procured from only two or three parties, and then in limited quantities and subject to great delay. Individuals have little use for iron of such magnitude as the Navy must have, and there must unavoidably be great outlay to prepare for the execution of such work. With only the Navy for a purchaser there can be no competition, and the Government will be compelled under such circumstances to pay almost any price the mills and forges may demand. No inconsiderable portion of an iron ship can be made and procured at the ordinary mills, and so far as it can be done it may be the best policy to be so supplied; but as the heavy and expensive portions cannot be so procured, and unless the Government is prepared to execute the work, it will be subject to imposition and its vessels to marked inferiority.

And it is no less a necessity than a duty that we should legislate for these United States as a great maritime power. The laws of nature have decreed it, and nothing but our own folly can prevent it from becoming so. It is far different, it will be perceived, from the question presented by the Army. Experience has demonstrated, from the wonderful extent of our territory and the physical surroundings of the case, that we need entertain no fear on that score. To defend this country against a foreign foe millions of men could be raised in a week, and the extraordinary development of our manufacturing interests could almost as rapidly equip them.

But, sir, a navy is a work of time. Its growth, to be substantial and well conditioned, must be, relatively, slow. It must be subject to the improvements and changes and advances yearly being made by the great nations, and required by the advancing spirit of the times, and the growing wants of the country. For my part I am opposed to the abandonment of any of our navy-yards. Should such a course be adopted, in my opinion the time will come when it will be deeply regretted. I can see no logic in the proposition to wait until a city is burned down to build the necessary fire-extinguishing apparatus, and I can see no radical difference between the cases.



The whole object and reasoning and necessities which led the Government to establish League Island were to supply an imperative national want. It was not done or intended as an *additional* yard, and it is not one in fact. It is one of a *different character* only, and has been established with the purpose of meeting the requirements of the changed condition of naval affairs and the needs of an iron navy. The Secretary of the Navy, in his annual report of December 1, 1862, says upon this subject:

In selecting a site for such a navy-yard, there are two essential and controlling considerations which must govern. One is the very great advantage (if not absolute necessity) of fresh water over salt water for the preservation of iron vessels. The other is security from an attack by a foreign enemy. These two primary qualities are to be had at League Island. Iron and coal are also in close proximity to that location.

In regard to the location of naval depots, and the necessity for having them secure from foreign enemies, I cannot more clearly present what are the requisites than by quoting from the report of a very able board of eminent officers and engineers on the sea-coast defenses, made in 1820, as found in Naval Library, volume 13, page 4, as follows:

Security against an attack by sea or land is undoubtedly the first condition required; for the destruction of an establishment of this nature involves with it the destruction of all those elements of a naval force which have been collected a long time beforehand and during peace, to the incalculable loss of the public. Such a misfortune must be severely felt during the whole course of a war, and cannot well be repaired while it continues. This indispensable quality (security) must be obtained, as well as localities will admit, without having recourse to artificial fortifications, for these must be very costly; and if that expense can be avoided, the same sums will be much more advantageously laid out in improving and aggrandizing the establishment of the depot. Thus, if equal in other respects, a place whose site is naturally strong and whose position with respect to the general frontier is well covered should be preferred to another that requires to be fortified.

The great essential here specified of security from attack by a foreign enemy appertains to League Island, which has in that respect strong topographical advantages. Its interior location might have constituted an objection at a former period when only sailing-vessels were in the naval service, but the introduction of steam has wrought a revolution in this respect, rendering the movements of our war vessels independent of wind and tide. Immediate contiguity to the ocean is no longer deemed an advantage, but a disadvantage. Steam, rifled cannon, and modern improvements in ordnance have rendered harbors and depots immediately on the seaboard insecure. In a recent debate in the British Parliament it was emphatically urged that Portsmouth and its immense and costly works must be abandoned, for the reason that a naval depot should not be within the range of five or six miles of an attacking force. If, then, fresh water be indispensable for a navy-yard for the construction, repair, and dockage of iron vessels and vessels that are clad with iron, there is no position east of the Delaware where the difficulties from ice do not exceed those urged against League Island, nor has any place been proposed that presents equal advantages or is so secure from an attack. While there are some obvious and admitted objections to League Island, no place has been proposed that combines so many advantages, unless it be the contracted and altogether inadequate yard at Philadelphia. That yard may perhaps be extended so as to double its present capacity, but, besides involving a large expenditure, it would be then insufficient for our future iron navy.

So also, in the same document:

There is no doubt that for the purpose of a navy-yard and establishment for an iron navy and its wants the banks of the Delaware present advantages that are not to be found elsewhere in the United States.

So also, long after the bitter experience of war practically illustrated the destitute condition of a country like ours without the proper facilities for building an iron vessel, in reply to a resolution of this House of Representatives, under date of May 9, 1864, the Secretary of the Navy says:

I have felt it my duty on repeated occasions to call the attention of Congress to the necessities for a yard and establishment where iron and armored vessels could be constructed for the Government, but the preliminary steps for such an establishment have not yet been taken. In the mean time the Department and the Government are wholly dependent on contractors, who, if they have the will, do not possess the ability to furnish these vessels promptly. Conflicting local controversies in regard to the place which shall be selected and benefited by the proposed important national establishment for an iron navy, such as the present and future necessities of the Government require, have contributed to delay action on this important subject. Having in view economy, as well as the public necessities, I have at no time recommended that the number of our navy-yards should be increased on the Atlantic coast, but it is my deliberate opinion that no time should be wasted in establishing at a proper place a suitable yard where iron vessels can be made and repaired. We feel its necessity in the emergency which has called forth the present inquiry, and not a single contractor is able to meet his engagement even for one of this class of small vessels. In the event of a foreign war with one or more of the principal maritime powers, our position would be most unfortunate, with no Government establishment for the construction or repair of armed vessels such as modern science and skill are introducing.

Such, sir, were the controlling reasons which led the authorities to establish the naval depot at League Island. Strong and unanswerable as they were then, they are stronger far to-day. They appeal with redoubled force against the influence of any conflicting local prejudices, to the patriotism of men who love their country and take a proper pride in the future glory of free Government. I have already said I speak from no sentiment of local pride in this matter, but from an abiding sense of my duty to the whole country. Philadelphia in this, as throughout her past history, has shown her disinterested devotion to the welfare of the entire country. When the question of iron vessels and a fresh-water station for iron vessels was originally suggested by the sufferings and the wants of the nation, the head of the Department wrote to the mayor of Philadelphia to know if League Island could be obtained. Philadelphia came nobly forward and offered to purchase and present to the Government this site, if it were deemed suitable and proper for the purpose. After exhaustive examination it was so deemed; and Philadelphia accordingly purchased and presented the site to the United States in fee. She has since laid out largely of her public money in improving and developing the means of access, and, save as she loves the welfare of the nation, she

has no other interest in it. It surely is not necessary for me to dwell on that.

Only a few days ago every member of this body had visible evidence of the generous, loyal spirit actuating her noble people. They have given without stint, both city and State, to celebrate the anniversary of—not *their* birth, not *their* vanity or *their* glory—but of the sealing anew and the reconsecration of the pledge of free government for a free people throughout the wide borders of the world. The proposition which is made to abolish League Island I trust, therefore, I may be permitted to oppose without being charged with any selfish sentiments of local interest. Why, sir, in December, 1864, the Secretary of the Navy again iterates and reiterates his views in this behalf. He says, alluding once more to this matter and impressed with the vast importance of it:

An extensive water frontage must also be secured. For such a depot and establishment, where costly machinery and material would accumulate during years of peace, the advantages of an interior location are most manifest. These favorable conditions are to be obtained nowhere else so completely as on the Delaware River; and the position of League Island, within the limits of the city of Philadelphia, presents probably a stronger combination of the points that are necessary than any other location.

And this, sir, was a gentleman from near New London, the only other place offering to assist the Government. He had gone through the fiery trials of actual experience, and knew what it was in the day of carnage to hear calls for that which it was impossible to supply. He knew the desperation of the situation and the imperative duty due to the future. He says again—and who can say it may not be with prophetic words?—

Our next contest may be with a naval power which will attempt to direct upon our shores a course of operations similar to those which we have applied to the southern coast for suppressing the rebellion. One yard at least where iron vessels, iron armor, and iron shafting can be manufactured is now imperatively necessary. Among the considerations that should control the selection of a site for such a yard and establishment, which shall become the depot for the materials collected in years of peace with which to build and repair our naval vessels, and where will be aggregated machinery and tools such as at present are not to be found in this country, and which, when once procured, could not if destroyed be easily or readily replaced, will be its absolute safety from attack by sea or land. So far as is possible we should avail ourselves of natural advantages in obtaining the indispensable security for such an establishment, without depending entirely on fortifications and artificial means, which would be more costly than the navy-yard itself.

I have heard the argument suggested that it will cost largely to complete League Island, and therefore this rash measure of destruction is commendable. This, I beg to say, is a *non sequitur*, and is just no argument at all. Was there ever anything more absurd? Is it within the range of human reason to suggest an illustration of greater want of knowledge in the whole history of nations than such a proposition? Why, sir, what are the duties of the Government and for what the exercise of the proper functions of power if not to provide itself for a day of war and for the time of trial? If we are ever to maintain our power and dignity among the nations of the earth, it must be by our flag upon the ocean.

The combined navy-yards and stations of the United States are to-day far more than equaled by single establishments of France and England. The latter nation has expended on Portsmouth alone over \$50,000,000 for additional fortifications, rendered necessary by its proximity to the sea and the improvements of modern ordnance developed by the American civil war.

I propose to give a few figures to illustrate the relationship of our Navy now, as far as regards the appropriations therefor in this bill, in comparison with those made say from 1853 to 1860, when the party represented by the gentlemen on the other side of this House had full control of the Government. Then we were in possession of duly-organized naval establishments fitted for the then order of things. Iron vessels had nowhere been heard of in the history of the world, and no one had ever dreamed of the necessities which have arisen since 1861. The following are the amounts appropriated for the support of the Navy for the eight years preceding the war:

1852.....	\$7,853,042 18
1853.....	10,099,156 71
1854.....	13,694,353 37
1855.....	11,458,610 65
1856.....	15,701,968 49
1857.....	14,117,637 03
1858.....	13,109,357 36
1859.....	15,580,991 99
1860.....	10,279,483 03
Total.....	111,894,622 81

The appropriations for five of these years far exceed the amount proposed in this bill, and the reasons given then are the ones which are sound to-day. Changes were being made to conform to the introduction of steam, and funds were needed then as they are now to suit the progressive spirit of the times. And such should always be the aim of a wise legislation as tending to true economy and public safety. And yet what does the record show. The Secretary of the Navy, in his report for 1862, says:

From mistaken economy or from design the Government was, in its need, deficient in ships and destitute of material for their construction. No alternative was left when resistance was made but for the Department to build its vessels as speedily as possible and of such timber as could, in the greatest haste and emergency, be procured. As a consequence vessels that should have lasted for years will soon perish, and must in the mean time involve heavy expense in necessary repairs in order to keep them afloat.

Is it the intention of this House to have this nation once more encounter such a possible contingency? Even Germany, recognizing



the great necessity, has appropriated \$72,000,000 for naval purposes since the Franco-German war. Her voice in the councils of Europe will be increased thereby, and add to the probability or possibility, after the unsettled condition on the continent has passed away, of the inauguration of a European policy in conflict with cherished American ideas, but which the United States will be, when too late, unable to impede. I hope the experience of the past will not be thrown away, and cannot believe otherwise than that this House will vote down all amendments looking to the further abandonment or destruction of our Navy and its establishments.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time I have sought the attention of this House; and if I can secure that attention for a few minutes, I desire to give expression to some views on the general condition of the country which I trust may tend to promote reform by showing the necessity for it, and I desire also to say some things in reference to the people of my own State, which I hope may tend to remove prejudices which exist against them in the minds of many honest people of the North and, by the removal of these prejudices, produce a better feeling toward them.

It has been well said that "plain words are best," and if there be any one place where plain words may be more fittingly spoken than another, that place should be on the floor of the American Congress. While each member in this House represents in an especial sense his immediate constituency, whose interest it is his duty to guard, he is also in a much broader sense charged within the limits of the Constitution with legislation for the general welfare of the whole country; and as a wound to any part or member of the body affects the whole body, so legislation which is unjust to any part of the country, however insignificant, or legislation which discriminates in favor of any part of the country, however great, will in the end produce evil; and we can only promote the "general welfare" by carefully guarding and protecting the rights and interests of every part. This we cannot do if our judgments are warped by prejudices or if we shut our eyes to wrongs that exist in any section of the country because they seem not to affect our immediate constituencies. It is by a free interchange of opinions and a candid statement of the conditions, the wants, the rights, and the wrongs of our respective sections that we are enabled to inform ourselves and to do exact justice to all—to remedy evils resulting from national legislation if any exist, and to prevent a recurrence of wrongs if any have been perpetrated; and by doing this we, each and every one of us, best discharge our duties and best serve our own people.

The substance as well as the form must be preserved.

It was a poet and not a statesman who said:

For forms of state let fools contest;  
Whate'er is best administered is best.

So far as this sentiment ignores the virtue of forms I do not indorse it, but the best form of government may be administered so ignorantly or so corruptly as to destroy the virtue of the good "form" and make it, in fact, a very bad government. "A sound mind in a sound body" has been, from very ancient times, regarded as constituting the highest type of man; and a good "form of state," a sound constitutional government, wisely, honestly, well and faithfully administered, constitutes the best type of government. We have in our Constitution, in my judgment, the best form of government that has been devised for mankind. The "form" is good, it is the "best;" and if the highest interest of the people has not at all times been secured or promoted by it, the fault has not been in the "form," but in the administration of it; and when this has been faulty, it is the duty of the people, whose government it is, to correct the evil, and reform, not the "form" of government, but the administration of it.

#### RESPONSIBILITY.

Power and duty carry with them responsibility. No one can dispute this proposition. The man who has power to act, and whose duty it is to act, is unquestionably responsible for his action, is responsible for the manner in which he exercises power and discharges his duty. If he does it well, he is entitled to commendation; if otherwise, to condemnation. This abstract proposition will not be denied.

Now, as a fact, and I state it as a fact which no candid man can controvert, the republican party for nearly fifteen years has had absolute control of this Government. In each branch of the national Legislature that party had much of the time a majority of more than two-thirds, and could enact any law that might be deemed conducive to the public good or promotive of party interest. I know that it has been attempted by straitened party leaders, who see and feel the force of the corruption which has marked the administration of public affairs, to break that force and shirk responsibility by charging that the administration of Andrew Johnson was democratic. A distinguished republican, a prominent aspirant for the Presidency, (I allude to Mr. MORTON,) has had the candor to admit that "there has been a good deal stolen;" but he says—I quote his words:

The administration of this Government was substantially in the hands of the democratic party during the years 1865, 1866, 1867, and 1868. I have here a statement of the tax on whisky during this period of substantial democratic administration as collected, leaving off the hundreds. For the fiscal year ending the 1st of July, 1866, the receipts were \$33,268,000; for 1867, \$33,542,000; and for 1868, \$18,655,000, with a tax of \$2 per gallon on whisky.

And another leading and distinguished republican [Mr. SHERMAN] says:

We know very well that Andrew Johnson, with all the power in his hands, with officers scattered over the country, with a tax of \$2, only succeeded in collecting \$18,

000,000 from the whisky tax, or the tax on 9,000,000 gallons; therefore when the Senator charges \$1,300,000,000 of lost revenue, I hope he will charge the administration of Andrew Johnson in 1868 with \$182,000,000 of the loss, because if the tax had been collected, \$2 tax on 100,000,000 gallons would have produced \$200,000,000, and we only got \$18,000,000.

The facts as to the loss are true, but the statement that the Government was during this period "substantially in the hands of the democratic party" is so wild, is so great a mistake, that I am utterly astounded that it should emanate from statesmen holding the highest places in their party, and I am saddened by the thought that it is possible that the weight of such eminent names may impose it upon the country and serve to divert the public mind from the authors of frauds upon the revenues which these gentlemen are obliged to concede. But the charge that the democratic party had control of this Government in 1865, 1866, 1867, and 1868 seems to me entirely "too thin" to impose upon any one. The republican party had a majority of more than two-thirds in the Senate and in the House, and Andrew Johnson had been chosen as one of their leaders. He was elected by them. No democrat voted for him; and when our republican friends seek to hold the democratic party responsible for the action of public officers, they ought at least to have the fairness to allow that party to select the officers for whose acts they are to be held responsible. I myself, in view of the selections they have made from their own party, should most earnestly protest against being held to account for a democratic President elected solely by republican votes. He would be a rare democrat indeed, and from his begetting it would be wonderful if things went well with the country. However, our republican friends seem to select as by instinct a certain class of men for office, and it may be that when they went into the democratic party to find an officer that instinct guided the selection, and it would perhaps be unreasonable to expect them to make a better selection from the democratic party than from their own.

But to be serious, even if Andrew Johnson had been a democratic President, chosen by the democratic party, and for whose acts that party could be honestly held responsible, which is not the fact, every candid and truthful man must concede that he was powerless. All his important appointments had to be confirmed by the Senate, and, as I have stated, the republicans had largely more than two-thirds of that body; but not content with this, with the intent to deprive him of all power, which they did effectually, they passed early in March, 1867, the act regulating the tenure of certain civil officers. This act stripped him of the power to remove or control in the slightest degree his Cabinet and other officers, who by the time-honored usage of the country had been held to be more immediately responsible to the Executive and should be in accord with him. This act not only deprived Andrew Johnson of the right of removal as it had been exercised prior to that time, but we all remember how certain officers, of very delicate sensibilities but hostile to the President, did "stick" to use a noted word of the day, and, instead of his being responsible, he had no party power whatever, and having no power, according to the maxim with which we set out, he had no responsibility. His Cabinet and subordinates, those "officers scattered over the country," were all republicans, "dyed in the wool," and most of them hostile to Andrew Johnson. He had no power over their action. By the tenure-of-office act he was liable to a fine of \$10,000 and to imprisonment for five years if he attempted to remove one of these officers, though he might have been caught stealing, and many doubtless were engaged in that popular official vice; and any one whom he might appoint was liable to a like punishment if he should attempt to exercise the functions of office.

But it is puerile and, to say the least of it, uncandid to say that the democratic party had control of this Government during that period; and it would be equally as uncandid for any republican to say that his party did not have absolute political power, so far as a party can have it, from March, 1861, to the present time, certainly to the sitting of this Congress; and they now have power to prevent any action which they may choose to prevent. Well, they have had the power, and, as I have said, power, duty, and responsibility go together; and if the country has prospered and is now prosperous; if industry has had its full reward; if public offices have been faithfully, honestly, and economically administered; if no one has been oppressed; if public officers have discharged their duties well and with reference to the public good; if confidence in the integrity of public servants gives to the people a feeling of safety and security; if there has been no legislation tending to the advantage of a favored few at the expense of the many, no discriminating legislation by which individuals have become millionaires while the laboring millions have languished and the industrious poor have been robbed of the reward of their labors; if the public revenues have been collected faithfully and honestly accounted for; if we have had a currency that supplied the wants of trade and was just to all classes; if, in one sentence, the people are to-day contented, prosperous, and happy, then it would be unjust, it would be uncandid, it would be dishonest to withhold commendation and praise from the party which has been in power, and not to give to that party the plaudit and reward of "well done."

But if, on the other hand, the country has not been prosperous; if industry has not had its fair reward; if reckless extravagance, fraud, and dishonesty have marked in any degree the administration of public affairs; if public officers, (the head of the Government setting the example,) instead of discharging well their duties and with reference to the public good, have regarded and treated their offices as



private property to be used for private gain and advantage or as personal rewards to retainers and partisans for personal favor and party support; if the confidence of the people in the integrity of public servants has been shaken and there is a feeling of uncertainty pervading the public mind; if by partial and unjust legislation monopolies have been established and classes favored, and wealth heaped upon these favored classes; if the purses of those favored few have been made fat with yellow gold, doubling and quadrupling their investments, while the laboring masses have not been able to get even "rag money," as it is now derisively called, though at one time it was little short of treason to say aught to its discredit, and that too when these favored classes were buying with it their gold-bearing bonds at prices ranging at from less than forty cents to eighty-five cents on the dollar in gold; and now these bonds are to be paid in full in gold, dollar for dollar.

I must not be and will not be understood as saying one word against the constitutional obligation to pay these bonds, but what I mean to say, and what I do say, is that the party in power, with all its pretensions to regard for the poor and lowly, is responsible for that system of finance which has enriched the few and beggared the million—which has given to the capitalist gold and to the laborer "rags," which has paralyzed industry and filled the land with bankrupts. By establishing a banking system which excludes competition and every basis of credit other than national bonds, (for the banking act with the 10 per cent. tax effectually does this,) they have given to these bondholders and the corporations established by them the great and dangerous power of controlling the industry and to a great extent the legislation of the country.

If these things be so; if all the industries of the country have languished, commerce been destroyed, agriculture, manufactures, shipping decayed; if confidence has been destroyed and universal distrust over-spreads the land; if the people have mourned and are mourning, and we have high authority for saying "when the wicked rule the people mourn"—if, in one sentence, the people to-day are not contented, prosperous, and happy—then it would be candid, just, fair, truthful, honest, to say that the long dominant, controlling republican party is responsible for this condition of affairs, and it is the duty of the people to correct, not the form of government, but the administration of it.

#### EXTRAVAGANCE OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

Economy and simplicity should characterize a republican government, and honesty and fidelity should mark the character of its public servants. In the earlier days of the Republic this was the case. From the 4th day of March, 1789, the day the Federal Constitution went into operation, down to June 30, 1875, the entire net ordinary receipts of the Government, exclusive of loans, amounted to \$6,337,034,618.25. Of this sum only \$1,841,953,353.62 were collected from the foundation of the Government down to 1861, and \$4,495,081,264.63 have been collected since that time. That is, largely more than twice as much money has been collected from the people in fourteen years of republican rule than was collected in more than seventy years prior to their advent to power. Now let us see how about the expenses for the same period of time. From March 4, 1789, to June 30, 1875, the net ordinary expenses of the Government—as any one may see by adding the figures under the head of "net ordinary expenses," on pages 65 to 67 of the official report (pamphlet copy) of the Register of the Treasury, made November 4, 1875—amounted to \$6,801,956,954.69. I have caused a table to be made, grouping these expenditures so as to show the amounts expended each four years of the successive administrations of the Government. Here it is:

*Civil list and net ordinary expenditures of the United States Government, by periods of four years, from the organization of the Government.—(Condensed from the report of the Register of the Treasury for 1875.)*

Dates.	Civil list.	Net ordinary expenditures.
From March 4, 1789, to December 31, 1792....	\$1,138,052 03	\$3,797,493 20
For four years ending December 31, 1796....	1,607,960 07	12,093,205 35
For four years ending December 31, 1800....	2,329,433 08	21,348,351 19
For four years ending December 31, 1804....	2,297,648 17	17,174,432 96
For four years ending December 31, 1808....	2,616,772 77	25,926,355 72
For four years ending December 31, 1812....	2,887,197 98	36,117,857 98
For four years ending December 31, 1816....	3,768,342 61	108,537,086 88
For four years ending December 31, 1820....	4,494,606 42	57,698,087 71
For four years ending December 31, 1824....	4,665,602 11	45,665,421 88
For four years ending December 31, 1828....	5,271,124 34	50,501,913 31
For four years ending December 31, 1832....	6,081,307 73	56,270,480 62
For four years ending December 31, 1836....	7,659,086 86	89,522,286 68
For four years ending December 31, 1840....	9,899,496 58	121,729,801 16
From January 1, 1841, to June 30, 1845....	11,508,546 86	104,360,163 10
For four years ending June 30, 1849....	10,615,571 14	165,381,026 34
For four years ending June 30, 1853....	14,214,458 90	165,684,050 48
For four years ending June 30, 1857, (Pierce)....	25,036,171 74	232,820,632 35
For four years ending June 30, 1861, (Buchanan)....	25,180,671 32	261,165,809 62
For four years ending June 30, 1865, (Lincoln)....	30,765,508 71	3,176,017,346 94
For four years ending June 30, 1869, (Johnson)....	*66,412,391 61	1,012,420,202 14
For four years ending June 30, 1873, (Grant)....	†69,989,774 16	656,066,892 39
For one year ending June 30, 1874, (Grant)....	17,646,253 38	194,217,210 27
For one year ending June 30, 1875, (Grant)....	17,346,929 53	171,529,848 27

\* This includes \$7,200,000 paid for Alaska; also \$5,505,451.79 paid for mail service, Post-Office Department.

† Total in six years of Grant's two terms, \$1,021,813,950.91.

From March 4, 1789, to June 30, 1861, the entire net ordinary expenses of the Government amounted to \$1,581,706,195.34. From June 30, 1861, to June 30, 1875, fourteen years of republican rule, the net ordinary expenses amounted to \$5,220,250,759.35—and this is exclusive of the public or war debt; that is, fourteen years of republican rule cost the Government more than three times as much money as the whole cost of the Government from 1789 to 1861, a period of seventy-two years. But it may well be said that the ordinary expenses of the Government during the war were necessarily increased. That is true, and to make the comparison fair let us take a period of ten years since the war; and I wish it to be borne in mind that I am now speaking of the "net ordinary expenses" of the Government, exclusive of the interest paid on the public debt, which amounted to over \$1,000,000,000, and the sums paid on the public debt itself, which amounted to many hundred millions more. From March 4, 1789, to June 30, 1861, the expenses of the Government—embracing a period of more than seventy-two years, covering the war of 1812, the Indian wars, and the Mexican war—amounted, as I have already shown, to only \$1,581,706,195.34. The net ordinary expenses of the four years of Johnson's administration was \$1,012,420,202.14; six years of President Grant, \$1,021,813,950—making in ten years of peace the enormous sum of \$2,034,233,412.14, being nearly one-third more than all the expenses of the Government for seventy-two years, from 1789 to 1861, including the war of 1812, the Indian and the Mexican wars; and if you add to the ordinary expenses of the six years of President Grant's administration the amount of principal and interest paid on the public debt, it will amount to \$4,008,438,461.82; that is, more than two and a half times as much as the entire expenses of the Government from March 4, 1789, to June 30, 1861. I have here the table showing the total expenditures under the administration of President Grant for six years, from June 30, 1869, to June 30, 1875, as will be seen from the official report of the Register of the Treasury, page 67 of the pamphlet report:

Year ending June 30—	
1870.....	\$703,155,391 44
1871.....	692,238,332 40
1872.....	682,360,760 17
1873.....	523,785,932 23
1874.....	724,897,160 26
1875.....	682,000,885 32

Making a total for six years..... 4,008,438,461 82

Total receipts from all sources for the same period of six years, (see page 62:)

Year ending June 30—	
1870.....	\$696,729,973 63
1871.....	652,085,864 54
1872.....	679,158,419 73
1873.....	548,672,269 47
1874.....	744,252,330 30
1875.....	675,971,607 10

Total receipts for six years..... 3,996,880,464 77

#### FRAUDS.

But this is not the worst. I have shown from the official report that the net ordinary revenue collected by the Government and which went into the Treasury since 1861 amounted to \$4,495,081,264.63. Now I propose to show from high republican authority and from official sources that that was not more than three-fourths of the amount that ought to have gone into the Treasury, and that the remaining one-fourth, amounting in round numbers to \$1,500,000,000, that ought to have gone into the Treasury, has been lost to the Government, lost by the failure of those whose duty it was to collect it—to do so, or to account for it; lost, I said—that puts it too mildly, stolen—stolen from the people by corrupt and fraudulent officials and combinations and rings. And now for the proof.

The commission appointed by the President under the act of March 4, 1871, consisting of George William Curtis, Alexander G. Cattell, Joseph Medill, Damson A. Walker, E. B. Elliott, Joseph H. Blackfan, and David C. Cox, made their report in 1871. And the President by his special message of December 19, 1871, transmitting this report to Congress, indorses it and "asks for all the strength which Congress can give to enable me [him] to carry out the reforms recommended by the commissioners." These commissioners say, (Senate Documents No. 1 to 2, second session Forty-second Congress, 1871-72:)

It is not easy to compute in figures the exact economical difference between a good and a bad system of the civil service. It is, necessarily, a matter of inference and of comparison between the probable operation of a careless and a careful method. But it is calculated by those who have made a careful study of all the facts, that one-fourth of the revenues of the United States are annually lost in the collection, and for a large part of that loss a system of the service which is partially unsound may reasonably be held responsible.

Now, if this estimate is correct—and it is an estimate made by the highest republican authority, and I doubt not and I think I can show is under rather than over the mark—if this estimate is correct, not more than three-fourths of the revenue that ought to have gone there has found its way into the Treasury, leaving the other one-fourth, amounting in exact figures to \$1,498,360,421.54, to be accounted for as "strayed, lost, or stolen," especially the last. But were these commissioners correct in their estimate? I propose to show that their estimate of the amount is, if anything, too small. The Secretary of the Treasury (Mr. Fessenden) in his annual report for 1864 said "the annual yield of our distilleries has been about 100,000,000 gallons." The census



of 1860 shows that it was then over 90,000,000; and I suppose I may safely appeal to the observation of the country for proof that the consumption of ardent spirits has kept full pace with the increase of population. I have here a statement showing the number of gallons of distilled spirits on which the tax was collected and returned to the Office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for each fiscal year since the organization of the present internal-revenue system:

*Statement showing the number of gallons of distilled spirits on which the tax was collected and returned to the Office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for each fiscal year since the organization of the present internal-revenue system.*

Fiscal years ending June 30.	Number of gallons of spirits distilled from—		Total.
	Apples, grapes, and peaches.	Grain and molasses.	
1863.....	(a.)	16, 149, 954	16, 149, 954
1864.....	(a.)	85, 295, 393	85, 295, 393
1865.....	(b.) 22, 065	16, 936, 780	16, 958, 845
1866.....	248, 654	14, 599, 289	14, 847, 943
1867.....	440, 607	14, 148, 132	14, 588, 739
1868.....	515, 262	6, 709, 546	7, 224, 808
1869.....	908, 857	61, 183, 559	62, 092, 416
1870.....	1, 223, 830	77, 266, 368	78, 490, 198
1871.....	2, 412, 011	59, 842, 617	62, 314, 628
1872.....	1, 089, 698	65, 145, 880	66, 235, 578
1873.....	2, 658, 260	62, 945, 154	65, 603, 414
1874.....	766, 688	61, 814, 874	62, 581, 562
1875.....	1, 757, 203	62, 668, 709	64, 425, 912
Total.....	12, 103, 135	604, 706, 255	616, 809, 390

(a.) Included in next column. (b.) Mostly included in next column.

It will be seen from this statement that the whole amount of distilled spirits accounted for from 1863 to 1875 was only 616,809,390 gallons, when it should have been in fact 1,300,000,000. In 1868 it was only 7,224,808 gallons; that is the year in which the \$182,000,000 of which Mr. SHERMAN speaks were lost. In 1865, 1866, 1867, and 1868, when the tax was \$2 per gallon, \$800,000,000 ought to have been realized from spirits alone, but only \$104,000,000 in round numbers were paid into the Treasury, leaving \$696,000,000 in round numbers lost to the Government. I do not mean to say that all this money was stolen by the officials. Much of it doubtless was, but the tax on much of it was never collected at all, though it was the duty of the officers to collect it. The statement that the high tax amounted to a prohibition is utterly unfounded. As proof of this and of the fact that the tax was not honestly collected, the whisky sold in the market by the gallon for less than the amount of the tax, and taking the value of money into consideration was as cheap as it is now. It is no excuse for those whose duty it was to collect the tax to say it was not collected. They could not thus evade responsibility; and there are abundant facts going to show that, by combinations and rings, bribery and corruption, the Government was grossly defrauded. While the tax was \$2 per gallon, if all of it had been faithfully collected and accounted for, \$1,200,000,000 in round numbers ought to have gone into the Treasury. Instead of that, less than \$300,000,000 were accounted for, leaving \$900,000,000 lost to the Government. Now this was upon the single article of distilled spirits. That is, upon this one article the Government was defrauded out of \$900,000,000 in six years. Now who will say that the estimate of Mr. Curtis's commission is not under rather than over the mark?

Let us look at this a little in detail. It is conceded that \$182,000,000 were lost to the Treasury in one year alone, 1868, on this one subject of taxation. Just think of it! In one single year of republican rule there was lost or stolen from this single source of revenue ten times as much as the whole expenses of the Government for the eight years of Washington's administration, nine times as much as the whole four years of John Adams, four times as much as the whole eight years of Jefferson; \$40,000,000 more than the whole eight years of Madison, embracing the war of 1812 with Great Britain; \$75,000,000 more than the whole eight years of Monroe; more than \$130,000,000 more than the whole four years of John Q. Adams; more than \$40,000,000 more than the whole eight years of Andrew Jackson; \$60,000,000 more than the whole four years of Van Buren. And some of us are old enough to remember how the economical spirit of the country was aroused by the extravagance of Martin Van Buren, and how in 1840 he was overwhelmed by the people because of what was then thought to be extravagance, but in comparison with these times would be considered stingy economy, for in one single year of republican rule we have seen that \$60,000,000 more was lost to the Government on spirits alone than the whole four years of his administration cost. In this one year \$75,000,000 more was lost or stolen than the cost of the whole four years of John Tyler's administration; \$16,000,000 more than the whole four years of Polk, embracing the period of the Mexican war; \$16,000,000 more than the four years of Taylor and Fillmore; and more was lost on whisky alone in 1866, '67, '68 than the whole cost of the Government under the combined eight years of Pierce and Buchanan.

The amount out of which the Government has been defrauded is so immense that, like the centennial exhibition in Philadelphia, it bewilders you and it cannot all be taken in at once by the eye or comprehended by the mind. Just think of it again, \$182,000,000 in one single year on spirits alone. Why this is \$50,000,000 more than the whole assessed property of the State of North Carolina, as shown by the census of 1870. Just think again! If all the property of this once proud old State—land, houses, corn, everything—were put up at auction and sold for cash it would not amount to as much as the whisky fraud upon the Government amounted to in one year. It was more than the assessed value, according to the census of 1870, of Alabama, or Arkansas, or Delaware, or Florida, or Mississippi, or New Hampshire, or Vermont, or Texas.

Who will say with this exhibit—in which nothing is said of the frauds in the collection of the tobacco tax, for I have not time to go into that—that the estimate of Mr. Curtis's commission is large enough? But assuming it not to be over the mark, we have shown by the highest proof that the Government has been defrauded out of one-fourth of its revenue; that is, in round numbers, \$1,500,000,000; but this does not represent all the loss. If this money had been faithfully collected and honestly applied, it would have gone to the extinguishment of that much of the public debt. So that to represent the real loss the interest must be added. Now, any one who will take the pains to calculate it will see that \$1,500,000,000 + \$600,000,000 = \$2,100,000,000; the interest would exceed \$600,000,000. Now, the public debt is less in round numbers than \$2,240,000,000. So that it will be seen that nearly enough has been lost to the Government to pay the entire public debt. Is it not time for people to arouse themselves? If this money had been faithfully collected and honestly applied and economy had marked the administration of the Government, how different would be the condition of the country to-day.

There would be no public debt hanging like a mighty weight around the necks of the people to paralyze their energies and sink them in despair; no bonds and bondholders to be paid in gold. The ordinary old-time receipts from customs would abundantly defray the expenses of the Government, and there would be no necessity for internal revenue, with its attendant train of assessors, collectors, and deputy assessors and collectors, supervisors, detectives, and spies, its rings, its frauds, and its thieves harassing the people and disgracing the nation.

The tobacco-grower could sell to whom he pleased, for there would be no more tax on his industry. The man with his little orchard or vineyard could turn it to profit by distilling his fruit, which he cannot now do, because under a complicated system of revenue regulations he does not know when he is safe, and if he did he could not compete with the mammoth rings organized under the shadow of the Government.

But this is not the worst. In the same report from which I have read the commissioners' story, on page 22 of the report:

We would not exaggerate the importance of the peril, but the constant exposure of official dishonesty, the vast system of political corruption, the disclosure of which has produced a peaceful revolution in the city of New York, should suggest to every good citizen the possibility of a similar revolution which might not be peaceful. If by that great and organized corruption it had been possible—and such a contingency is not improbable—to decide a presidential election, and in a manner universally believed to be fraudulent, the consequences would probably have been a civil war. If such corruption is not staid, the result is only postponed; and nothing so surely fosters it as the system which makes the civil service a party prize, and convulses the country every four years with a desperate strife of office.

Remember that this was in 1871. If the official frauds and corruptions then exposed were sufficient to arouse in the minds of good republican gentlemen, appointed by President Grant and indorsed by him, apprehensions of safety to the Government because the people would not bear it, how infinitely worse is it now when in one single collection district, as at Saint Louis, millions are stolen? And I beg that our friends will remember that this comes from republicans of the "straightest sect." No southern confederate or disloyal democrat had anything to do with this report. If there was danger then, as they thought there was, how infinitely worse, I repeat, is it now?

It has been abundantly proved by the investigations instituted by this House that the poor soldiers on the frontiers have been robbed of hundreds of thousands of dollars, charges upon their purchases by post-traders who had to pay to the Secretary of War, to the brother of the President, (see testimony of Orvill Grant, and others,) and to his friends and partisans, money to get their places, and money to aid in carrying elections. Of this the proof is conclusive.

The freedmen have been robbed of hundreds of thousands of dollars by corrupt men who, many of them professing to be pious, have called themselves their friends and guardians. Of the sum deposited in the Freedman's Savings Bank in this city by over seventy thousand depositors, poor freedmen, the sum of about \$1,500,000, saved from their hard earnings, has been lost. The poor washerwoman, whose hands were shriveled by labor at the wash-tub; the day-laborer who received his fifty cents or seventy-five cents for his day's hard toil—these put their small earnings in the bank, confidently expecting it to come back to them with gain in the hour of want, as was promised to them; but, for shame be it said of men—men, most of them, with white skins—the most of this was lost, stolen; and, still deeper the shame, while the poor freedman wants bread and lives in rags, the thieves live in luxury and roll through your streets in splendor, and



think it full compensation to the poor negro to have it known that \$300,000 of it, as the evidence will show, was lost to aid in carrying the elections in favor of the "party of advanced moral ideas;" for the proof is, as I am reliably informed, that the election in North Carolina in 1872 and the election of President Grant cost the bank that sum. And these are the special friends of the colored man.

Whatever else may be said of us, I make the assertion, and I defy contradiction, that the African has attained to a higher degree of civilization among the white people of the South than has been known to his race anywhere else on the globe. No one of the colored races in any other part of the world has been elevated to the high privileges or deemed capable of the exalted duties of a free citizen of a great republic. We have brought him from a state of barbarism to be considered, at least by our republican friends, as their equals; but if there is on the part of the white people of the South pride of race and of Caucasian descent it is not unnatural, and what is natural cannot be very wrong. Looking back on the past, we have seen all great achievements in arts, sciences, governments, laws, and material wealth the result of the labor, the toil, the genius, and the guiding intellect of the white man. With the blood of his race has been a long career of progress, and it has been only by his courage and proud spirit that free governments have been established, and while I have pity for the white man who would hate a black man simply because he is black, I have scorn for the white man who is not proud of his race. The pride of the Saxon is a hostage to honor, and while this lasts truth, justice, and civil liberty are safe, and whether they be white or black, the rights of all, as established by constitutions and laws, are secure.

#### NORTH CAROLINA.

And now I wish to say a few things in vindication of my own State against a charge preferred by the gentleman from Maine, [Mr. BLAINE.] That gentleman, some time ago, when the question of amnesty was before this House, was pleased to read, with evident gratification and with his then triumphant air, (I am glad to observe that he appears more subdued and of milder mood since,) a letter from his friend W. W. Holden, once governor of North Carolina, which reflected unjustly and untruly not only upon the democratic party of that State, but upon the whole State, inasmuch as the act of which he complained was attributed, not to a sense of justice in the tribunal before which he was tried and convicted, but to partisan persecution. That letter has gone to the country with the indorsement of the gentleman from Maine, who would not permit a moment's time to gentlemen on this floor who desired at once to repel a grave charge against their State. It has gone to the country in a speech of bitterness and hate, which some supposed was intended for the amiable purpose of making a President from the State of Maine, but which, failing in that, can only serve the bad purpose of keeping alive in the minds of those who follow him feelings toward one section of this country which every friend of good government, every friend of peace, every patriot ought to wish to see buried forever. That gentleman, with an inexcusable ignorance of the facts, (inexcusable because he would not allow an answer in the way of correction to a question tauntingly propounded by himself,) said that it was "purely a political impeachment; not prosecution, but persecution; persecution of a man for opinion's sake," \* \* \* a Union man of North Carolina."

I now have the opportunity, and I avail myself of it, to say to the gentleman from Maine that every substantial statement contained in the letter of his friend is untrue, and I propose, without any feeling of bitterness, but with a feeling of pain and regret that such a letter should have been written, and in discharge of what I conceive to be a sacred duty to the good, true, and honest people of the State which I in part represent, to make a brief and plain statement of the leading facts relating to the crimes, the impeachment, the trial, and the conviction of the author of that letter.

His crimes, as set forth in eight articles of impeachment, were briefly as follows:

First. Raising unlawfully armed bodies of troops, and causelessly declaring the county of Alamance in a state of insurrection, and unlawfully arresting Lucian H. Murray and eighty-one other citizens of that county and detaining them, when the civil officers of the law were in the full exercise of their functions.

Second. The same in Caswell County as to Mr. Kerr and many others.

Third. Unlawfully arresting and imprisoning Josiah Turner in the county of Orange.

Fourth. Unlawfully arresting and detaining John Kerr and others in the county of Caswell.

Fifth. Refusing to obey the writ of *habeas corpus* in the case of A. G. Moore.

Sixth. Refusing to obey the writ of *habeas corpus* in the case of John Kerr and eighteen others in Caswell County.

Seventh. Unlawfully recruiting a large body of troops from the States of North Carolina and Tennessee, and placing them under the command of one Kirk and other desperadoes from the State of Tennessee, and with those troops unlawfully arresting and imprisoning John Kerr and many others; for hanging by the neck Lucian Murray, William Patton, and others; for thrusting Josiah Turner and F. A. Wiley in a loathsome dungeon without lawful authority; for issuing his warrant upon D. A. Jenkins, treasurer of the State, for \$70,000 to pay those unlawful troops.

Eighth. For inviting and procuring the State treasurer to disregard the injunction to restrain him from paying the sum of \$80,000 or more out of the public treasury for the unlawful purpose of paying said troops.

This is a brief abstract of the crimes of which he was charged and found guilty; the facts were clearly proved, and he is mistaken when he says it was done by democrats, if he means, as the gentleman from Maine understands him, to say it was a party vote of conviction. And without conceding that it is necessary to vindicate the honor of the democratic senators who upon their oaths voted to convict upon clear proof, I will give a statement of the vote. The constitution requires two-thirds to convict. On the sixth charge there were only eight senators who voted "not guilty;" forty-one voted "guilty;" five republican senators voted "guilty." Every republican lawyer in the senate voted to convict except one, and the exception was the son-in-law of the accused. Of the eight senators who voted "not guilty," one was the son-in-law of the accused; four were colored members, with no knowledge of law; and the other three were party politicians, one of whom was deputy United States assessor, who was indicted in the Federal court for the crime of forgery, plead guilty, was sentenced to prison by a Federal judge, and was afterward pardoned. I will say to the gentleman from Maine that these were the crimes, and this the manner of the conviction, of one who subscribes himself "your friend." As I have said, of the five republican lawyers in the senate all except one, the son-in-law, voted guilty, and I venture to say that there is not a respectable lawyer in or out of the State of North Carolina who, with a knowledge of all the facts and the law, would say that an intelligent and impartial jury could have found any other verdict, or who would say that the acts proved were not in plain and open violation of the constitution and the laws.

The State judiciary had been exhausted by him. And just here I wish to say, as an act of justice, that it was to an upright Federal judge (Judge Brooks) that the people were indebted for a vindication of the majesty of the law and the discharge of the men so unlawfully held by the usurpations of the governor.

Upon conviction, the disability of which he complains followed as a constitutional result; the constitution of 1868, put upon the people by him and his party against the votes of the democratic party, having fixed the penalty. He is equally mistaken in saying that there was a refusal by a strict party vote to remove his disabilities. Every lawyer knows that the Legislature had no power to remove his disabilities, and it was doubted whether the convention, having been a restricted one, had the power to do so; but as it was, the removal of his disability was defeated, if I am not greatly mistaken, by a republican vote. He is equally mistaken in saying that he is the only man in North Carolina who cannot hold office. He stands not alone. By the same constitution which disqualifies him from holding office, there are several thousand persons, mostly of his own political faith, convicted of various crimes, most of them before republican judges, who labor under the same disability imposed by a constitution which they themselves made. He says "I am the only man in North Carolina who cannot hold office," and writes that while holding one of the fattest offices in the State—that of postmaster at Raleigh.

But the gentleman from Maine says he was a "Union man." Yes, like Longstreet and other Union men of the South, he has put on the livery of the republican party as a badge of fealty, and that is enough for the gentleman from Maine, and I shall not trouble myself to enlighten his ignorance, though he may be laughed at in North Carolina, and I doubt not that even the ex-governor himself, when he looks at the sacred gold pen with which he signed the ordinance of secession—a pen never to be desecrated by other use—and remembers the pleasant (cruel) things which he said about the Union and Union men, will chuckle audibly and, hugging his official robes close about him, feel more secure against the competition of "the late insurgent leaders" one of his associates.

Governor Holden professes to be a Christian, and remembering the prayer taught by our blessed Saviour, "forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us," he might at least have been silent and not asked the condemnation of his "fellow trespassers," among whom he may be said to have been one of the chiefs; but he has volunteered as a witness to furnish to the enemies of my State fuel for the fires of hate, and I have deemed it just and due to the people of that State, who have been traduced and maligned for party purposes, to say thus much. I shall ever stand ready to vindicate to the utmost of my ability the fair fame and honor of my native State, for she is to me the dearest spot on earth. I know that she has been under a cloud. I know that since the war under the guise of loyalty her people have been robbed of their property and, what is much dearer to them, once boasting the proud title of the "honest old North State," she has been robbed of her honor. I know that after war had done its work, and her body lay helpless, vultures preyed upon her; and it is not the least distressing thought that she had within her own borders men, political serfs, ready to attorn to any party that would give them office, and that these men combined with adventurers without character, and who cared nothing for her honor, to fasten upon her a debt which she is not now able to pay and which she cannot pay without ruin to her people, a debt for which she never derived an equivalent of five cents on the dollar. Let me illustrate by a statement which I hope will disarm the malice of her enemies.



By the convention of 1868, and the legislation of that year, a debt now amounting to more than \$15,000,000 was fastened upon the State. The two delegates to that convention, and the two members, and the senator in that Legislature from my county, and all the men who voted for them combined, did not at that time pay as much property tax as any one of half a dozen men in the county who were not allowed to vote under the reconstruction acts.

The district which I now have the honor to represent, and which I am proud to represent, was represented on this floor by a man whose highest merit was that he did not pretend to be honest, and who openly said that he "was down South on the make," and that he did not blame the democrats for disliking carpet-baggers. This man was guilty of the crime of bribery, and when charged with it on this floor, to evade the inevitable expulsion, he resigned, as others have since done, and has not that I am aware of since been seen in the district which he disgraced. In resigning, however, he had the cool candor to say, "As soon as I was aware that I had done wrong, [he had only taken \$1,000 for a cadetship,] I endeavored to make a return as far as I could. I returned the money immediately, and I have tendered my resignation to the governor of my State, believing that it is the duty of a member of Congress to make vacant the place he has disgraced." But it was all made right when he said, "I have given \$12,000 to control the presidential election in my State." (Congressional Globe, volume 76, page 1617.)

Any one who wishes to see a curious production can find it in his letter, published in the congressional proceedings of the Forty-first Congress on page 1617 of the seventy-sixth volume of the Congressional Globe.

But it is said that the South is represented on this floor by confederates, and whenever we raise our voices in behalf of good and honest government, and exposure of fraud and corruption, the force of what we say is sought to be broken by the cry of rebellion and disloyalty. Now let me say one thing about that. The war, as every candid man will concede, resulted from a long-protracted and often bitter difference of opinion upon certain political questions. These differences became sectional, and culminated in an attempt by one of the sections to withdraw from the Union, and a resolve on the part of the other that the Union should not be severed. The issue was submitted to the arbitrament of the sword, and brave men fought it out. The result is known to the world; every question involved in that contest was honestly surrendered, and the soldiers of the South, with a quiet and submission to authority that was remarkable, sought their homes and the sweet pursuits of peace. "Peace hath her victories no less renowned than war," and they have bent all their energies to the tasks of peace. I can say this of a truth as to the soldiers of the South, and I believe it to be true of the great body of brave soldiers of the North.

The Union was to be preserved, and to be preserved for the sake, not simply of the Union, but of civil liberty and good government. The soldier who was roused to deeds of daring and courage by the cry of the Constitution and the Union, and by the rally of the old flag, believed that civil liberty was to be preserved by that Union and under that Constitution. The soldier of the South, when he took with him the same Constitution, was equally conscientious when he offered his life in the conviction that he, too, was fighting for civil liberty; both were alike devoted to the same idol, civil liberty—the one fighting to maintain it in the Union, believing that in this way alone it could be preserved; the other to maintain it in a new confederacy, but both claiming to be freemen and the right to be freemen. The Union was victorious, and from that day it was settled that civil liberty and good government must be preserved in the Union, and not out of it. The right peaceably to secede and the sectional institution which was the alleged cause of secession were surrendered by us, surrendered in good faith by brave and true men, and we were again in the Union. But our right to be freemen was not involved in the issue. We never surrendered our manhood; we never surrendered our right to free government as we inherited it from our fathers; we never surrendered the proud and glorious memories of the past; we never consented to be slaves or cravens. We must be in this Union of States as equals or the Union is so in name and not in deed. The South must be represented by men of her choice or this is a republican government in name and not in deed. And as long as the South is represented on this floor by men of her choice, she will be represented by men of honor, and men of honor would not have her represented otherwise.

Since the days of 1865 we have not always been thus represented here, but we have had an abiding faith that devotion to constitutional government would prevail, and that when the stormy passions begotten of war had subsided the bright goddess of civil liberty would resume her throne in American hearts and that loyalty to party would give place to devotion at her shrine. Sir, the man who would have us back in the Union as slaves and not as freemen; the man who would have us here as disgraced criminals and not as brethren with whom, the unhappy but manly strife having ended, they were to live as brethren again; brethren in unity of aim and purpose; brethren again in affection to a common country, just to all her sons; brethren again in the proud memories of the past and in the bright hopes of the future—the men who would not have us thus back, who would have the States of the South in the Union as conquered provinces and not as free States—such men know not the spirit of free

government; such men would tyrants be, and, failing that, slaves. I am glad to believe that such are not the men of the North. Exceptions there are, but I am glad to know that thousands on thousands of her people hail us as brethren again in the Union and as worthy the name of brethren. I am glad to know that the soldiers who fought the battles of the Union desire to see the fruits of their victories secured by the preservation of a peaceful, harmonious, and happy Union of States. I am glad to know that Hancock—brave and gallant soldier, wise and accomplished civilian, a hero in the field, a statesman in counsel—that McClellan and McClernand, that soldiers of the Union army, my gallant friends on this floor, and the thousands whom they represent, that the soldier-statesman from Massachusetts and the generous Representative from Pennsylvania on the other side of this House—I am glad to know that men like these represent the feeling of the people, and that the doctrine of hate, like the questions which divided us, must be of the past.

Let me say to our friends at the North that they have the same interest in the liberties of the South that we have: they have the same interest in good government that we have. You cannot make an Ireland or a Hungary or a Poland of the South without endangering your own liberties. The States of the South must be free, living, breathing, sound, and healthy members of this Union. You cannot afford to have a dead body fastened to the living. It was an ancient custom of certain tyrants to punish offenders by binding the body of a dead man to the living criminal and compelling him to carry it about till the contagion from the putrid mass took away life. Virgil gives an account of one of these tyrants, Mezentius, and describes the awful punishment.

These, limb to limb and face to face, he joined,  
Till choked with stench the lingering wretches lay,  
And in the loathed embraces died away.

And it was in allusion to this horrid custom that St. Paul uttered the exclamation, "O, wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" You cannot afford to have such a dead body joined to you, and have liberty survive it; and I appeal to every man who loves civil liberty and good government and who desires to see the Union again strong in the affections of all the people, to work for reform, to work to restore to the people a government in which economy, honesty, capacity, and fidelity shall characterize every department, and harmony, good-will, and brotherly love shall prevail in every section. I think I know the feeling and sentiment of the people of the South; and for them I will pledge that none will go before them in earnest prayers and zealous works to attain this happy end.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BLOUNT. I now move the committee rise, for the purpose of taking a recess until half past seven o'clock, and also for the purpose of ordering that all general debate upon this bill be closed after to-day.

Mr. KELLEY. The gentleman proposes to admit general debate this evening.

Mr. BLOUNT. Yes, sir.

Mr. KELLEY. I make the inquiry because I desire to reply to something that has been said here to-day.

Mr. BANKS. Is it proposed to confine the debate this evening to this bill?

Mr. BLOUNT. Yes, sir.

Mr. BANKS. The session last evening was occupied upon other matters altogether.

Mr. KELLEY. It is the intention, I understand, that debate shall continue this evening upon this bill, and that no other business shall be transacted.

The motion of Mr. BLOUNT that the committee rise was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker *pro tempore* having resumed the Chair, Mr. CLYMER reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the Union generally, and particularly the bill (H. R. No. 3375) making appropriations for the naval service for the year ending June 30, 1877, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

STEPHEN POWERS.

On motion of Mr. BANNING, by unanimous consent, the Committee on Military Affairs was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. No. 3332) for the relief of Stephen Powers; and the same was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by U. S. GRANT, jr., one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed a bill of the following title:

An act (H. R. No. 3368) appropriating \$9,000 to pay the expenses of the select committee to investigate the Federal offices in Louisiana.

The message also announced that a bill of the following title, having been received by the President on the 4th instant, and not having been returned by him to the House in which it originated within the ten days prescribed by the Constitution, had become a law without his signature:

An act (H. R. No. 1595) for the relief of John T. Burchell, of Knoxville, Tennessee, for services rendered the Government in a small-pox hospital.



## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. HARRIS, of Georgia, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

An act (H. R. No. 1218) making appropriations for the payment of claims reported to Congress under section 2 of the act approved June 16, 1874, by the Secretary of the Treasury;

An act (H. R. No. 1618) to remove the political disabilities of William L. Maury, of New York; and

An act (H. R. No. 2018) to authorize the Exchange National Bank of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, to improve certain real estate.

## CLAIMS UPON VENEZUELA.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the House of Representatives:

In answer to a resolution of the House of Representatives of the 5th instant, requesting information as to payments by the government of Venezuela on account of claims of citizens of the United States under the convention of the 25th of April, 1866, I transmit a report from the Secretary of State, to whom the resolution was referred.

U. S. GRANT.

WASHINGTON, May 16, 1876.

## CHARLES METCALF.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*, by unanimous consent, laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report from the Commissary-General of Subsistence on the bill (H. R. No. 3283) for the relief of Charles Metcalf, late lieutenant United States Navy; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## PRINTING IN ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a communication from the Adjutant-General on the breaking up of the printing office attached to his office, as contemplated in the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CASON, for twelve days from the 19th instant, on account of important business;

To Mr. EGBERT, for one day, on account of business;

To Mr. VANCE, of Ohio, for seven days;

To Mr. HUBBELL, for four days, on account of important business;

To Mr. DOUGLAS, for one week from the 23d instant; and

To Mr. SMITH, of Pennsylvania, for one week from to-morrow, on account of important business.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BLOUNT. I move that all general debate on the naval appropriation bill close with the adjournment to-day.

Mr. DUNNELL. Then it is proposed to take up the bill for consideration by sections to-morrow?

Mr. BLOUNT. Yes, sir.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLOUNT. I now move that the House take a recess till half past seven o'clock this evening, for the purpose of general debate on the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at four o'clock and forty-five minutes p. m.) the House took a recess till half past seven o'clock p. m.

## EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House re-assembled at seven o'clock and thirty minutes p. m.

## NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BLOUNT. I move that the rules be suspended and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to resume the consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, (Mr. CLYMER in the chair), and resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. No. 3375) making appropriations for the naval service for the year ending June 30, 1877, and for other purposes.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I regret that my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIS] is not in his seat, that I might testify to him personally my sense of the great advantage the country may derive from confiding important duties to gentlemen who are utterly ignorant of the subject-matter upon which legislation is proposed. I am quite sure that if he had known anything of the navy-yards of the country or of the history of the growth and development of our naval establishment or the revolutions that have taken place in naval architecture and armament during the last fifteen years, the world would never have received the novel suggestions he offered to-day touching navy-yards, the proper sites for them, &c. I can certify to their novelty but not to their value, and I think he may become famous in naval history as the man who believed at this late day that iron ships ought to be built on salt water

and that the great reservoir of machinery for the construction of vessels and armament under the exigencies of war ought to be located in an exposed sea-port. Sir, had he known anything of the subject his imagination would have been restrained and he would have simply given us details, practical illustrations, opinions of distinguished line officers or naval engineers, and told us nothing but what we knew or might learn by the study of competent authorities. But we should have had no new range given to our imaginations. Unlike him, I shall deal with facts, and give the committee a history of the establishment of a naval station at League Island.

In this matter I can define my position best in the language of the gentle Desdemona—

I do perceive here a divided duty.

I have been identified with the history of the project from the time Gideon Wells, the then Secretary of the Navy, made known confidentially to Alexander Henry, the then mayor of Philadelphia, that a commission of distinguished naval officers had been appointed by him to secretly survey the coast and determine privately and report the best site on the Atlantic coast for a fresh-water naval station, where land enough could be had in proximity to ample supplies of coal and iron and skilled workers in metals to establish the works for the construction of heavy material for large iron-clad or iron vessels and for the manufacture of heavy armor and implements of war and the machinery for handling such implements; and that the board had reported to him that in League Island they found a sight incomparable not only in the United States but in the whole world in combining all these conditions. Just at that time I was made acquainted confidentially by the Navy Department with the operation.

The mayor of Philadelphia in that communication was requested to ascertain in whom the title of the land was vested, whether it could be purchased, and, if so, upon what terms. He entered heartily into the honorable work confided to him, ascertained the price at which it could be had, and reported the facts to the Navy Department. At the suggestion of the ablest man I have met in connection with the American Navy, G. V. Fox, then Assistant Secretary, the Secretary suggested that if possible the title to the island and back channel should be acquired contingently upon Congress making appropriation for its purchase. Mayor Henry, believing that if it became known that the Government wanted the property speculators would intervene and the cost would be greatly increased, induced the city of Philadelphia to purchase it and hold it for the Government. It did purchase it at a cost of nearly half a million dollars, and it not only held it for the benefit of the Government, but it conveyed it without consideration to the Government absolutely on condition that it should be held as a naval station, and that the small yard containing about twenty acres, then obstructing the commercial progress of the city, should be removed.

Sir, I have said I do perceive here a divided duty. I feel to-night that, as a Philadelphian, I would be ready, if it were possible, to overwhelm Congress with my thanks if it would reconvey to Philadelphia these two and a quarter miles of its best river front, shutting its main avenue, Broad street, from access to tide-water; and during the whole of more than fourteen years I have been involved in contest on this subject I have never hesitated to say to my fellow-citizens that posterity would curse us for the wrong we did to Philadelphia in the granting of this six hundred acres of land, embracing more than two and a quarter miles of the most valued river front of the city. On the other hand, as an American citizen, I cannot be too grateful to my fellow-citizens for their generous devotion to the Government in securing to it a naval station unequaled in site in the world, and one which naval officers from England, France, and Russia have assured me, both at the Navy Department and when on League Island, is unequaled in its combined points of adaptation to the wants of the navies of the future anywhere in the world. As a Philadelphian I would rejoice at its retrocession, but as an American I would deplore the fatuity that prompted the act.

The imaginative and inexperienced gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIS] said that such an establishment ought to be at Brooklyn where it would be near the sea. The foreign officers, as well as our own, say that among its chiefest values are the facts that, while it has easy access to the sea and is protected abundantly by forts already existing at different points along the river by which it is approached, it is absolutely secure from attack; that the Government may gather stores for a war of half a century and keep them there without drain upon its general military or naval resources for their protection.

Why, sir, the Swamp Angel that hurled its ponderous shells into Charleston would destroy such an establishment from the open sea, if it were in Brooklyn. One of the great points in favor of League Island is its security; another is the fresh water that surrounds it. Salt water is the natural enemy of iron. Sea-water will eat up the heaviest iron plate; and nature, as if to protect it while exposed to foul sea-water, attracts to the surface of iron exposed to its action all sorts of parasites; so that, on the arrival home of a British iron-clad, the Ben Ledi, from a cruise, ten tons of muscles and barnacles were taken from her surface by mechanical processes, many of them having fastened so tightly and being of such solid and vitrified substance that in breaking them away great portions of the iron came with them.



These operations of nature threatened to preclude the possibility of the successful establishment of iron navies. But nature provides an antidote for every bane, and it was discovered that fresh water was the antidote to these. Had the Ben Ledi had a naval station in water fresh as that at League Island to resort to, in three days her surface would have been as clean as when she was launched. And, although the yard at Portsmouth, England, had cost over £60,000,000—something over \$300,000,000—it was found useless when England began to create an iron navy, and she had to abandon it, except for repair and a station for wooden ships. To keep the iron vessels there was to destroy them or reduce their speed. To invite nature to so protect them against the effect of the poison of the sea as to reduce their speed from 20 to 30 per cent., as was often the case before the end of a year's cruise, was not a safe reliance. What did England do in this emergency? Why, with her three-hundred-million-dollar yard at Portsmouth, her government went to the headwaters of the Medway. They bought a site. They constructed immense fresh-water basins. They made an artificial channel to them, and there, having expended another \$100,000,000, and having added to the ninety-five acres of their yard a tract of land very kindred to League Island, but embracing about two hundred and eighty-four acres, they went on increasing their fresh-water basins so as to have the cure at hand for the effect of the waters of Portsmouth and Brooklyn waters upon iron-clads and iron ships.

This is not imagination. I have not been studying this question anew. I am but repeating to the committee facts that I brought to the attention of the Thirty-eighth Congress in the winter of 1863 and 1864 in an elaborate report on this subject from the Naval Committee. And I propose to detain the committee with an occasional extract, not from my own statements, but from valuable financial papers I then reported.

The President had made reiterated recommendations for the establishment of a naval station and dock-yard for the purposes of an iron navy. The Secretary of the Navy, Gideon Welles, on the 9th of June, 1862, made a communication to the Naval Committee, in which, referring to the President's message, he said:

It is now generally conceded that vessels for fighting purposes must be heavily plated with iron if they are not built entirely of that material. In this, as in most costly fabrics, economy is reached through durability. Iron ship-building is new in this country; but few persons are engaged in it, and it is a novelty in our yards. Heavy iron beams, shafting, and thick iron plates can be procured from only two or three parties, and then in limited quantities and subject to great delay. Individuals have little use for iron of such magnitude as the Navy must have, and there must unavoidably be great outlay to prepare for the execution of such work. With only the Navy for a purchaser there can be no competition, and the Government will be compelled, under such circumstances, to pay almost any price the mills and forges may demand. No inconsiderable portions of an iron ship can be made and procured at the ordinary mills; and so far as it can be done it may be the best policy to be so supplied; but as the heavy and expensive portions cannot be so procured and unless the Government is prepared to execute the work it will be subject to imposition and its vessels to marked inferiority.

Other nations, whose wooden ships-of-war far exceed our own in number, cannot afford to lay them aside, but are compelled to plate them with iron at a very great cost. They are not unaware of the disadvantage of this proceeding, but it is a present necessity. It must be borne in mind, however, that those governments which are striving for naval supremacy are sparing no expense to strengthen themselves by building iron vessels; and already their dock-yards are undergoing the necessary preparations for this change in naval architecture, notwithstanding those governments have at their command the greatest experience and the most extensive and complete iron and machine factories that private enterprise can produce. These facts are suggestive to our Government; and I desire to call your attention to the necessity of making the necessary provision for ourselves by providing the means and conveniences for building and repairing a navy such as the strength and character of our Government and country require, in order to maintain its true position among maritime powers.

Mr. Welles proceeded to explain that great works could not be suddenly called into existence; that they must be in the neighborhood of a bountiful supply of fuel, of iron, and steel, and large numbers of skilled workmen. In his annual report of December, 1862, he renewed his suggestions, saying:

In March last and again in June I invited the attention of the Naval Committee of Congress to the importance of taking prompt preliminary measures for establishing a navy-yard, including foundries, shops, and docks adapted to the growing wants of the service and the country. It was not that we needed an additional navy-yard, but that we required one of a different character in many respects from any that we possess. In view of the importance of possessing somewhere in this country a navy and dock yard for the purposes of an iron navy, the suggestion of the Department received the favorable consideration of Congress. The city of Philadelphia, the commercial center of the iron and coal region, became interested in the question and was induced to make a free offer of League Island, a body of land of about six hundred acres near the confluence of the Delaware and Schuylkill Rivers, to the United States for naval purposes. In consequence of this liberal offer, Congress authorized the Secretary of the Navy to receive and accept League Island, provided, however, that it should not be accepted until the title shall be perfect to low-water mark, nor if, upon a more thorough examination and survey of the premises by a competent board of officers to be appointed by the Secretary of the Navy, he shall discover that the public interest will not be promoted by acquiring the title as aforesaid. That the board to be appointed shall, before proceeding to any decision of the questions referred to them, make a survey and examination of the harbor of New London, in Connecticut, and its surroundings, with reference to its fitness for a naval depot and navy-yard, and that they also make the same investigation in regard to the waters of Narraganset Bay.

In pursuance of that resolution a board was appointed from whose report the philosophic but inexperienced gentleman from New York read this morning. The first resolution of that board when it met for action was that in all questions of engineering or which were solvable by engineering the report of the engineer should bind the board, and the result was the unfortunate and unfounded report made by Admiral Stringham, for which, subsequently, I think, every member of

the board expressed extreme regret. The result was that the engineer whose interests were centered in one of the other places named instead of boring League Island proper, which is part of the main land and is water-bearing, bored only in the mass of alluvial accretions around the island. Having thus chosen a false field for his tests, he could give a faithful statement of the results of his boring and yet deceive the board. Having given him absolute control of all engineering questions before the board, it could do nothing else than report against it.

Mr. Welles and his able Assistant Secretary, to whom I have alluded, who had had the matter privately examined, rejected the report of the board, appointed a new one, and directed that the borings should be made faithfully over the island, and the results in detail will be found appended to my report; showing that for nearly three hundred acres the land is solid and, as I have said, water-bearing; the wells upon it yielding water at the same depth as they do now in the heart of the great city of which it is a part; that it presented over two hundred and fifty acres of land on which the heaviest machinery could be operated, and offered foundations for the heaviest works or buildings that could be constructed; and the report contains engraved illustrations of the heaviest trip-hammers then known to be in use, and shows that they could be operated without artificial support upon such lands; and the officers to whom the matter was then confided reported in favor of its acceptance, agreeing with the former board that the water of both Narraganset Bay and Winthrop Point was salt, and therefore unfit for an iron naval station. But that in Philadelphia on League Island there was ample land, there was ample wharf-front, and withal there was offing to float our entire Navy. There was also a natural back channel requiring but little dredging and the placing of draw-doors at either end, one on the Schuylkill and the other on the Delaware, to make a basin larger and more commodious than that of Cherbourg that had then recently cost imperial France over \$50,000,000 for the basin and shelter-walls alone.

Such is League Island. That part of it is below the water-surface, and protected by embankment, I admit; and I claim it as a very great advantage in view of the extent of the island. More surface has already been prepared for use than the old navy-yard contained. The old yard has been sold for a million dollars. That money is now in the Treasury, and covers quite or nearly all the money the Government has expended in the preparation of that part of the surface of the island, in erecting wharfs, store-houses, workshops, and in re-erecting a large ship-house, the materials of which were removed from the old yard within a few months.

The difficulty in the neighborhood of our great iron and steel works in Pennsylvania is to know what to do with the waste and refuse matter. As you travel through our State you see acres and tens and scores of acres in the vicinity of our great works covered with slag and cinders; and if private parties were to offer to fill League Island to the water-line, it would be a matter of great extravagance on the part of the Government to accept the offer, for with every increasing workshop a demand will arise for a place of deposit for its cinders, slag, and other refuse matter.

By examining the report of the engineers who made the last borings at the island, you will find that the surface even of the accretions is of a tough clay, easily cut when wet and very hard when dry. Mingle that with the earth that must be removed for the foundations of buildings and in the preparation of the docks and yards, and you will have a cement for the slag, cinders, and refuse materials from the shops and buildings that will make, so brief experience has shown, pathways for the heavy wains for carrying materials and armament quite equal to the best Macadamized roads known to the people of Pennsylvania.

If we are to abandon iron-ship building, if we are to say that the timber lands of Maine alone shall supply the material for our future navies, then let us keep Kittery as our chief reliance; because that yard lies as near to the timber lands of Maine as League Island does to the coal and iron fields of Pennsylvania, the forges, the furnaces, the machine-shops, and the millions of skilled workers in coal, iron, and other metals that find their metropolis at Philadelphia.

If, however, with those of other nations our Navy is to carry heavy guns and to resist the heaviest of those of other nations we must have a fresh-water yard; we must have an antidote to the poison of the sea; we must, when war shall again kindle its flame either on our own land or on the oceans that surround us, have the means of bringing into existence in the briefest possible time a great iron navy and all its appointments.

I concur with the Committee on Naval Affairs in its desire to maintain as small a navy in time of peace as is consistent with the dignity of our country, to stimulate in such times the commerce of the country so that when the day of war shall come they who leap from the deck of the merchantman to the deck of the vessel of war may go forth to make our country as she ever has been on the ocean, the victor in the war in which the flag shall be borne. Such being our policy, the necessity of keeping great workshops is apparent, not of keeping them employed; not of maintaining armies of workmen, but of having ever ready the cunning machinery which gives force, speed, and energy to the will and skill of man in constructing matters pertaining to naval warfare.

At League Island we have what reduces Chatham in comparison almost in the same degree that in yonder exhibition, which but a



little while ago was spoken of in Congress as a Philadelphia job—in yonder exhibition you have two models, one of the cañon of the Colorado, and beside it, on the same scale, a model of Niagara. As I surveyed them the other day I heard an intelligent New York man beg that the model of the giant waters of Niagara might be removed from such juxtaposition. It was pigmyed by the contrast. Two hundred and fifty feet of Niagara against five thousand feet in the walls and dashing waters of the cañon. I say Chatham scanned as a naval station beside the capabilities of League Island would show as Niagara shows compared with the cañon of the Colorado in that wonderful exhibition.

Again, compare League Island with Cherbourg, built up in the ocean, starting for its foundation near the end of the sounding-line. And yet with toil and energy and material resources, year after year, millions of the wealth of the French Empire disappeared under the deep waters, until after more than half a decade there came some to the surface. Now the great naval works of Cherbourg, which fourteen years ago had cost more than \$50,000,000, are the only rival France can present to the capabilities of League Island, which cost the Government not one cent, but which I and my constituents and townsmen paid for. We have given you, in return for removing that little yard that obstructed our commerce, a million of dollars, with which you have paid for all the improvements yet made at League Island.

Permit me, Mr. Chairman, to say again, "I do perceive here a divided duty." If Congress will retrocede that island to Philadelphia they shall have my everlasting thanks. They will save me and the others from Philadelphia who have been my co-laborers in this matter from the denunciations of posterity for having cut off the main river front of our great and beautiful and beloved city.

But under the influence of a broader feeling, under the influence inspired by that flag, under the influence that has made me—let it subject me to what criticism it might—strive by all the means in my power to cement anew the brotherly love of the American people in this centennial year, I cannot but say do not retrocede League Island; do not deprive your country and mine of the possession of the site for the grandest depot that nature has made—for nature made League Island for a depot for naval purposes—and civilized man has yet discovered on the face of the globe.

Mr. REAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I recognize the delicacy of undertaking to oppose in any of its parts a measure recommended by one of the leading committees of this House; and I would not offer a word of objection to the bill reported by the committee if I did not feel that a sense of duty and propriety required this to be done. In that portion of the bill beginning with line 43 it is provided:

For the civil establishment at the navy-yards at Brooklyn, New York; League Island, Pennsylvania; Norfolk, Virginia, and Mare Island, California, \$80,000; and for the protection and care of the navy-yards not enumerated, \$5,000. And the Secretary of the Navy is hereby directed to make inquiry as to the best method of making sale of the navy-yards at Charlestown, Washington, and Pensacola.

I shall at a proper time propose to amend this portion of the bill by inserting after the word "California," in the forty-fifth line, the words "and Pensacola," and by increasing the appropriation in the same line from \$80,000 to \$100,000. I shall propose to do that for the purpose of keeping Pensacola in its position as one of the navy-yards to be used for repairs, or, if deemed necessary, for repairs and construction. I shall then propose to strike out in line fifty the words "and Pensacola;" so that this navy-yard shall not be included in the list of those in regard to which the Secretary of the Navy is to be directed to make inquiry as to the best method of making sale of them.

In looking into this subject, Mr. Chairman, I shall not attempt to discuss the question as to the number of navy-yards that there ought to be upon the Atlantic coast. That there ought to be one upon the Gulf of Mexico and one upon the Pacific coast will not, I think, be controverted. We have upon the Gulf coast no private yards in which the war vessels of the Government can be repaired; and in this age of the world we need for the purposes of war not only steam-vessels but iron-clad vessels. In case of war with a foreign power, if one of our vessels in the Gulf squadron should become crippled or disabled in any way, such a vessel, without a navy-yard there for repairing and refitting, would have to be dropped out of service or brought around Cape Sable and up the Atlantic coast to a place where it could be repaired, losing the time of the officers and crew, and taking the perils of such a voyage in a crippled condition in time of war.

In looking at our national necessities I may be excused for calling attention for a moment to that portion of the United States. The Gulf of Mexico may well be termed our American Mediterranean—a great sea in itself. It is from the Atlantic coast of Florida by an air line about two hundred and sixty miles westward to Pensacola. It is from the Atlantic shore of Florida four hundred miles by an air line westward to the Mississippi. It is from the Atlantic shore of Florida seven hundred miles to the western shores of the Gulf of Mexico. It is from Cape Sable westward to Galveston eleven hundred miles and more across the Gulf of Mexico. It is from the mouth of the Mississippi River southward to the southern part of the Gulf of Mexico west of Yucatan eight hundred miles and more, and from Pensacola more than five hundred miles southeast to Cape Sable. I mention this to show the magnitude of that inland sea bounded, on the east by Florida, by the islands of Cuba, Hayti, and the other West India Islands, and by the peninsula of Yucatan; on the south by Mex-

ico; on the west by Mexico and Texas; and on the north by Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi and Florida.

Upon that gulf there is now a large commerce. If the work going on for deepening the mouth of the Mississippi River by the South Pass succeeds, as it is hoped by Mr. Eades, the projector of that great work, it may succeed, and we get twenty-eight feet of water there for the largest class of vessels, the amount of commerce passing out of the great and fertile valley of the Mississippi to the open ocean will be almost incredible. At present it is very large. If the work going on at Galveston shall succeed in giving the depth of water that the United States engineers believe it will give, this commerce will be still further enlarged. There, too, is being concentrated the commerce of the State of Texas, with its present population of a million and a half of people, and with an increase of between 200,000 and 300,000 a year. With the commerce that will go there from the Indian Territory, from Kansas, from New Mexico, from the northern states of the republic of Mexico, a commerce will be centered at the great commercial emporium of what we call the "new west" only less than that which will be poured out of the mouth of the Mississippi River.

Remember that on our entire coast, extending from Cape Sable up the western coast of Florida and along the coast of Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas for more than fifteen hundred miles, we have no other naval station or ship-yard than Pensacola. That has a fine depth of water, capable of bearing almost any, perhaps any, vessel in the American Navy. It has a fine harbor and roadstead. It is a fortified position, well secured against danger. It would seem that our national necessities would not be so far overlooked as to destroy this only ship-yard upon that extensive coast.

One thing more I desire to say on this subject. In case of war with a foreign naval power the vulnerable part of the United States is upon the Gulf coast.

A war inaugurated now with Great Britain, with France, or with Spain, unless the mouth of the Mississippi River was protected by a sufficient number of our best monitors, would be as easily ascended by a hostile fleet of war vessels as it was by the Federal fleet during our recent intestine war. It will be remembered that Fort Saint Philip, Fort Jackson, and other batteries along the shores of the Mississippi were not sufficient to stay the progress of a fleet composed in part at least of wooden vessels.

The commerce of the Mississippi Valley deserves and needs protection; and when I speak of this commerce I do not mean to be understood as speaking alone of the commerce of the country bordering on the Gulf of Mexico, for it is likewise the commerce of Louisiana, of Arkansas, of Mississippi, of Tennessee, of Kentucky, of Missouri, and of all the rich States which lie between the Ohio and Mississippi and to the west of the Mississippi, which finds its way to market by means of that unequaled channel of commerce. Protection, therefore, is necessary.

Galveston, the other point I mentioned standing second in commercial importance to New Orleans upon the Gulf, is in such condition to-day that war vessels could bombard and destroy the city and its commerce.

I have not spoken of Mobile, Brashear, Sabine Pass, Indianola, Corpus Christi, and the other towns which lie upon the border of this great inland sea. All of them in case of war would be exposed to the ravages of an enemy and incalculable injury could be done to us, for many of them are to-day without a particle of protection. Even Galveston to-day has not a single gun mounted, and a single step has not yet been taken to protect it in case of war against a hostile fleet.

What would the consequence be if we should be drawn into war, which we all trust may not happen? For, sir, we cannot take to ourselves the assurance that we shall be exempt from war. Our Government occupies a position which makes it necessary that it should deal with all the great questions which interest the nationalities of the earth. It must take its responsibility in disposing of these great questions. It should direct its commercial policy to more intimate relations with Mexico, the Central American and South American states, so that, instead of manufactures from other countries supplying those countries, they should come from New England or the Middle States. It seems to me there is no reason why, under a wise, prudent, and proper policy, we should not control the vast trade of those countries, very little of which we control at this time. In our intercourse with them, which must grow and increase, we stand liable to complications. We have seen that we were liable to be drawn into difficulty on account of the trouble in the island of Cuba. We cannot tell but danger may be on us at almost any moment. It is at least prudent in time of peace to make reasonable and needful preparations for war. That preparation may avert what might otherwise fall upon us.

A great power like this, having its commercial relations with the whole civilized world, needs and must have a navy. It should have one that would command for the Government that respect due to one of the first powers of the earth. If we have such a navy we must provide for building ships of war and for repairing them. I have heard it suggested in conversation that this might be done at private ship-yards. As vessels of war are now built we can hardly expect, even in our progressive, go-ahead country, to find private ship-yards that will prepare such iron, and in such quantities, as will be necessary for the construction of great iron war steamers. If we are to have these, they must be made by the Government, at least in large



part. In this connection let me read an extract from the report of the Secretary of the Navy, Gideon Welles, in 1866:

For the construction of iron and armored vessels, it can only be repeated that although our country has the material in great abundance, and possesses many advantages in that regard, we are almost wholly unprepared. In future maritime wars the contests between the great naval powers for supremacy on the ocean will be determined chiefly by iron-clad or armored ships. Our turreted vessels or monitors will be powerful and effective for harbor and coast defense, but in conflict with any European power our countrymen will hardly be content with mere defensive warfare.

Armored vessels for ocean cruising must necessarily be of large size, which cannot, with the requisite strength, be secured in wooden structures. If attempted, the immense masses of timber must rapidly decay, and the cost resulting from deterioration will be such as no economical and prudent nation will consent to sustain. Ships for cruising and offensive operations must be such as can use sails, for no vessel can long keep the sea under steam alone. Such vessels as are here suggested should be built at a Government establishment, for though private enterprise can do much in aid of the Navy, the peculiarities of iron vessels for naval purposes are such that private parties cannot undertake the work unless at prices which will cover all the outlay for the establishment as well as the vessel, for there can be no other customer than the Government for such work.

In this view of the subject it is plainly the interest of the Government to erect its own shops and machinery, and to possess its own establishment for the construction of its iron and armored naval vessels. Several years of preparation will be required to provide the necessary appliances for such an establishment, and a special and convenient location, with ample area, should be promptly selected. In each of the navy-yards a dry-dock is indispensable, and for a steam navy there should be suitable shops and accommodations for the repair of vessels.

I read this much from the report of Secretary Welles of 1866 on the point as to the necessity of Government navy-yards possessing the peculiar machinery necessary to the building of ships of war such as are used in modern times. While I have this report in my hand, I will also read an extract from it in regard to the navy-yard at Pensacola. After going on at some length, reasoning upon the necessity for establishing the navy-yards at Norfolk and Pensacola, he uses this language:

The suppression of the rebellion and the re-establishment of that peace and unity which constitute us one country and one people make it a duty to restore these national establishments to their former efficient condition. In so far as there was reason during the rebellion for refusing to do this, because insurrection prevailed in the region where the yards are situated, that reason no longer exists. True, the expenditures will be made in States which were in rebellion, but the rebellion has passed away, the States are parts of the Union, and the establishments which are to be renovated are national in their character and of general interest to all. Upon the Pensacola yard, even in its present ruinous state, we must depend for repairs and supplies for any squadron we may employ to guard the ocean outlet of the great central valley of the Union and of our whole coast bordering on the Gulf. To neglect to put that yard in proper condition would be to neglect Iowa, Illinois, and the States north, as well as Louisiana and Mississippi.

In the event of a foreign war with the great maritime powers, our country would labor under serious disadvantages were we without a navy-yard or naval station in the Gulf. A naval force of steamers—and all fighting-vessels must hereafter be steamers—could not be maintained in the Gulf without frequent repairs and supplies. With no navy-yard in the Gulf, the disabled vessels would necessarily be withdrawn from their station and compelled to proceed to a northern yard for refitment. Besides, the perils incident to a voyage under these circumstances, with an enemy on the coast, the services of the officers and crews, as well as of the vessel itself, would be lost during the time she might be absent in going to and returning from a northern yard. The rebels and the waste of war have devastated the Norfolk and Pensacola yards, but the best interest of the service and the obligations of the Government are not less imperative now, when peace and union are restored, to place them in proper condition. It is to be hoped, therefore, that liberal appropriations will be made for that purpose.

While reading extracts from official sources, I will call attention to what is said by the present Secretary of the Navy in his last annual report in regard to the Pensacola navy-yard. He says:

During the past year the old hospital-building within the walls of the yard has been torn down and destroyed, and a new hospital erected upon the ruins of one without the walls, destroyed during the war.

While it is not deemed wise to place this yard in condition for building ships, yet it is considered eminently proper that it should possess all requisite facilities for docking and repairing the vessels of the North Atlantic squadron. Several additional buildings are necessary, and estimates are submitted for another timber-shed and a machine-shop for steam-engineering.

It is hoped that two sections of the iron sectional dock for this navy-yard will be finished during the present fiscal year.

Therefore the last report that comes from the Secretary of the Navy sustains the one made several years ago by Secretary Welles as to the importance and necessity of preserving that navy-yard, at least for repairs and supplies. It may be matter for future determination how far construction shall go on there. Two vessels of war at least were built there in former times. In addition to the necessity of a naval station and navy-yard for the repair and supply of vessels on that vast inland sea for the protection of our coast cities and great commerce, it may be said in relation to Pensacola that in addition to its fine, capacious, and secure harbor and deep water, it lies in the finest timber region on the Atlantic waters. The supplies of live-oak to all the navy-yards of the country come from Florida, and I was going to say from Texas, but I am not sure of that. But in Florida and on the coast of Texas along the Colorado and Lower Brazos are vast supplies of live-oak timber. In Southeastern Texas, back of the Sabine Pass, on the Sabine and Natches Rivers, there are almost limitless amounts of as fine white oak as grows on the continent. And many years ago I was told by a gentleman who had made an examination of the fine pine regions bordering these two rivers lying back of the Sabine Pass that even then, since the pine had been cut as it was in Maine and in Florida, the finest timber for spars and masts was to be found in Eastern Texas. So that you have the live-oak and white oak if needed, and the finest timber for masts and spars on the Atlantic waters close around Pensacola.

In addition to this, there are mines of coal and iron up the Alabama River now being developed in limitless quantities at a convenient distance from Pensacola. The means of transportation for the coal and iron which go down the Mississippi River to Pensacola are such that they may be carried there with great ease and facility and cheapness; so that they have all the materials necessary for the repair or construction and supply of ships. I see, therefore, no reason why that place should not be considered as occupying a commanding position for a navy-yard.

The suggestion has been made that Pensacola is subject to occasional visitations of yellow fever, and that in the prevalence of that disease the workmen may have to abandon their post of duty. It is true that all the towns and cities upon that coast are occasionally subject to visitations of yellow fever. But it is proper for me to say that in a period of fifteen years at least—and some more, I think, may be added to that, but I will not undertake to say precisely how many from memory—that city has only been twice visited by yellow fever.

Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama. It never originates there.

Mr. FINLEY. It is always imported.

Mr. REAGAN. Two gentlemen near me suggest that it never originates there and is always imported. Proper quarantine regulations will at all times protect that place against yellow fever.

But the time which might be lost, it may be once in five years or so, by the workmen at that yard for that reason, will not be equal to the loss of time sustained in the cold regions of the North, where our navy-yards are, because of frost and snow. With the exception of such danger as may exist from this source there is nothing at all in the way at any time or at any season of the year to impede the work of construction and repairs going on at that navy-yard.

It will not do to say that because the people of that region are sometimes subject to the scourge of the yellow fever—and I understand from physicians that in modern times it has modified somewhat its type, and possesses less terror for the people than formerly—it should be remembered that our country is there, our people are there, our commerce and trade are there, our national honor is pledged as much to the protection of that people and that commerce as it is to the protection of any other portion of the American people and the American commerce. Where our people live, where they rear their families, where they make their homes in the sunny lands of the South as happily as elsewhere, surely the officers and employees of the Government can live.

I say this in order to meet that argument if it be suggested. It has just as much force as I have indicated, and no more. It will not do to say that that country must be abandoned to its fate; that the commerce of the vast region of country that pours into the Gulf of Mexico is in case of war to be left at the mercy of the enemy because sometimes there may be yellow fever at Pensacola where our navy-yard is.

I have said this much because I feel that in proposing to strike out so much of the appropriation as is necessary to keep in existence the navy-yard at Pensacola the committee have made a great mistake. The national interest, the national honor, and the national peace demand that it shall not be done.

The Committee on Naval Affairs make a different recommendation, but we are not now dealing with their report. It recommends, as I understand, in conformity with the recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy, that the Pensacola navy-yard shall be preserved for repairs and supplies. If we make no appropriation for it, the law leaves it, without the means of carrying it on, in such a condition that the yard must go to destruction, and the vast amount of money that has already been expended there must be lost, the national defense must suffer, and in the event of war the commerce of our country must be unprotected to an extent that I am not now fully prepared to show. I have said this for the purpose of calling the attention of the Committee of the Whole this evening to the subject, so that when the proper time arrives I may offer the necessary amendment to preserve this navy-yard as recommended by the Secretary of the Navy and by the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. BANKS. Mr. Chairman, the portion of this bill to which I desire to call the attention of the committee to-night will be found on page third, relating to the civil establishments at the navy-yards at Brooklyn, League Island, Norfolk, and Mare Island: directing the Secretary of the Navy to ascertain and report as to the best method of making sale of the navy-yards at Charlestown, Washington, and Pensacola, the recession of the naval station at New London, and the establishment of a naval rendezvous at Tybee Island or Cockspur Island, in the State of Georgia. It is briefly to this portion of the bill that I wish to direct the attention of the Committee of the Whole. I speak as a representative of the section immediately and greatly interested in one or more of the provisions of this portion of the bill making appropriations for the naval establishment in the opening year.

Mr. Chairman, it comes to us in an unexpected and unusual form. Here is an appropriation bill, which ordinarily contains only the specific appropriations required by existing law, appropriations of specific sums demanded by existing laws for carrying on the Government or in anticipation of measures now pending and that are probably to become laws during the present session. That is the ordinary function of the Committee on Appropriations, and that is the anticipated result of their labors. But in this bill, in the provisions



to which I have referred, we find an entirely new theory of legislation.

For example, under the rules of the House matters relating to the naval establishment of the country would ordinarily be referred to a committee composed of gentlemen representing different sections and acquainted with that interest. And all these matters have in fact been referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and the House is now waiting for its conclusion and report. And now, while yet waiting the conclusion of the committee constituted for that purpose, the Committee on Appropriations, in ten or a dozen lines of this bill, proposes to sweep away even the very foundation of that establishment. Although two or three points only are named in this portion of the bill which are to be abolished or destroyed, it may occur that the House itself or this committee first and the House may add other locations to those already named and thus the very foundations of the naval establishment may be abolished, and so in a week or two, so far as the House is concerned, we may find little or nothing left upon which the Navy Department can rest.

I wish to speak in the first instance against this method of legislation. There is nothing that has ever been proposed or that can be conceived so fatal to honest legislation as that which allows all the subjects of the ordinary legislation of a session to be fastened upon appropriation bills, with special and exclusive privileges that are never accorded to the legislative measures referred to or reported by any other committee whatever, and which are not given even to bills providing appropriations to carry into effect existing and long-established laws. The utmost privilege ever accorded to an appropriation bill is that of being reported at any time; but this practice permits any measure, whatever may be the subject to which it relates or however important the changes it works in existing laws, to be made without notice and forced to a conclusive and final vote at the time it is proposed. It gives to the Appropriation Committee the power to scoop into its hopper the work of every committee and every topic of legislation of whatever name or nature. This is in contravention of every principle of parliamentary law. Appropriation bills have been restricted by immemorial usage and practice to the legitimate and limited purposes and objects, not of legislation, but of specific or general appropriations of public money necessary to the execution of established laws. If this were a reform legislature, and intending to make a reform in the general legislation and condition of the country—and I am one of those that concede earnestly and willingly that reform is demanded by all parties and all sections of the country—if this House of Representatives intended to do this, then it has committed a fundamental and fatal error. No such mischievous rule of legislation, no such vicious system of political action, was ever devised or proposed as that which we have established here, if it be admitted that it gives to the Committee on Appropriations the opportunity to ingraft upon its bills all the legislation that its members may think just and proper, I will not say to usurp, but to assume jurisdiction and final control of the duties of almost every other committee of the House.

It is impossible for us to reform the abuses of the Government, it is utterly out of human power to have an honest administration or an honest government if this system of legislation to which I am referring shall become the established and recognized system of national legislation. It would not surprise me at all if we should find the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which the rules of the House have committed the duty of considering and reporting upon everything that pertains to the naval establishment of the country, seeking through its chairman and through the chairmen of its subcommittees—humbly seeking at the hands of the Committee on Appropriations an opportunity to offer the results of their deliberations and investigations as amendments to this bill.

The Committee on Naval Affairs, whether it has done its work well or ill I cannot say, has certainly prosecuted its inquiries with great industry, and has brought together a mass of information such as never has been presented to the country before in regard to the naval establishment, which has presented and will present in the end many volumes not only of interesting but of instructive testimony from the most honest and intelligent men in different parts of the country whose lives have been connected with the service—all this labor will have been wasted, if not lost, because the Committee on Appropriations assumes the right to take away the very basis upon which the Committee on Naval Affairs has predicated its labors.

If this policy shall be fastened upon the Government as an established rule of action, we may bid farewell forever to any chance or opportunity of making an honest administration of the Government. It does not matter whether it fall into the hands of republicans, democrats, or independents; no party and no people will be able to conduct the affairs of this Government independently or honestly, with a just and proper regard to its various interests, where such unlimited and unrestricted power is given to a single committee as has been given by our action in this case to the Committee on Appropriations. Should it be perpetuated, it will be a measure more fatal to honest legislation than any legacy ever bequeathed by the members of one Congress to the members of another. So much for the manner in which this subject is presented.

Let us look, then, at the question itself. The committee proposes to sell one, two, or three of the establishments which are known to the country as navy-yards. It is a mere chance that Charlestown or Pen-

sacola or League Island or Mare Island are mentioned. These are designated, and we may, if we concur in the action of the committee, destroy them, simply because the gentlemen of the Committee on Appropriations happen to be from sections of the country which have no especial interest in these particular establishments. If I were upon the Committee on Appropriations, of course you understand that I would not propose a measure which would destroy the navy-yard at Charlestown. There would be no dishonesty, no impropriety in my acting in the view which I have expressed, because very naturally, being from that section and knowing its capacity, I should then think it most unwise, as I do now think it is most unwise, most injudicious, and even criminal, speaking of it as a measure of administrative policy, to destroy that and possibly some other navy-yards that are herein mentioned.

The gentleman from Texas, [Mr. REAGAN,] who has spoken so ably and with so much reason against the abolition of the navy-yard at Pensacola, could not be supposed to have been inclined, or to have consented under any circumstances whatever, to the destruction of that yard if he had been upon the Committee on Appropriations, simply because being from that section of the Republic he would have appreciated its importance, and for that reason would have been disinclined to consent to its destruction.

Therefore any of the recommendations which we have from that committee depend not so much upon the merits of the particular propositions that are presented as upon the accidental location and residence of the members of the committee. Of course I do not intend to criticize or condemn the action of its members in this respect any more than I would condemn my own action if I were a member of the committee and had stood by the navy-yard at Charlestown instead of proposing to abolish it, as it is now proposed to do.

This certainly is not a wise method or principle of legislative action. A matter of this kind ought not to be presented to us either as a matter of privilege or of chance, giving to the committee that proposes it authority to suspend all the rules of the House by a majority vote and insert within its provisions any subjects of legislation without limitation or restriction, provided only that it contains an argumentative or presumed reduction of expenditures, and to press them to a final determination in a few hours. In the case before the committee, four hours of the time allowed for general debate were last evening given to the discussion of matters entirely disconnected from the principles or measures embraced in the naval appropriation bill.

It ought not to be given to a committee to make these fundamental changes in the legislation of the country and in the administrative establishments of the Government under such advantages, and thus deprive us of the opportunity of a full and clear examination and discussion of them upon their merits. I do not make any criticism at all upon the committee; it does not enter into my mind to utter one word of censure upon the committee for what they have done. I only speak of the influence and effect of the position which they occupy in this regard and the new and perilous practice we have established in the legislation of the country.

Let us then revert to the immediate question before the committee. What is it? It is to sell two or three, and in the end it may be all the navy-yards now owned by the Government. It is true that the language of the bill proposes to restrict the Secretary of the Navy to an inquiry as to the expediency and best method of selling the yards named. But this presupposes the expediency or necessity of selling them. Its effect upon the country and upon foreign nations will be the same as an order to sell, and it might result in their sale without imposing either upon Congress or the Navy Department any proper responsibility for such an important step. And why, if there is to be an inquiry should it be limited to the establishments here named? Why should it not embrace all yards wherever located, and give to the commission authority to examine all and report those that could best be spared and those which it would be most beneficial for the Government to retain? Why should not the whole question be submitted to the Navy Department? Indeed this ought to be the instruction given to the Secretary, if we give him any instruction upon this subject. If we mean merely to instruct the Secretary of the Navy to inquire what naval establishments can be dispensed with, we ought to leave the whole matter to him or the commission he may appoint. The proposition should not embrace merely the navy-yards at Charlestown, Pensacola, and the Pacific coast. Let him have the whole matter. If there is to be any inquiry, let the whole subject go to this commission or to the Secretary of the Navy, who knows what sort of men to appoint in order to give this House at the next session the full opportunity to examine the whole question. Why should we, upon a pretense that we do not take any action at all, deprive the Secretary of the Navy effectually of the opportunity of considering whether one-half of the existing naval establishments are worth retaining or whether they are not? Why should we not open the whole field to him? I trust that if this committee should do anything on this question it will, when it comes to that point, give unlimited instructions to the Secretary of the Navy to inquire whether any one or all of these establishments should be abolished. At present the proposition is in fact and effect an order to sell certain yards specifically named, reserving an inquiry only as to the best method of making the sale. This ought not to be, and I hope will not be, done.



Now what is it that we propose to do? To sell land. If the Government were an individual sixty or seventy years of age, likely to die in three or five months or years, and having heirs among whom its property was to be distributed, or intending to give it to some charitable institution, then it might be very well to settle up affairs in this way, to convert the lands into bonds or money, and put the proceeds where they would do the most good. But, sir, the Government is not in this condition. This Government is here, not for months or years, but for centuries. It is here for a thousand years. Why should it sell its land? Why should it sell the best position in Boston harbor? Why should it sell the military and naval position it owns at Pensacola? Why, above all, should it sell that position on the Pacific coast where after scientific deliberation and investigation it has planted its naval establishment? What is to be gained by it?

Sir, what member of the committee is able to tell us what will be the necessities of the Government in five years or ten years or twenty-five years at any one of these points? There are on the borders of the Pacific Ocean 500,000,000 people, a power whose ultimate development and destiny is beyond the comprehension of man. Nobody knows what it is to be in the future. Nobody knows what effect it will have upon this country. Why should we tie up our hands at the suggestion of the Secretary of the Navy or a commission appointed by him and deprive ourselves of the key-points upon the Pacific coast which ultimately are to confront and control the movements of that part of the world, the most populous of all portions of the globe, embracing in fact half its entire population? Who can tell us what will be the ultimate effect of the sale of the land which the Government now owns and has appropriated to the natural defenses of the Pacific coast?

Mr. Chairman, (Mr. CLYMER in the chair,) you are a wise man, of large experience, having known something of the course of local as well as general administration. Did you ever know a university, for example, or a charitable corporation having a little apparently unimportant land given to it by benevolent persons for benevolent purposes, that being spurred on by thoughtless and unreflecting men into parting with it as soon as it got it upon the supposition that it was good for nothing and that the institution did not need it—did you ever know one such institution that did not find after twenty-five or fifty or one hundred years that the whole of its influence or its very existence was dependent upon getting back that land or its equivalent in money, if it could? Look at Harvard University; look at any university, or any other institution of learning or charity, that has parted with its lands in that way, and see what the effect has been. We are acting here just as if we were a community that had not more than ten or fifteen years' lease of life given to it, and that it was, therefore, necessary to close up its affairs. But it is not so. We are acting for a people that are to endure a thousand years, for many thousand years it may be; and every step that we take in regard to parting with these key-positions of the continent may be fatal to our people and our country hereafter. Sir, it is a crime that I trust we shall not commit.

We come, then, to the Charlestown navy-yard, now embraced within the new limits of the city of Boston. There was a time when the city of Boston might have been benefited by the sale of this land, but it is not now. Boston originally had six hundred acres of land—no more for a hundred years; and I do not know how much longer it occupied but six hundred acres of land; and until within four or five years past it never covered more than three thousand acres of land. It has reclaimed more than two thousand acres from the sea. Boston is a city set upon sticks. Men have gone out into the deep water, driven their piles, and brought in their filling, and made the land. It is their creation. It has cost millions and tens of millions of dollars to furnish a foundation for the city of Boston and to make it what it is, a city of which this country ought to be proud, a city which in any aspect, whether you consider its social influence, its intellectual character, the advantages of its location, the beauty of its architecture, its beneficent influence upon education, art, society, and government, its contributions to commerce, manufactures, and the mechanic arts, its part in the creation of the great arteries of transportation and communication by sea and land, its sacrifices for universal liberty, and its general industry and prosperity, is unsurpassed by any city on the face of the earth. These people have reclaimed the city they occupy from the deep sea. From six hundred acres of land they have made it, in point of intellectual, aesthetic, and moral influence, one of the noblest cities of the globe.

Now, sir, a navy-yard long ago was planted on the other side of the bay opposite the city of Boston. It is high land; Bunker Hill overlooks the tri-mountain city. It is planted upon deep water; no dredging or piling there. It is the best part of Boston harbor. There is no commercial or naval position which can rival or surpass the advantages which commercial or naval vessels enjoy at the Charlestown navy-yard.

If Boston could have planted itself on that side of the harbor instead of the three mountains it now occupies, it would long ago have embraced millions of acres within its jurisdiction without disturbing the surface or soundings of the deep sea. But fortune decided otherwise. The Government in the end came to occupy that advantageous position which Boston had so long coveted. It was obtained at a very reasonable cost. It has served a good purpose. No discredit attaches to the location or its institutions. The adjacent and surround-

ing communities have grown up with it and adapted themselves to it. They have prospered together. They are all necessary to the Government and the prosperity of the people. Why should the Government now separate them? Why should Boston, that has been compelled to recover from the deep sea the very land upon which she stands, be deprived of the local and general advantages it has so long enjoyed from her intimate and honorable connections with the Government, in peace and war, at that point for more than three-fourths of a century? Why should we sell this land? Are we to make any money by it? When we sell land we do not get the money that we pay when we buy it. If the Government sells the navy-yard at the city of Boston within twenty-five years it will pay a million dollars for other lands for every thousand it receives for this land. Is there to be no navy-yard on the New England coast? Is there any better position elsewhere? Why, then, should we sell them to buy again? What is to be gained by it and who advises it?

There are eighty acres now occupied there for the various purposes of a naval establishment. It costs the Government nothing as a property; it costs the prosperous and busy communities nothing by which it is surrounded; it is no expense to anybody. Taxes are of no account and the interest upon the money the land is worth is of no account, because neither taxes nor interest run against the Government. If sold it will only take the place of other lands upon which interest and taxes are now paid, and neither the State nor the General Government will be richer or stronger for the change; and after ten or twenty years the Government will buy it back, or some other land, and pay a million dollars for every thousand it gets if it sells it now. Just so it is with Pensacola and just so it is with the station on the Pacific coast. Even taking League Island at the reputation it bears here with those most opposed to it, admitting that it is half under water, if the Government has got it and owns it the Government had better keep it. If the city of Philadelphia had looked to its own interest and regarded less the interest and the welfare of the Government it never would have allowed League Island to pass out of its jurisdiction. Although I never set eyes upon it and know nothing about it but what has been said here, I know that, if it is land near the city of Philadelphia and the Government owns it, it is good property, and the day the Government sells it they will that day and that hour begin to wish they could buy it back again. So with every one of these places. They were chosen by wise men. They were not mere territorial purchases for local and temporary objects. They were chosen by wise men who knew the principles upon which the Government must be defended. They were selected as the key-points of the continent for this purpose.

Now it is proposed to this committee and House to sell them. Why do you sell them now? Who is selling landed property now? In the country where I live, among industrious and frugal mechanics, a man who bought a house five years ago for \$1,000 and has a mortgage for \$500 on it, if he should sell it for the best he could get and pay the mortgage he would find that he had lost his property and was saddled with a debt a hundred dollars or more besides. It is so everywhere. Real estate sells for less than half its former value. Is this, then, a time for us to go into the market with acres of land, most valuable for defense and for business, and force it upon an unwilling people, who have no disposition to buy and nothing to pay with?

Then in regard to the yard at Charlestown or Boston. Let me ask you who owns it? The Government of the United States, for the purpose of a navy-yard; but it is the general belief among the people best acquainted with it that some portion of the land at least was sold or given to the Government specifically for a navy-yard, and that this portion, whatever it may be, would revert to heirs who are said not to be in this country, and who may have already parted with their reversionary interest to those who may be among those urging the Government to sell. I have made diligent inquiry on this subject within the last few hours, since it was brought up here, but have not been able to find any proof of this allegation. But it is the general belief of the people of Charlestown. The counsel of the Government admitted it in the hearing concerning the East Boston bridge. I know perfectly well it is their belief that there are heirs living in England who have a reversionary interest in this land, if it be abandoned for the purpose of a navy-yard. Are gentlemen ready to sell this land under such circumstances for probably less than a third of its value?

Admitting all that is said by the honorable gentlemen who presented this question to the committee as to the excessive debts, the gigantic taxes, and the doubtful future of the country—admitting all, confessing that our condition is even worse than they have stated, as I believe it to be—admitting all that, is there no remedy but the sale of the public property, and especially the landed property, these key-points of the continent, essential to the defense of the country as well as to the maintenance of its commerce? No, sir; there are other means for the recuperation of the industry and the restoration of the prosperity and the revival of the ancient integrity which distinguished our people and its Government. And one of these means, ay, Mr. Chairman, the only one—there is no other and there never will be any other—is to bring every subject of legislation regularly and in order before the House, that it may be examined before it is acted upon, that we may know in advance when it is to be considered, that we may enjoy a reasonable opportunity to study the reports of the committee presenting it, and one after the other move upon these



questions and dispose of them understandingly, honestly, and consistently with the interests of the country. That is the best and only method of recuperation, so far as legislation is concerned; and if the honorable gentlemen who have undertaken the management of the affairs of this House, and, so far as this House is concerned, of the Government itself, will adopt this method of legislation they will give a joy to the people that they have not known for many a year. But if you seek to restore their prosperity and to revive their exhausted energies by the forced and unrequited sale of the key-points of the continent, the land we have obtained for the defense of our commerce and our honor, to those who do not want it and have nothing to pay for it, to buy again when it is gone a larger territory at a higher price, then, sir, we shall be disappointed in the result and the people will have reason to withdraw the confidence they have bestowed upon us.

So much, sir, for that. Now what is all this for? Yes, sir; what is it all about? Well, I do not know. But here [turning to page 3 of the bill] is a suspicious and dark-looking low-decked schooner, with rakish masts and narrow beams, as if built for speed rather than strength, her prow directed toward "a naval rendezvous" at Tybee Island or at Cockspar Island, in the State of Georgia, "a naval rendezvous" that at present at least has no existence. Now, sir, is there any necessity for establishing this "naval rendezvous" in the State of Georgia? If we are so destitute and desperate that we must sell the Pacific coast, Bunker Hill, the defensive positions of the Gulf of Mexico, and every prominent point in the country heretofore identified with greater men and greater events even than those with whom we have been associated; if there is any imperative and immediate necessity for the "naval rendezvous" in the neighborhood of Tybee and Cockspar Islands in order that this suspicious craft that I thought I saw in the offing silently and even stealthily moving in the direction of the State of Georgia may find it, could we not wait a little? Is it possible that the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. BLOUNT,] who presents this bill, has no other conception in regard to it than that it is to lead to a new "naval rendezvous" in the State of Georgia?

They may say it is only "a rendezvous!" What is a rendezvous? It is a place where there is a general meeting for general and well-understood purposes; and if League Island, which the gentleman from Pennsylvania says has the incomparable advantage of being half under water—if League Island is an advantage to the country that requires an appropriation of forty or fifty million dollars hereafter, what security have we that this "rendezvous" at Cockspar, or Tybee Islands, in the State of Georgia, may not cost the Government in the next twenty-five years forty or fifty million dollars more? Will the honorable gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. BLOUNT,] who reported this bill, give us a guarantee, backed by his unquestioned responsibility, that the Government shall be put to no cost by this? Why, sir, should we be required to strike down Bunker Hill, to sell it to the enemy it may possibly be, in order to establish such a rendezvous at Cockspar, or Tybee Islands, in the State of Georgia?

There was a man named John Adams, a citizen of Massachusetts, associated as Vice-President with George Washington, and the second President of the United States. It is to Mr. Adams we owe the foundation of our Navy. There were among public men in this country in his time, as now, many who did not greatly admire a naval system, and did not much encourage the foundation of a naval establishment, for very good reasons, no doubt. But Mr. Adams, having fixed his resolute and determined mind upon the idea of a naval establishment, had the strength to bring Congress and the people of the country to support it; and one of the earliest naval stations was fixed at Charlestown, in the State of Massachusetts, now a prosperous and flourishing part of the city of Boston.

Why did they take Charlestown for one of the first navy-yards? Because, sir, it was in a section of country where the people first gave their attention to the sea. In the State-house at Boston, in the house of representatives, a house unlike this, where the natural light and air of heaven sometimes enter, where the sentiments of the people are well and truly represented, just in front of the speaker, as if waiting an opportunity to do that which we all most diligently seek to do—to catch the Speaker's eye at important moments—there hangs, swimming in air, the well-mounted effigy of a gigantic codfish, suggesting the origin and giving a typical representation of what is called there "the codfish aristocracy." It is kept constantly in the eye of legislators to admonish them that they owe their prosperity, their liberty, and their honor to the codfish and the deep-sea fisheries. It was no vulgar origin; there is many an aristocrat in this and other countries who has not as respectable an ancestry as that. The codfish was the original source not only of their means of sustenance but the basis of the industry and commerce of that portion of the country in its early settlement and ultimately in no inconsiderable measure of the whole country.

In the ancient and honorable town of Medford, of the district which I represent, and but two or three miles from Charlestown, was launched one of the first vessels built on this continent. The Dutch people in New York and the southern people in Virginia built other vessels about the same time, it may be a little earlier or a little later. But certainly one of the earliest and best vessels built on the Atlantic coast was constructed by the colonists at Medford in 1630 or 1631, and named, with religious ceremonies and with the prayers of the people, "The Blessing of the Bay." It was the blessing of the bay. It brought them sustenance and kept them alive. Little by little they grew so as to be able to chase and capture a nobler game. They followed

the whale into Hudson Bay and the northern oceans. Their chivalrous and triumphant chase of this gigantic game of the sea drew from Edmund Burke that most remarkable and eloquent meed of praise which he bestowed upon the people of New England for the success of their whaling industry.

A little later the vessels that had been built upon the Atlantic coast found their way into the Indian Ocean, and carried the manufactures of Massachusetts into the crowded empires of the East, where by their superiority they drove the English manufactures out of the eastern markets. They owed to that little vessel built at Medford, in the neighborhood of the navy-yard at Charlestown—that little vessel which they reverently and wisely called *The Blessing of the Bay*—all their prosperity and power. It was the offspring of that vessel that forced upon the world American cottons, and which in turn gave to the cotton States a market for their staple product. We put more of the raw material, which was abundant, into the product of our looms than English manufacturers could give, and it secured for us the markets so essential to our manufacturing industry and to the increase of the cotton crop. It was "*The Blessing of the Bay*" that did it.

At a later period it was the means of establishing the ice trade, taking an article which nobody believed could ever be of any value whatever, and making it as well the basis of an extended and prosperous commerce and a source of revenue to the State and a blessing to all nations. William Gray, Theodore Lyman, Frederick Tudor, and other merchants, who were the precursors of Francis Lowell and the mechanics associated with him in the organization of the American system of manufactures, must forever be numbered among the founders of the commercial and industrial prosperity of the country. It was no doubt in part for these reasons, as well as on account of the advantages of its situation, that John Adams and the patriots of that day selected Charlestown, in the vicinity of Boston, as the site of one of the earliest of our navy-yards. It had the best water; it was upon high and rising ground; it was in the midst of a prosperous and industrious people; they found there the best shipwrights in the world and the best sailors that ever plowed the sea.

The first Napoleon paid only a just compliment to New England sailors when he said that while Frenchmen were the best soldiers that ever stood upon the land, the Americans were the best sailors that ever floated upon the sea. The sailors of Marblehead, who are represented by my friend here of the Gloucester district, [Mr. THOMPSON,] gave chase to British cruisers and captured them in the very month of the British Channel.

The mechanics of the navy-yard at Charlestown built the *Constitution* and the *Guerriere* and the thirty or forty vessels which carried our flag triumphantly over every sea during the great struggle with Great Britain, a struggle that no infant state like ours ever before made with such success against a power that had never before been measured and conquered, a State which Mr. Webster correctly and truly described when he said that "it was a power to which Rome in the days of her glory was unequal, whose morning-drum beat, following the sun, and keeping company with the hours, encircled the earth daily with one continuous strain of the martial airs of England."

The mechanics of that neighborhood built the *Constitution* and the *Guerriere* and the other majestic floating batteries that humbled the power of Great Britain upon the sea. They were built by mechanics who were residents, rulers, and defenders of the little communities of the Atlantic coast ranging all the way from Maine to New York, and farther south, if you please, to Virginia and the Carolinas and Georgia. It was for such reasons that Charlestown had been selected and is yet maintained as the site of one of the best navy-yards to be found in any part of the world.

Now, what has Charlestown done that she should be deprived of the memento left of those glorious days and great men? Look at her history. It might be deemed perhaps invidious to recall even the names of its citizens who were among the chief figures in the moving panorama of the world during the hundred years just closed. There were Lexington, Concord, and Charlestown within a circle whose radius is less than five miles. Lexington, Concord, and Bunker Hill! Who can forget them? Who can cease to remember what we owe to the men whose patriotism and prowess have led to the glories which we now enjoy in common with the rest of the world?

Shall we strip Bunker Hill of that establishment which was intended as a memento and monument of earlier enterprise and success and the instrument of later if not greater achievements? Shall we deprive Lexington and Concord of this honorable recognition of past services which the Government of the United States gave to this section three-quarters of a century ago because it deserved it and could best use it? I think this committee will scarcely do that. No, sir; let Bunker Hill stand; let her try her chances and test her destiny, whatever it may be, in the century that is to come. Let her contemplate what she has been and what she is, and not be made to hang her head with shame when she remembers that an American House of Representatives, the first parliamentary assembly in the world, has deprived her of the recognition of patriotic services and the chapel of honor that our fathers accorded her. Let those now engaged in labor for their bread and that of their children for weary hours at stunted pay bear constantly in sight the flag which floats above them, a perpetual reminder of the glories of the past and the hopes of the future; of the virtues of their fathers and their mothers; for there were then mothers as well as fathers of the country.



I am sure I need not ask the committee to consider well what will be the effect of any such action as this. Sir, my heart would pour itself out in tears if I believed that while I was a member of this House its honorable Speaker would ever be called upon to append his name to a bill which should be a chart of dishonor for Bunker Hill; and for what? For a few dollars in irredeemable currency as a compensation for land improvidently sold, which no man can say will be worth twenty-five cents on the dollar five or ten years hence. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, you may think this is a mere expression of local or personal feeling; that my sincerity and warmth are not natural and sincere. But it is an error. Sir, in the twenty years I have been off and on a member of this House, I have often spoken in moments of great excitement when strong appeals were made. I have seen incidents and events that were calculated to blanch the cheeks of the boldest and bravest men. I have been called to speak honest words, sometimes of denunciation, sometimes of argument, sometimes of appeal. But never in any moment did I speak upon a subject or an occasion that more closely touched the inner recesses of my heart than now, when I appeal to the committee for the honor of Bunker Hill, Lexington, and Concord, identified with the best days and the best men and the greatest events of our history or the history of the world. I speak not merely for the people of the New England villages, a few hundred men and women, but the people all around, the descendants of the "embattled farmers" who with their muskets upon their shoulders stepped into the line of action and of duty. For these people I appeal to this committee to let Bunker Hill stand; or if there be an occasion for its dishonor, let us take another occasion than the centennial year 1876 to do that deed or discharge that duty. [Earnest and long-continued applause.]

Mr. HARRIS, of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, after the eloquent appeal made by the distinguished gentleman from the Charlestown district, [Mr. BANKS,] it may perhaps seem useless for me to attempt to say anything upon the subject which has been presented to the House in the three propositions which are before us. Yet, Mr. Chairman, I propose to say a few words in order that I may lay before the House some facts which it should consider in disposing of the proposition to sell the Charlestown navy-yard.

This yard in the bill of the Committee on Appropriations is proposed to be disposed of. The Committee on Naval Affairs have presented a proposition to keep in active general use the navy-yards at Kittery, Charlestown, Brooklyn, and Norfolk; to use the navy-yards at Pensacola and Mare Island for general purposes of repair; and to recede the navy-yards at New London and League Island. But the gentleman from New York, [Mr. WILLIS,] who addressed the committee to-day, proposes another and a different disposition of the navy-yards. He proposes to sell the Charlestown yard, to close those at Kittery and Pensacola, and to have only two navy-yards in the country: one at Brooklyn, near his own home, and the other on the Pacific coast. Here are three propositions; and all three of these propositions have sprung into existence within the last few days, for I maintain upon this floor that, so far as the Naval Committee have had anything to do with this subject, these propositions have never been heard of within the doors of the committee-room for discussion or deliberation until within the past three days. In all our peregrinations over the land no testimony has been taken by any committee or any member of it in my hearing upon the subject of selling any navy-yard in this country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am a resident of Massachusetts—not, however, particularly interested in the Charlestown navy-yard. I live south of Boston; and I believe that within the last two years there have been but three persons at work in the Charlestown navy-yard from the district which I represent. I have therefore no particular interest in that yard; and notwithstanding the remarks of my colleague who has just taken his seat, I am inclined to the opinion that the interests of Boston do not particularly require that that navy-yard should be preserved. I am not sure that the commercial interests and the wealth of Boston would not be subserved by converting that navy-yard into sites for other kinds of business. It has a grand water-front; it is in the center of that city; it has many advantages for commercial purposes. Therefore, when I speak upon this subject, I am not speaking either from personal interest or from what I deem to be the monetary interests of the community within which that navy-yard is situated. But, sir, I speak of this as a navy-yard which in the past has rendered incalculable service. My eloquent friend has told you of the ships of former times built at that yard and which have reflected honor upon the State and the country; and I may, without giving offense I believe to any man, point to the ships built in that yard within the last fifteen years which made their mark and told in the interests of their country. The navy-yard at Charlestown during the late rebellion was active in all its departments in bringing forth iron-clads and wooden ships of all classes. Thousands of men were successfully employed in that yard during that unhappy period. That this navy-yard during that time—and the object of these remarks is to lay before the House the facilities and advantages which that yard now has, and to present if I can some of the reasons why it should not be sold or destroyed—that this navy-yard during that period was useful to the country no man will deny.

What have we gathered there? What have the people of the United States put in that yard which for naval purposes may here-

after be useful? The only great cordage establishment which the United States Government owns is in the navy-yard at Boston. That establishment for the manufacture of cordage of all kinds and every size is equal to any in the country to-day; and I suppose I might say without vanity that it is superior to almost any in the country. It is ready to start its machinery to-morrow and produce cordage of the first class. My friend from New York [Mr. WILLIS] may point to his navy-yard, over which he rejoices, and may fail to find elsewhere anything like it.

Mr. WILLIS. I wish to correct the gentleman. He refers to the Brooklyn navy-yard as belonging to "the gentleman from New York." That is a great mistake. If the interests of the country could be subserved by the sale of that yard I would cheerfully vote for it.

Mr. HARRIS, of Massachusetts. From the manner of my friend's speech, I ought to be excused for the error.

Furthermore the navy-yard at Charlestown possesses a rolling-mill capable of converting scrap-iron of all kinds into every description of rolled iron used in the Navy, with the exception perhaps of the large armor iron used on iron-clads. It possesses a forging-shop of great dimensions and capacity. This, I think, is not common to all the yards. In the late visit of the committee to that yard we were told by engineers and men familiar with the subject that the yard had the machinery and all the facilities for constructing in every part the largest steam-engines which could be put into any ship of war. In passing through that machine-shop and examining the machinery there, I was of opinion that those who claimed it to be the finest machine-shop in this country were not in error. In the large machine-shops of Charlestown are to be found the most perfect and the largest engines for working iron that can be found in any machine-shop belonging to the Government of the United States. What else is there at that yard? Vast accumulations of timber of all kinds stored in wooden and stone buildings, large docks, wet docks, filled with the timber which the Government has seen fit (in its wisdom, I think) to accumulate and to store up for future needs.

Mr. Chairman, destroy that navy-yard at Charlestown; offer it for sale, as my friend from New York suggests, because it is in a large city, and the land will bring a good price, and then undertake to remove the material which that navy-yard contains. In the first month of your operations you will lose by the destruction of property more than the whole price the navy-yard would bring. We have witnessed such destruction at the Philadelphia navy-yard; we have seen what came of destroying one navy-yard; and, so far as I am concerned, I hope never to witness the destruction which will follow the removal of another.

Mr. Chairman, the navy-yard at Charlestown includes within its limits to-day a vast amount of wealth. The dry-dock of granite, equal to that in the New York yard—commenced in the days of John Quincy Adams and finished in the days of Andrew Jackson—would cost to-day hundreds of thousands of dollars to construct. It is in perfect condition, ready and able to receive the largest ship that floats. The proposition is to sell it; why I do not know. Whence the proposition emanates I scarcely know.

Mr. Chairman, these navy-yards were not made for times of peace. These great accumulations of wealth and material and power were not gathered together for times of peace. They were put there in order that this country might be able in time of war to meet any enemy it might have to contend with upon the sea. League Island to-day is not in condition to receive and copper a ship of fifty tons. There is, to be sure, an immense wooden dry-dock near the navy-yard there; but it is not now in condition for service, and nobody will pretend that it is. There is a ship-house, lately removed from the Philadelphia navy-yard, standing upon piles seven feet above the ground, and which never can be used until there shall be placed under it a stone foundation and the piles removed. The navy-yard at New York, great as that yard is, is to-day a hospital for old hulks unworthy to float upon the sea. It is in no better condition this hour to meet the requirements of war than the navy-yard at Boston.

My friend from New York [Mr. WILLIS] has discussed the question of the Navy, and I will say the remarks the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] made this evening were correct as to the acquaintance of gentlemen with naval affairs. Why, so far as I am concerned, I was placed on that committee I never learned, and the profundity of the ignorance of the gentleman from New York in respect to naval affairs is only excelled by my own. He has given no reasons why the navy-yard at Charlestown should be sold. He has told us why the navy-yard at New York should be preserved, that it is in the center of a great city, while he speaks of other cities in which navy-yards are situated as little country villages. Boston is a little country village and yet the navy-yard there is equal to that of New York. He proposes to sell it and yet the Brooklyn navy-yard is the only one he has ever visited, on his own confession.

While the little village of Boston does not compare with the great city of New York, still I think the gentleman from New York may learn a little about naval affairs if he will spend a few hours in the Charlestown navy-yard; something about the demands of the Government and something about the building of ships of war. He may understand something, too, of what it is to accumulate vast amounts of property and have it ready and in condition for use at any moment.

Now, I care nothing personally on the subject of the Charlestown navy-yard. I have no personal interest in it. I do not believe the



people of my State are particularly benefited by it. I do say if there is a community in the country, with the exception of that in and around the city of New York, capable from experience, capable from habit, successfully to perform labor and do work in a navy-yard, that community is within twenty miles of the city of Boston including the city in its limits. Where will you find better skilled mechanics in the construction of machinery than there? Where will you find men better acquainted with the construction of ships than there, or even all the way from the British possessions down to Cape Cod? A large portion of the people residing on the southeastern coast of Massachusetts between Boston and Cape Cod are learned and skilled in the art of ship-building.

Mr. Chairman, there is one subject to which I desire to call the attention of this House, and in that I think I shall agree with the gentleman from New York. He remarked that our navy-yards are silent, that our machinery is still, that we are doing nothing. Yes, granted; and yet we are keeping by our contract system some great private establishment of the country employed in the manufacture of steam-engines, iron plating, and in building and repairing hulls for the Navy of the United States. It is a system pernicious, wasteful, and extravagant. We have had occasion lately to know by our examination that the Charlestown navy-yard has been called upon to furnish to private contractors the timber from its ship-houses and iron and copper from its store-houses, and that a ship of war was being built within sight of the navy-yard under private contract, while the skilled mechanics, the skilled workmen which the United States should keep in its employ were idle or seeking other employment.

Give the navy-yards the legitimate work which belongs to the construction of our Navy, and you have navy-yards enough in the country to do the work. Their capacity is not what it should be. They should be building two ships of war in every navy-yard of the United States to-day, and we should keep on building them. We should keep in full repair all other ships worthy of going to sea. To do that requires more than the New York navy-yard. A little help might be rendered by Boston and Pensacola and a great deal by Norfolk and Mare Island navy-yards.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, this proposition will not meet with any favor in the House, and that the navy-yards, if they are to be sold and disposed of, will be sold and disposed of after some deliberation, after some investigation by competent men. I hope this proposition will not be forced through the House of Representatives upon a bill which came into existence within one week from the time when it is to be finally passed upon by the Representatives of the people.

#### PROTECTION OF AMERICAN LABOR.

Mr. WALLACE, of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, that the manufacturing interests of the country are fearfully depressed; that a large percentage of our furnaces and mills and factories and workshops are silent and still, and that a million and more of laborers, many of whom are skilled workmen, are without employment and know not where to get bread for themselves and families, are facts admitted and recognized by gentlemen on both sides of this House. That the people are looking toward and expecting Congress, if possible, to do something to revive the business of the country, restore confidence, and relieve the pressing wants of the people, are also admitted facts. The remedy for all those ills, so far proposed, is a dose of finance, and the amount to be administered ranges from an inflated bolus commensurate with the powers of deglutition, down to an infinitesimal pellet of contraction. After careful and attentive consideration of the many and conflicting prescriptions suggested, each claiming to be an infallible panacea, I am forced to the conclusion that the case is not well understood.

Lord Brougham, when interrogated as to what he understood by the Schleswig-Holstein question answered, that there were but two men who ever comprehended that subject; one man knew and had told him, but that the man who knew had died, and he had forgotten what the man had told him. Now, sir, it does appear to me that the man who understood this finance question practically, and who fully comprehended the situation of the country and who knew how by direct legislation on the finance question to revive the industrial interests of the land, to relieve the pressing wants of the laboring-men, and restore confidence among the people, died some time ago and forgot to tell any man how it was to be done.

It is an easy matter to construct plausible and high-sounding theories of finance, and every man in Congress and out of it has one; but when you come to apply those theories practically, to meet the present condition of affairs, difficulties confront you at every step. The proposition to issue an indefinite amount of greenbacks sufficient, it is asked, to meet the business wants of the country, is a proposition of great latitude and should be accepted with much caution. An essential element in a sound currency is stability of value, and a currency which rests solely upon credit, and which is but a promise to pay without ability to fulfill the promise, must necessarily fluctuate in value, and being unstable itself, must in a greater or less degree unsettle all values and render uncertain and insecure all kinds of business; and the larger the inflation the greater the fluctuation, and the greater the liability to business derangements.

I would be glad to see the time come when what we call a dollar would mean a dollar, and not a promise to pay, and am in favor of a return to a specie basis at the earliest day that is practicable and possible, but am opposed to a forced resumption, which would in my

judgment be impossible to maintain, and which would certainly bring distress and ruin upon the industries of the whole country. More than one year has elapsed since the bill was passed fixing the time for resumption, and I would ask gentlemen upon this floor what progress and preparation have we made to meet the requirements of such an exigency? The prospects for resumption on the 1st of January, 1879, are more unfavorable to-day than they were one year ago. The amount of coin in the Treasury of the United States to-day available for that purpose is a mere nominal sum. Many of the advocates of that bill, as well as the Secretary of the Treasury, tacitly admit that their expectations have not been realized and that the act fixing the time for specie resumption was a mistake. Then if we cannot resume by the time fixed, why allow this resumption act to remain suspended over the heads of the manufacturing and business men of the country like the sword over the head of Damocles, threatening and ready to fall at any moment? I am clearly of the opinion that we ought to repeal the clause of that act fixing the time for resumption, and I am well convinced that a large majority of this House are of the same opinion. If by our legislation we have not been able to retain in our country the gold taken from our mines, how can we expect to retain the foreign gold which we purpose to purchase with our bonds? It cannot be done.

With our large indebtedness abroad, requiring so large an amount of gold to pay the interest on our bonds; with the balance of trade against us, averaging over \$100,000,000 annually, it is utterly impossible to resume specie payment with this condition of affairs existing, either on the 1st of January, 1879, or at any other time.

To relieve the manufacturing and industrial interests of the country, and to restore confidence and prosperity to the people, I propose three things:

First, repeal the clause fixing the time for resumption, and thus relieve the manufacturers of the impending dread of the results of a forced resumption, and then let the currency question alone, and allow the laws of trade and commerce to regulate the time when specie resumption can be maintained without too severe a shock upon the business of the country.

Second, prohibit banks from paying interest on deposits and enforce and increase the penalties for charging illegal rates. Banks pay 6 per cent. on deposits, and consequently have to discount at rates of 12 and 14 per cent. No manufacturing or other business can be conducted successfully and pay such extortionate rates for money.

Third, instead of reducing our present rates of tariff duties, as proposed by the bill now reported to the House and gotten up in the interests of British manufacturers and free-traders and importers of foreign goods into our country, I would increase the duties upon all products and manufactures which we can produce and manufacture at home. The time has come when we must direct our attention more to the interest and welfare of the many, the laboring class of society, and not so much to the few, the money-changers and importers of foreign fabrics and the stock-jobbers of Wall street. Labor constitutes the wealth of a nation, and, therefore, should receive that careful and earnest consideration of the law-making power of a nation which its importance demands. When you sum up this question of finance, which so troubles, distracts, and befogs the minds of the people, it resolves itself into simply the measures affecting the labor of the country, and the question of labor means the question of protection to American industries.

Is it not a wise policy for every nation to protect her own industries? A nation to become great must become independent, and to become independent must rely mainly, if not solely, upon her own internal resources. Not only her independence, but her civilization, depends upon the development of the resources within her own territory.

It has been said that the amount of coal consumed by a nation, being given, affords a fair measure by which to judge of her civilization, for the reason that coal is the chief aliment of manufacturing industries, and the amount consumed represents the development of the manufacturing interests of the people, upon which the wealth, the prosperity, the greatness, the grandeur, and the independence of a nation depend. No society homogeneous in character, with homogeneity of labor, ever has achieved or ever can achieve national greatness or national distinction. Extent and variety of manufactures develop trade and commerce and create a steady and reliable home market for the products of the soil, so that all departments of industry are benefited and the people contented and prosperous; and with prosperity and accumulation of wealth, the fine arts, literature, and science find encouragement; so that just in proportion to the differentiation of labor does society more and more perfect its organization and the people rise higher and higher in the scale of civilization. Great Britain, under the fostering care and high protective policy of her government, built up and extended and diversified her manufacturing interests till her labor-saving machinery became so varied, so immense, and complete that she aspired to the proud preeminence of making her workshops the workshops of the world, her consumption of coal being so far in excess of any other nation on the globe that to-day she claims to stand first in rank among the civilized nations of the world.

If, then, the consumption of coal by a nation be a measure of its actual civilization, then the coal area of a nation ought to be a measure of its potential civilization. The United States, having a larger coal area than the world besides, under wise and comprehensive legislation ought to march to the front and take the first place in the



rank of civilized nations. In extent and variety of minerals, in magnitude of national domain, in fertility of soil and its adaptation to the growth of almost every variety of products, in salubrity of climate, and in external and internal facilities for commerce we stand without a peer among the nations of the earth.

In my judgment this question of protection to American labor is the great question before the American people to-day. It rests on the unquestioned principle inherent in nations as well as in individuals, the right of self-preservation. It is upon this principle that Congress, the law-making power of the United States, has the right to make and enforce tariff laws. I never understood by what principle of right and justice one nation could impose and collect duties upon the importation of products and manufactures of another nation for the purpose of raising revenue to meet the expenses of the state; but when imposed to protect its own industries the principle becomes plain and intelligible and the question of revenue becomes incidental. In this country, where we have a large public domain and which is accessible to every one, men will not toil from morning to night for a mere subsistence, and should not, for that can be obtained by the culture of a few acres of land with much less labor. Besides, it should not be the policy of this great and free Government to impoverish the laboring class of society. The mechanic and laborer should receive fair and remunerative wages, so that they may be able to surround themselves with many of the comforts of life and to educate their children, so as to fit them for the better discharge of the high and responsible duties incumbent upon them as citizens of the United States.

I do not accept the constabulary idea of government, that it is but a police arrangement for the punishment of offenders of the law and the enforcement of contracts. These are but the lower functions of government. The end of government is the good of the people, and that government is best administered when the greatest good is done to the greatest number. Ours is pre-eminently a government of the people, for the people, and by the people. Wise legislation should and will look to the welfare of the whole, and not to the particular interests of a few, and whenever legislation departs from this sound principle of public policy the state becomes weakened. Each and every citizen should feel that his interests and happiness are as well cared for as can possibly be done, having a proper regard for the general welfare of the whole. Feeling that he has this care and consideration bestowed upon him, he manifests a just pride in his government and becomes strongly attached to its interests and perpetuity, and the state thereby becomes strong in all its parts. Whenever a government fails to throw her protecting care over any class of her citizens and allows them to suffer hardships that might be relieved, she thereby alienates that class from herself and becomes weaker just in proportion to the numbers and to the extent of the alienation.

With cheap money and cheap labor of the Old World the European manufacturer can bring his wares and fabrics to our very doors and undersell us at home, putting out the fires of our own workshops, impoverishing our own laborers and mechanics, and diminishing the wealth of the nation. We have to-day in our country one million and a half of men out of employment, and a large proportion of them skilled laborers, who ought and could each earn at least one dollar per day, so that one million and a half of dollars are daily lost to the country. To remedy this seems to me to be the great financial problem to be solved.

The only way to accomplish this object is to direct our legislation to the promotion of the general welfare of the country by the development and the protection of our own industries, or, in other words, we must make and sell more and buy less. The people understand this question better than we do, and are determined to be heard on this matter, and woe be to that party which places itself in antagonism to this great and momentous question of American policy. I am glad to find that the press all over the land are discussing this question with much interest. The Chicago Inter-Ocean, one of the ablest conducted papers in the country, speaking on this subject a few days ago, says:

The people of every section and every party must soon be convinced that relief to the finances of this country can come only through the development of every form of productive resources. Precisely to the extent that the national policy has departed from that rule and substituted discouragements and antagonisms for that generous recognition and ample protection which every nation owes to the industries and business of its people, has the course of things gone wrong. In 1873 Congress found the country so prosperous that it gave away the revenues with a free and almost destructive hand. It abolished import duties yielding thirty millions of revenue, and it gave relief, or intended to give relief, to many rates of duty supposed to be oppressive to the people here who consumed imported goods. The purpose was good, but the act was bad; the relief came chiefly to the producers in foreign countries who had no other market equal to our own. The following statement shows that the imports free of duty have risen from about fifty to one hundred and eighty millions within six years, and that the aggregate paying duty fell off nearly two hundred millions in 1875 from its amount in 1872. We have opened the flood-gates of free importation, as we shall see, at quite too heavy a cost:

*Imports in the fiscal years of 1869 to 1875.*

Years.	Free.	Paying duty.
1869-70	\$46,559,965	\$415,817,602
1870-71	57,857,761	483,635,947
1871-72	61,010,902	579,327,864
1872-73	166,296,821	497,320,326
1873-74	179,936,668	415,921,580
1874-75	167,180,614	386,725,509

It will be seen that we have given up our markets to foreigners with a freedom that could scarcely fail to drain us of gold. All these imports are paid for in gold; and, when their aggregate rises to \$663,617,147 in one year, as in 1872-73, it is reasonable to expect prostration to follow. Since the fatal reductions of the several acts of 1872, we have imported an average of more than six hundred millions yearly, and have let one-third of this vast aggregate come in free of duty. It did not need a prophet to predict paralysis and bankruptcy as certain to follow on such events.

This presents a correct view of the chief cause which has so nearly overwhelmed the country in financial distress and industrial ruin. During the last ten years our imports have exceeded our exports \$1,100,000,000. Is it strange, then, that we have to-day one million and a half of men pleading and begging for work and the country becoming impoverished? Not at all.

I have compiled a table showing the values of a few leading articles of importation into the United States for the last three fiscal years ending June 30, 1875:

Articles.	1873.	1874.	1875.	Total.
Chemicals and drugs	\$25,286,138	\$23,041,122	\$22,041,122	\$70,368,382
Clothing	8,551,161	7,069,996	7,455,569	23,076,726
Cotton, manufactures of	29,752,116	23,572,610	22,790,337	76,115,063
Earthenware and china	6,015,925	4,882,355	4,285,210	15,183,490
Fancy articles, perfumery, &c.	5,336,473	6,939,524	6,005,940	18,331,937
Flax, manufactures of	20,428,391	17,472,755	16,603,242	54,504,388
Glass and glass-ware	7,420,044	6,257,964	5,805,115	19,483,123
Hides and skins	17,398,612	16,444,877	18,536,902	52,380,391
Iron, pig, railroad, chains, &c., including steel rails	44,860,441	21,596,716	10,463,940	76,921,097
Silk, manufactures of	29,535,867	23,996,782	24,380,923	78,213,572
Steel, cutlery, saws, &c.	14,648,013	12,196,930	8,671,793	35,516,736
Spirits and wines	9,258,469	8,636,469	7,769,527	25,664,465
Wool, unmanufactured	20,433,938	8,250,306	11,071,259	39,755,503
Carpets, worsted dress-goods, &c.	50,462,775	46,378,079	43,925,943	140,766,797
Total	229,688,363	226,786,485	209,806,822	726,281,670

Here we have the figures, showing that in three years, during panic times, that of a few leading articles, which we should have produced and manufactured at home, we have imported to the amount of \$726,281,670, while our own mills and factories and workshops have been standing comparatively idle. Is this the kind of policy that gentlemen on this floor wish to adopt? Will such a policy result in national greatness and national independence?

One fact, sir, is worth a dozen of theories; and the great fact that to-day stands out before the world, illustrating the soundness of the protective policy, is the financial and industrial condition of France. But a few years ago, when the victorious German army marched up to the gates and into the city of Paris, and compelled that proud nation to capitulate, Bismarck imposed an indemnity upon the nation of \$1,000,000,000 in gold. Bismarck intended to impoverish the French people to the extent that they could not give Germany any more trouble for a generation to come. What has been the result? France increased her duties on importations, and on many articles the duties amounted to an entire prohibition, and at once put her wheels and hammers and spindles in operation all over the land, and the result has been that France has paid the indemnity imposed, and to-day has more gold and silver in her coffers than any nation in the world; and her exports, during the last fiscal year, have amounted to over \$800,000,000. Her exports have exceeded her imports over \$100,000,000 annually, while ours have been directly the reverse. She has become rich, while we have become poor. Other illustrations of the reverse of this policy can be found in the present condition of India, Portugal, Turkey, Egypt, Peru, and some other nations, which have adopted the opposite, or free-trade policy. These nations have become impoverished, weak, and dependent, and to-day their commerce is not worth looking after.

It has been said that our tariff is higher than that of any nation of Europe. This is not a fact; and I am indebted to my friend Dr. Young, of the Bureau of Statistics, for the following table, giving the rates of tariff on iron and steel in France, Austria, Russia, and Italy. I have not chosen these two articles because the duties on them were higher than on other articles, but because they represented two leading articles of commerce, and gave the general rates of tariff in those countries:

*Statement showing the European tariffs on iron, steel, &c.*

Classes of iron and steel.	France.	Austria.	Russia.	Italy.
Iron bars..... per ton..	\$11 87 to \$15 00	\$12 50	\$17 08 to \$24 59	\$9 16
T and angle	11 87	17 50	17 08 to 74 17	9 16
Common castings	7 50	5 93	24 59 to 122 92	9 16
Screws, bolts, &c.	15 93	20 00	122 92 to 221 25	22 31
Iron anchors and cables	15 23	17 50	49 17 to 147 70	.....
Iron wire	11 87 to 20 00	20 00	71 25	16 25
Steel wire	22 50 to 30 00	20 00	71 25	46 25
Rails, iron	11 87	12 50	10 00	9 16
steel	18 00	12 50	21 08 to 65 83	9 16
Fish and bed-plates, iron	15 93	20 00	49 18	12 90
steel	40 00	20 00	.....	12 90
Tires, iron	20 00	17 50	49 18	9 16
steel	20 00	17 50	65 83	27 50
Locomotive and wagon	.....	.....	.....	.....
axles, iron	20 00	\$12 50 to 20 00	49 18	13 75
steel	30 00	12 50 to 20 00	65 83	46 25



Statement showing the European tariffs on iron, steel, &amp;c.—Continued.

Classes of iron and steel.	France.	Austria.	Russia.	Italy.
Axles, with tires fitted, on, iron .....	\$20 00	\$20 00	\$14 58 to \$49 18	\$13 75
steel .....	30 00	20 00	14 58 to 65 83	46 25
Bearings and spiral springs, steel .....	21 87	20 00	65 83	30 00
Wrought goods, shafts, winches, &c., iron .....	20 00	12 50 to 20 00	49 18	22 91
steel .....	30 00	12 50 to 20 00	65 83	46 25
Locomotives:				
Without tender .....	80 00	20 00	36 66	16 25
With tender .....	20 00	20 00	36 66	16 25
Steam-engines .....	11 87	13 12	14 58	11 87
Machine tools .....	11 87	13 12	14 58	(1)
Agricultural machines and implements .....	11 87			7 91

NOTE.—The pound sterling computed at \$5.

To illustrate more clearly the fact which I wish to present, I have in conjunction with the above table another, giving the rates of wages paid to skilled workmen in those same countries:

A table showing the average rates of wages per day for skilled workmen in France, Austria, Russia, and Italy.

Skilled workmen.	France.	Austria.	Russia.	Italy.
Blacksmiths .....	\$0 85	\$1 15	\$1 50	\$0 80
Bricklayers .....	80	1 00	1 40	80
Masons .....	80	1 00	1 40	80
Cabinet-makers .....	85	1 00	1 25	90
Carpenters .....	85	1 10	1 35	80
Coopers .....	80	1 00	1 25	70
Engineers .....	1 00	1 35	1 50	90
Machinists .....	1 10	1 75	1 75	1 00
Painters .....	80	1 40	1 35	75
Plasterers .....	80	1 00	1 40	60
Shoemakers .....	80	1 00	1 25	60
Tailors .....	95	1 40	1 25	65
Tanners .....	80	1 20	1 00	65
Tinsmiths .....	80	1 20	1 00	65
Weavers .....	65	50	85	60
Wheelwrights .....	90	1 00	1 00	60
Factory operatives .....	85	1 00	1 00	70

The wages of ordinary laborers are about one-half of the above rates, while to women, who are chiefly employed in the manufacturing of the fine and light fabrics, still less wages are paid.

I have also compiled a table giving the average prices of the leading articles of subsistence in those countries:

A table showing the average prices of the leading articles of subsistence in France, Austria, Russia, and Italy.

Articles of subsistence.	France.	Austria.	Russia.	Italy.
Flour, wheat .....	\$9 00	\$11 00	\$11 50	\$8 50
Corn-meal .....	7 80	8 00		4 50
Beef .....	19	28	20	10
Veal .....	18	28	22	11
Mutton .....	19	15	15	08
Pork, fresh .....	20	30	16	10
corned .....	24	22	20	12
bacon .....	30	24	25	14
hams .....	30	45	30	15
Lard .....	15	24	25	17
Butter .....	35	42	35	25
Cheese .....	31	40	30	35
Rice .....	08	08	05	05
Potatoes .....	45	90	85	1 00
Beans .....	08	07	08	12
Eggs .....	24	15	20	12

Now, sir, I maintain that, when you take into consideration the cheapness of money in those countries, with the rates of wages paid for skilled labor, and the cost of subsistence, their tariff rates are from 10 to 25 per cent. higher than the tariff rates in this country as against the manufacturer.

Our American manufacturers cannot pay such high rates of interest on money as they have been doing, and pay the wages that our American mechanics should receive, unless they are adequately protected against the cheap money and cheap labor of the Old World. I am told by all the manufacturers with whom I have conversed, that if this iniquitous and crude bill now before the House should become a law, they will be compelled to close their doors. Should this bill become a law, I say to gentlemen now and here, that the distress complained of so much to-day is nothing compared to that which is to follow.

There is another mistaken idea which I find current in many places, and it is this: it is claimed that our country is so large, with such diver-

sity of soil, and climate, and resources, that naturally there must be a diversity of interests, and that it is difficult, if not impossible, to frame tariff laws that will bear equally upon all parts of the country. No graver error was ever conceived; it is this very diversity of soil, and climate, and resources, and labor, which creates and produces unity of interests. It is the differentiation of labor that begets reciprocity of interests, and makes a nation united, great, and independent.

I say to gentlemen of the South, you have the finest country in the world: compared with the hills of New England yours is a paradise; but the indomitable pluck of the New England men has made their barren hills to blossom as the rose and her workshops and mills to be seen on every hill and in every valley. Your mineral resources are inexhaustible. Sustain, then, the policy of protection to your own industries, and invite capitalists from abroad to come among you and build furnaces and rolling-mills and assist you to develop your own wonderful resources. Erect cotton factories where cotton is grown; plant more cotton in your rich alluvial lands, so well adapted to its growth, where you now raise corn, and purchase your wheat and corn from the people of Illinois, who cannot raise cotton, and send them in return your cotton fabrics.

The State of Missouri, with her geographical position and her extraordinary mineral resources, with fine soil and climate, under a stable and protective policy, would soon take rank among the first States of this Union.

To gentlemen from the Western and Northwestern States, which are more purely devoted to agricultural pursuits, I say, that the best and most reliable market for the products of your farms is the home market. In an able paper published by David H. Mason, esq., of Chicago, and addressed to the western farmers, in speaking of the wonderful growth of the import and export trade of this country since 1861, he says:

The explanation of this extraordinary growth of both export and import trade is to be found in the activity, enterprise, and prosperity of the home market, through the beneficial operation of the protective policy upon domestic industry. That policy encouraged manufactures on our own soil; diversified employments; created a demand for labor; advanced the rate of wages, and conferred purchasing power upon the masses of the people. It is the expenditure of earnings that energizes commerce and trade. A population that is steadily employed and well paid can buy and consume; but not otherwise. The sum of social misery among a people can be measured by their inability to obtain wages. Regular employment and labor fully compensated are the fruitful parents of general prosperity, content, and cheerfulness. Where there is work for the hands of men, there is work for their teeth, clothes for their body, shelter for their heads, fuel for their warmth, instruction for their minds, and progress for their condition. The protective policy, by conferring purchasing power, caused an increasing demand for all these things; and, by stimulating the productive forces, satisfied that demand. Services easily found employment, and the circulation of commodities from hand to hand became rapid. The home market, formerly sluggish, was converted into a scene of enterprise and thrift; abundance became the order of the day; and both exports and imports expanded to unprecedented values. A prosperous foreign trade is inseparably connected with a prosperous home market. There must be a large development of internal commerce before there can be a large development of external commerce. No more than an individual can a nation exert great strength outwardly unless such strength exists inwardly. To neglect the home market, by reaching out after the foreign, is to neglect the substance to pursue a phantom.

The home market to the people of the United States is worth more than all the markets of the world besides.

There is an objection brought against the protective policy, and particularly by the western people, which has no foundation in fact. It is alleged that the consumer pays the duty, and consequently it requires more of the farm products for less of the manufactured articles. Facts and experience prove that the objection is not valid. The foreign producer pays the larger share of the duty, and home competition soon brings down the price to the lowest point at which the article can be manufactured. American manufacturers are satisfied with much less profit than the foreign manufacturer, when he has the sole control of the market. Statistics prove that the western farmers exported more wheat and corn and received higher prices during the years of protective policy than they did under partial free trade. During the thirteen years from 1849 to 1861, under partial free trade, 88,629,783 bushels of wheat and 36,745,003 barrels of wheat flour were exported, or averaging annually 6,817,676 bushels of wheat, average price \$1.30 per bushel, and 2,826,539 barrels of flour, averaging \$6.07 per barrel; while from 1861 till 1874, thirteen years of protective policy, we exported 359,849,413 bushels of wheat, and 39,713,318 barrels of wheat flour, or annually 27,680,724 bushels of wheat, average price \$1.37, and 3,054,871 barrels of flour, average price \$7.33 per barrel. In the same partial free-trade period, from 1849 till 1861, we exported 82,033,737 bushels corn, or annually 6,310,287 bushels, average price 68.5 cents per bushel, and 3,280,722 barrels of corn-meal, or annually 252,363 barrels, average price \$3.56 per barrel; while in the same period of protective policy, from 1861 till 1874, we exported 207,221,555 bushels of corn, or annually 15,940,120 bushels, average price 74.8 cents per bushel, and 3,640,717 barrels corn-meal, or annually 280,055 barrels, at an average price of \$4.71 per barrel.

The same fact holds good in regard to the price of wool. Prices have always ranged higher when we have had high rates of protection and lower when low rates of tariff. Let me say to gentlemen from the West that your large prairie farms by the continuous production of wheat and corn will soon become exhausted, and you will find it a wiser and better policy to grow less wheat and more wool, which will pay you quite as well and at the same time render your lands more fertile. We ought to produce our own wool and manu-



facture our own woolen goods, and not go abroad for a single pound. Yet during the years of 1873, 1874, and 1875 we have imported \$39,755,503 worth of unmanufactured wool and \$140,766,797 of woolen goods.

The western people should erect woolen factories all over their country and manufacture their own woolen goods, which would at the same time create a home market for the various products of the farm. The increase in our country of the growth of wool and manufacture of woolen goods is one of the most encouraging signs of the times.

I am indebted again to Mr. Mason for the following statement and table touching the woolen interest:

To show the sudden and vast growth of the wool industry and the woolen manufacture in the United States under protection, we have compiled from the census reports the following tabular statement for three several periods:

Particulars.	1870.	1860.	1850.
Number of woolen mills.....	2,891	1,260	1,559
Sets of cards.....	8,366	3,209	.....
Hands employed.....	80,053	42,738	27,682
Capital invested.....	\$98,824,531	\$30,862,654	\$38,118,650
Wages paid.....	\$26,877,575	\$9,610,254	.....
Wool consumed.....lbs..	172,078,919	81,608,468	70,862,829
Value of products.....	\$155,405,358	\$61,894,986	\$43,207,545
Number of sheep.....	28,477,951	22,471,275	.....
Domestic-wool crop.....lbs..	100,104,387	60,261,913	.....
Population.....	38,558,371	31,443,321	23,191,876

These significant figures tell the story of benefits conferred upon farmers by the protective policy. What else but the demand created by it for domestic wool could have induced such a heavy increase in the number of sheep? What else could have kept the price of wool up to such high figures in the face of such a large addition to the supply? See how slowly the woolen manufacture crept forward between 1850 and 1860, the number of establishments absolutely diminishing—that is, the big fishes eating up the little ones—under the free-trade tariffs of 1846 and 1857. Then observe the advance by mighty strides between 1860 and 1870 under tariff protection, the progress having been very much faster than that of population. Of the wool consumed by the mills in 1870, as much as 154,767,095 pounds had been derived from various seasons of the domestic crop.

Farmers should study these statistics, which bristle all over with facts closely allied with their interests. To cap all, staple woolen goods are cheaper than they were before the war, as the prices-current will prove. Yet free-traders, with monstrous absurdity and dogmatic assurance, insist that western farmers are plundered by our system of tariff. They never were more prosperous, and they know it. They, of all classes, were least affected by the panic of 1873, because of protection to home industry.

Whenever any branch of American industry has been stimulated into activity by the protective policy, it has invariably reduced the price below that which was paid for the imported article. This proposition can be substantiated by an accumulation of facts which are incontrovertible.

A few years ago we paid twenty-five cents per yard for British cotton prints. American competition and increased facilities for manufacturing soon brought down the price to fifteen cents per yard, and, finally, just before the late war, good prints could be bought for twelve cents per yard, and that was as low as it was supposed the price could be brought. But improved machinery and the increased number of cotton mills, stimulated by protection, have reduced the price still lower, until to-day the same quality of prints can be bought for eight cents per yard.

In an interview with James E. Emerson, esq., a highly intelligent gentleman of the firm of Emerson & Ford, manufacturers of steel saws at Beaver Falls, Pennsylvania, I was informed that for twenty years, while manufacturing steel-saws in the State of Connecticut, he had purchased all their saw-steel from Mr. Jessup, of Sheffield, England, but for the last four years, since our American steel manufacturers have come in competition with English manufacturers, he had not purchased one pound of English saw-steel, and that the American saw-steel was of a better quality, and for which he paid 20 per cent. less.

In 1870, when a bill was before Congress to increase the tariff on the importation of English Bessemer steel rails, it met with stout opposition from gentlemen of the West, and it was stated on this floor that whatever increased duty was placed on steel rails would enhance the price of the rails just that much to the purchaser; that the price in New York at that time for steel rails was \$120 per ton; and that it required over one hundred bushels of western wheat to buy one ton of steel rails; and whatever additional tariff was imposed would require just that amount more of wheat to purchase a ton of rails, and those gentlemen believed it, notwithstanding it was shown that it was a mistake. What has been the result? The bill was passed, large rail-mills have been erected in our country, and to-day Bessemer steel rails can be had for \$85 per ton, requiring little more than half as much western wheat to buy a ton of rails.

Facts, sir, could be multiplied indefinitely proving the truth of the proposition; but I am admonished that my time has expired, and I must bring my remarks to a close.

It might be wise, sir, for this House to call a halt in our headlong course and take a quiet survey of the situation. We have been in session for nearly six months and have absolutely accomplished nothing of importance to the country. The principal business of this session has been the running of investigating committees, and so far at a cost to the country of not less than \$800,000, and the business has been conducted in such a reckless and discreditable manner as to

produce much demoralization to the whole country, and until our committees in many instances have degenerated into mere smut-machines, and until honest and decent men everywhere, irrespective of party, have become utterly disgusted with our proceedings.

The majority of this House have passed a diplomatic bill cutting up by the roots our foreign service and bunched together three or four of the states of South America whose commercial relations are naturally with us, and have provided for a resident minister to each bunch. We may call this economy, but it is not statesmanship. We have also just made a horizontal cut through the salaries of the clerks of the several Departments of the Government whose pay affords but a bare subsistence, and what is worse, the bill has overturned the organized system of conducting the business of the Government which had taken years of careful experience to perfect. We may call this retrenchment, but it is not reform. The majority of this House may overthrow our present tariff laws, but I tell you now and here that it will prove disastrous to the country, and the party which does it will meet with certain and utter defeat.

Mr. WILLIS moved that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. RANDALL having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. CLYMER reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union had had under consideration the bill (H. R. No. 3375) making appropriations for the naval service for the year ending June 30, 1877, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. CUTLER. I move that the House now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at ten o'clock and ten minutes p.m.) the House adjourned.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

The following memorials, petitions, and other papers were presented at the Clerk's desk under the rule, and referred as stated:

By Mr. BRADFORD: The petition of citizens of Coosa County, Alabama, for the establishment of a post-route from Rockford to Verbena, Alabama, to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CRAPO: The petition of Henry Fish, for compensation for injuries to his person, received while in the employ of the United States at Falmouth, Massachusetts, to the Committee of Claims.

By Mr. FELTON: The petition of James H. Rogers, for compensation for property taken for the use of the United States Army, to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FORNEY: The petition of Jane S. Harris, G. W. Rogers, William Autrey, D. L. Nicholson, and other Cherokee Indians, for reimbursement of the amount paid by them for transportation to the Cherokee Nation, in accordance with the treaty of 1835, to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER: Papers relating to the petition of Jonathan Witter, late a private in Company H, One hundred and first Regiment Ohio Volunteers, for a change of his military record, to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MCFARLAND: The petition of David Britton, late a private in Company E, Fifth Regiment Tennessee Volunteers in the war with Mexico, to be restored to the pension-roll, to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### IN SENATE.

SATURDAY, May 20, 1876.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. BYRON SUNDERLAND, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

#### BILLS BECOME LAWS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. C. C. SNIFFEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the following bills, having been received by the President on the 6th of May and not having been returned by him to the Senate within the ten days prescribed by the Constitution, had become laws without his signature:

An act (S. No. 40) granting a pension to Elmira E. Cravath;

An act (S. No. 425) granting a pension to James Eli Butts and Mollinda Frances Butts; and

An act (S. No. 504) granting a pension to Nancy True.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. G. M. ADAMS, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. No. 3263) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1877, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. No. 3471) to amend the sixth section of chapter 127, United States statutes;

A bill (H. R. No. 1253) granting to the State of Missouri all lands therein selected as swamp and overflowed lands;

A bill (H. R. No. 3479) making certain transfers of appropriations